

Insight Within a New Global Culture

The title expresses an ambitious project both of paper-writing and, if my projection is correct, of the historical process. How might I keep this presentation brief and accessible, yet not lose the unity of perspective I intend? Originally I wrote a first part, followed by the outline of the paper given earlier, intending to add a second part following the discussions of the conference. But Part II began to emerge as what I really wished to share. It is, however, altogether more dense and inaccessible, paradoxically much briefer than Part I. In that first part I had already relegated to footnotes complexities that could not be developed, lurking in the text and in the direct presentation. Part II resembles, perhaps, a simple melody overwhelmed by footnote chords, cords, hearts of matter.¹

Part I. Personal Directions

By a new global culture I mean a culture that is established in the scientific mode invented by Lonergan in his creative leap of February 1965, when he conceived of a functional collaboration in the global search for progress. In Christian terms one might see him as bracketing Paul's hymn to charity of *First Corinthians*, chapter 13, with a sublation of the two bracketing chapters, 12 and 14, with a refinement of interpretation, a maturing of thinking: "All do not interpret, do they?" (12: 30); "in your thinking be

¹A first footnote is necessary, hovering round the work *lurking* in the text above. It relates to a difficulty that occur in axial cultures - a later topic. The difficulty is summarily described by Lonergan in his treatment of *haute vulgarization* (*Collected Works*, vol. 6, pp. 121, 155). But the difficulty haunts his entire life's work, and his *Collected Works*. I have made a stab at writing about it in "Haute Vulgarization", chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, Axial Publishing, Cape Breton, 2007, and further in the first chapter of Part III of *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, a book to appear in 2009 in English and French, authored by Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane. This book is referred to below as **LLI**. I can make the completed drafts of my three chapters of Part III available on request, by e-mail. Below I also refer to writings on my website: the website is www.philipmcshane.ca; the books there are available free.

mature”(14: 20). But to that light-weight reading of a parallel in scripture there is to be added the deeper perspective of the effective unity of the mission of Jesus as it seeds the efficient unity of a human science. “It is quite legitimate to seek in the efficient cause of the science, that is, in the scientist, the reason why a science forms a unified whole.”² And that efficiency places the global solution to Plato’s ancient problem of the control of urban meaning in Lonergan’s final identification of the human component of Cosmopolis.³ Functional collaboration is to replace eventually the long muddled haphazard effort of thinking effectively forward in history.⁴

But what might I mean by *eventually*? It seems quite plausible to identify the third stage of meaning described by Lonergan in *Method in Theology* with the second time of the human subject that became a topic for him in the late 1950s.⁵ The distinction between the first and second time of the temporal subject is quite simple yet profound. The first time is a time of spontaneous intelligence, intelligence used but not adverted to. The second time is the time of intelligence that is self-appreciative in a habitual manner, a quite different control of meaning. One can certainly think of that shift ontogenetically: the spontaneity of the young Aquinas or the young Lonergan, sharply intelligent but not seriously self-attentive. But the meaning to which I attend immediately is the phylogenetic meaning that leads one to a view of an Axial Period in

²B.Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, University of Toronto Press, 1993, 160.

³In the second half of *Joistings 22* I discuss the manner in which the characteristics of Cosmopolis are realized in the strategy of functional specialization.

⁴This haphazard strategy occurs in all disciplines. Chapter 1 of my *Molecules, Minding, Meaning* (University of Toronto Press, 2008) gives an initial indication of the general problem.

⁵The first presentation of the topic occurs in *Quaestio XXI* of B.Lonergan, *Divinarum Personarum Conceptio Analogica*, Gregorian University Press, 1957. It is repeated in the later version of the same work, *De Deo Trino II. Pars Systematica*, 1964, which is now available in English from University of Toronto Press, 2007 as *The Triune God*.

human history that has its ontogenetic parallel.⁶ This view solves a problem both in the thinking of Jaspers and in Lonergan's reflections on the second stage of meaning.

First, there was Jasper's problematic view. In his *Origins and Goals of History* he placed a basic axis of history in the period between 800 and 200 B.C. when humans reached significant differentiation in Greece, Persia, Israel, India and China.⁷ In the context of a later discussion of a contemporary culture, he raised the question of a second axial period.⁸ Toynbee took issue with Jaspers in his last work, *Mankind and Mother Earth*: "It would be misleading to set a chronological limit to the Axial Age that excluded the two mighty epigoni (i.e. Jesus and Muhammad) of Zarathustra and 'Deutero-Isaiah'. Thus the Axis Age expands from a period of about 120 years to one of about seventeen centuries running from *circa* 1060 B.C. down to A.D. 632, which is the date of the Prophet Muhammad's death."⁹

In the fourth volume of his work *Order and History*, entitled *The Ecumenic Age*, Eric Voegelin moves to a fuller view of the historical process which resembles broadly the one I propose here. A central feature of Voegelin's view is his emphasis on the 'In-Betweenness' of human existence, to which he gives the name *Metaxy*. There is an emergence of a tension of "In-Betweenness" that Voegelin primarily associates with the noetic differentiation in the Greek tradition and the pneumatic differentiation in the Hebrew tradition. Clearly, Voegelin would consider this emergence into consciousness as axial in some temporal sense, so meshing his problem with ours, and it seems to me that a key pointer to the resolution of the debate regarding the meaning of axiality lies

⁶One may think thus, ontogenetically and phylogenetically, of the claim of Lonergan in *Insight* regarding metaphysics as latent, problematic, explicit: see the index under *Metaphysics, Latent*.

⁷K.Jaspers, *The Origins and Goal of History*, London, 1953, chapter 1.

⁸*Ibid.*, 97.

⁹A.Toynbee, *Mankind and Mother Earth*, Oxford University Press, 1976, 178.

in his recurring questioning of the meaning of modernity. So, in noting the parallel falsifications of history in the Sumerian King List and in Hegel's *Philosophy of History*, Voegelin is led to query: "And what is modern about modern mind, one may ask, if Hegel, Comte, or Marx, in order to create an image of history that will support their ideological imperialism, still use the same techniques for distorting the reality of history as their Sumerian predecessors?"¹⁰ In a later context he remarks: "A 'modern age' in which the thinkers who ought to be philosophers prefer the role of imperial entrepreneurs will have to go through many convulsions before it has got rid of itself, together with the arrogance of its revolt, and found the way back to the dialogue of humanity with its humility."¹¹

Voegelin asks, 'What is modern?' It is useful to advert to the meanings of the classical Latin word, *modo*, (merely, just, directly), and the derived medieval word, *modernitas*: present-dayness. Then - but I would note that the topic demands massive research of a functional kind - one, or rather mankind, can move to a dialogue with its humility and find ranges and varieties of fragmented consciousness as the character, or characters, of the long period of history between what Lonergan calls the first and second times of the temporal subject, making it possible to identify the first and third stages of meaning with these two and then to identify the Axial Period as the second stage of meaning, subsuming Jaspers two axial periods.¹²

This is all too dense in its expression and its anticipation of later functional specialist cycling and re-cycling, but at least I can add the suggestion that the view can

¹⁰E. Voegelin, *The Ecumenic Age*, 68; see also 7, 27-28, 173.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 192.

¹²I would note that there is the apparently quite different problem of the nature of personal enlightenment. Note 6 gives the broader context. It is through self-attention in the personal problem of attaining enlightenment that one arrives at an initial basis for reflection on the historical problem. The issue of enlightenment in either case, however, is a complex topic that requires classifications of differentiations and cultures.

give a powerful heuristic grip on the tasks sketched on page 250 of *Method in Theology*. Part of that heuristic grasping will be the evolution of geohistorical estimative specifications of the Axial Period. But my first burst forward in the late seventies to this view, with its 5000 year span, from 2500 B.C. to 2500 A.D., gives us an initial image to ingest. Further, the second date serves to nudge us towards the issues raised in the final section of chapter 7 of *Insight*: the date depends on us, and on Lonergan's later functional identification of Cosmopolis as the instrument of humanity's dialogue with its humility.¹³

But it is also a dialogue of humanity with its greatness, its call to ontogenetic and phylogenetic growth in viewing its journey *sub specie aeternitatis*.¹⁴ In an unpublished effort of 1965 to write a first chapter of *Method* Lonergan recalls Hegel: "As the labour of introspection proceeds, one stumbles upon Hegel's insight that the full objectification of the human spirit is the history of the human race. It is in the sum of the products of common sense and common nonsense, of the sciences and the philosophies, of moralities and religions, of social orders and cultural achievements, that there is mediated, set before us the mirror in which we can behold, the originating principle of human aspiration and human attainment and failure."¹⁵ Further, in that same set of fragments he gives a clue to the maturing of the ongoing genesis of methods that

¹³In *Joistings 8*, "Recycling Satisfaction", I associate the challenge of moving into functional specialized science as a participation in the satisfaction of Christ.

¹⁴Recall the challenge of "Finality, Love, Marriage": "theologians, let alone parents, rarely think of the historical process" (Lonergan, *Collection*, University of Toronto Press, 1988, 47). Recall notes 6 and 12 above. I would add that *sub specie aeternitatis* includes a perspective on a personal and phylogenetic genetic eschatology, a massive lacuna in present theology. Some pointers in that regard are given at the end of Part II of this paper.

¹⁵I quote from page 14 of a Lonergan archival file labeled A697. It contains a typescript numbered pp. 8-23. Very plausibly it is a continuation of the sketch of a first chapter of *Method* that is contained in file V.7, the same file which contains the basic first scribbled version of functional specialization. That file contains nine pages of typescript that is the beginning of a first chapter, and also a three-page scribbled outline of the entire chapter.

occupied him later in identifying a third order of human consciousness. “Second order intentionality has a second-order object that in a first order is not a datum of consciousness. Similarly, when as at present one introspects introspection, then there is a third-order consciousness and a third-order intentionality. There is a third-order consciousness, for consciously we advert to our adverting to our operations. There is a third-order intentionality whose third-order object was, in the second order, not an object but the datum of consciousness that is the introspection being introspected”¹⁶ Such a maturing of the Hegelian insight towards a luminous methodology obviously belongs to the second time of the temporal subject. Its naming no more carries us into that time than the slim identification of the need for self-knowledge fermenting in Confucius¹⁷ or in Socrates, carries us into *Insight*. It is a distant hope, a hope wonderously expressed in the end of the book *Insight* that I would mesh into the statistics of its realization: the complex of probabilities to be associated with the special auxiliary to humanity’s question that is functional collaboration.¹⁸ Hear Lonergan’s reach in that final 31st place of chapter 20 of *Insight*: “The antecedent willingness of hope has to advance from a generic reinforcement of the pure desire to an adapted and specialized auxiliary ever ready to offset every interference either with intellect’s unrestricted finality or with its essential detachment and disinterestedness.”¹⁹ It would be over eleven years later that the structure of that auxiliary would dawn on him, but it

¹⁶I am quoting here from page 8 of the draft-chapter titled “Method” referred to in the previous note.

¹⁷“When you meet persons of exceptional character / Think to stand shoulder to shoulder with them; / Meeting persons of little character, / look inward and examine yourself.” I quote from The Original Book IV (479 B.C.) of *The Analects*, translated by Jaime Barrera Parra in a paper read at the Loyola Marymount Fallon-Lonergan Conference, March 2007, “Encountering Confucius’s Ethics of Self Transcendence.”

¹⁸One may start with the simple statistical shift that is related to cyclic recurrence: see *Insight*, 121[145].

¹⁹*Insight*, 726[747].

is wonderful to note that in that ten-page section of *Insight* he mentions *collaboration* 29 times. Previously I have considered his solution of 1965 in relation to the demands of his suggestions about Cosmopolis, but it would be quite profitable - a task beyond this paper - to consider his suggestions here about collaboration in relation to that discovered functional auxiliary.

We should, however, pause further over his notion of a third order of consciousness in order to glimpse the character of the mature collaboration. That notion, to be slowly and empirically thematized, leads to a precision regarding the meaning of methodology that both lifts it beyond Lonergan's later searchings²⁰ and at the same time roots back to his initial aspiration in tackling the adventure of writing *Insight*.²¹ Second-order consciousness yields a luminous grip on a particular method. Third order consciousness grounds a luminous ordering of all methods. So, methodology's relation to methods is to resemble zoology's relation to the geohistory of animals.²²

Furthermore, the distinction between nature and grace does not warrant a separation of methods or a fracturing of methodology. So we are back at Lonergan's

²⁰See, for example, "The Ongoing Genesis of Methods", *A Third Collection*, Paulist Press, 1985, 146-65.

²¹A fuller reflection would add in consideration of the amazing achievement of *Insight* chapter 17 in defining the methodological strategy implicit in the universal viewpoint. That strategy is to be meshed with his later strategy of reversing counterpositions in a manner that twists the dialectic component of the universal viewpoint into the ongoing sequence of genetic systematics that, meshed with the universal viewpoint, is to be the dominant perspective of the operation of functional specialization: symbolically, UV + GS is to be the Standard Model operative in the cycle from Research to Communication and so on round. But that is a topic for a later work, Part 3, Chapter 3, "Research, Interpretation, History, His Story", of *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, by Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, already mentioned in note 1 above. A further context is the two books mentioned in the Appendix here.

²²The fact that we are only on the fringe of this perspective should not excuse us from the effort to shift context into the explanatory mode hinted at in the previous note. See Appendix 3 of any of the three works mentioned in note 5 above, where Lonergan treats of the handicap of failing to reach an explanatory heuristic even in the early stages of a science.

bent in his tackling the writing of *Insight*. And we are back to the beginning of this present essay where I emphasized the Christian perspective on the search for method.

But what of the next fifty years, of Lonergan studies, of the global searchings that I wrote of in the summary anticipation of this paper? If this paper is to take its place in the pragmatics of effective method, than it had best add concrete appeal through proximate agenda.

Already in this 50th anniversary year I have mused over such an agenda in the March Lonergan Conference in Los Angeles and the summary expression given there of that agenda would be a suitable start to my further reflections here. I place that summary expression between lines immediately.

Placing and Replacing *Insight* after Fifty Years: A Case of Three Interlocked Primers.

Possible and probably mutual self-mediations of present global culture and Lonergan's three priming communities grounded in [1] *Method in Theology* (1972); [2] *Insight* (1957); [3] *Circulation Analysis* (1944). Strategic minimalisms.

[1] Lonergan as fosterfather to history's mothering of functional collaboration (*Method, Minding, Meaning*, U of T. Press, 2008. Chapters 1, 6): Plato's Athenian reach, Thomas' *Quaestio Prima* of the *Summa Theologica* and the issue of the efficient beauty of metaphysics (Lonergan Archives, batch 5 section 7; *Topics in Education*, 160, line 16, and *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry* {Website, June, 2007}). Minimalist beginnings in apparently isolated disciplines: Physics as lead instrument of orchestra, and a fruitful digression on functional research. [See McShane, "The Elevating of Insight: Space-Time as Paradigm Problem", *Method Journal*, 19(2001)]. Educational psychology as zone of vulnerability in [2]; economic's vulnerable zones for [3].

[2] A minimalist effective strategy for *Insight* (See *A Second Collection*, 222 top, and

Method in Theology, last sentence of note on page 336). A focus on school texts, grades 11 and 12, and first year university texts. Functional researchers interlocking efforts (2011; 2111, as reflected on in *Loneragan's Standard Model*): see "Stray Points" below, especially (3) re ethos.

[3] The narrower strategy of interlocking texts on economics for Grade 12. See "Grade Twelve Economics: A Common Quest Manifesto" (Prehumous 1 on Website). The minimalism here of two circuits of analysis and of present descriptive weakness of texts and policies (*For a New Political Economic*, chapter 1, and *The Systematics of the Trinity*, end section, on explanatory heuristics needed in beginnings of science). Details in Prehumous 1.

Some Stray Points:

(1) The need for an elementary metagrammic control of metaphysics (see "Metaphysical Control of Meaning", *Method. Journal of Loneragan Studies* **24** [2006] and Appendix A of *Method, Molecules and Meaning* [to appear on the website as Prehumous 2]. Parallel with chemistry.

(2) The cyclic horizon shifting as ongoing genesis, total (*Verbum*, 238, "conceptualization as system....context"), as well as complexly and geographically genetic (Doran's pointers of *What is Systematic Theology?* within the larger functional, global and foundationless cycle-system).

(3) The practical genesis of the mutual self-mediative communities:

Detailed efforts are to emerge e.g. my own re Australia, Korea, etc, as compactly expressed in the thirteen *Eldorede*. It seems to me that the problem here is one of *ethos* and group-commitment e.g. to Loneragan's dedication to bring forth a democratic and enlightened political economy. We need pragmatic outreach to those in our circle of

teaching friends, teenagers, etc etc, in the mood of an “aesthetic apprehension of the group’s origin and story operative ... especially in a crisis” (*Topics in Education*, 230).

(4) the long axial road to the mature second-stage meaning of Conversion to Word, the Divine Explanation (an “embracing”: see (*Insight*, 417[442], 514[537], 699[721-2]; W3 and W5).

Reading between those lines is no mean task, one I cannot undertake here. But the suggestion of minimal effort is the centrally important element. The global academic community is secretly gasping for the division of labour described by Lonergan, and this is the place to start rather than with an invitation to tackle *Insight*, or at least supplementing that invitation with such a division.²³ The cycling of the full system will gradually - especially through the workings of *Method in Theology*, 250 - move the challenge of *Insight* into the global culture, East, West and South.

This notion of gradualism leads me to two comments regarding what would appear to be over-hastiness. The first comment regards intellectual conversion, the second is on the work of Robert Doran mentioned in the Summary of this paper.

Intellectual conversion is a massively complex human achievement ontogenetically and phylogenetically. It is to be a dominant presence only in the community of culture, the creative community of functional specialization, in the third stage of meaning. Certainly, it is a key challenge of *Insight* but, in my experience, it is beyond most of its present readers.²⁴ The fact of its difficulty is regularly noted by

²³The next note draws attention, both implicitly and explicitly - through the pointers from Mark Morelli - to the possibilities of both dialogue and dialectic with the Hegelian tradition.

²⁴The challenge is to get beyond a half-way house between sensism and idealisms that clings, perhaps with Kantian subtlety, to a naive realism on some level of sense or spirit, to reach beyond Hegel’s inwardness to a more radical inwardness, a dark and extreme realism. On Hegel in this regard see Mark Morelli’s very powerful and cogent paper of this meeting, “Going Beyond Idealism. Lonergan’s Relation to Hegel.” I would note that interviews of Lonergan

Lonergan so I leave you with his footnoted view.²⁵ The fact of its non-achievement by many experts in Lonergan is beginning finally to be a topic,²⁶ and I had best leave it to ferment forward as such: I am already sufficiently unpopular! Again, the cycling of the full functional system is the hope of effective achievement.

Then there is the dedicated work of Robert Doran, worth singling out precisely because he stands out in his effort to see the task whole and to push forward in it, in relative solitude. In the Loyola Marymount Conference in Los Angeles, this year (2007),²⁷ and more elaborately at the Boston Conference of June,²⁸ he presented his hopes of a move forward in systematic both through refinements of Lonergan's thematic of the absolutely supernatural and through the sublation of scripture

(1981) by Professor J. V. Rice, help to identify a more modest role for Kant in the drive of *Insight*. The driving element in *Insight* was an interest in methods, an eye on the distant future, an outreach for the thinking existential sufferer, but above all else a restructuring of thinking regarding the restructuring of all things in Christ. And among the elements of that drive there is to be found the truth of Ivo Coelho's claim: "It could be said . . . that Lonergan's method is not only post-Aristotelian and post-Kantian, but also explicitly and consciously post-Hegelian" (Ivo Coelho, *Hermeneutics and Method: The 'Universal Viewpoint' in Bernard Lonergan* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001], p. 194).

²⁵I need refer only to the single volume 18 of his *Complete Works, Phenomenology and Logic*. See, for example, the index there, under *Augustine*. But the volume also draws attention to the possibility of axiomatic expression (pp. 121ff), and this possibility is to be exploited fully with regard to what Lonergan calls *The Position*. This is a largely uninvestigated region involving a sublation of the simple positional statement of *Insight* 423 into an axiomatic form that involves axioms of intentionality, of incompleteness, of infinity. See, further, the reflections on the metagram, **W0**, at the conclusion of the website essay, *Prehumus* 3, "Metagrams and Metaphysics".

²⁶A key nudge here is the work of Richard Liddy, integrally presented in his book, *Startling Strangeness: Reading Lonergan's Insight*, University Press of America, 2006. Mark Morelli nudges further (see, here, notes 23, 24, 35, 58) and there is the (Hegelian?) challenge (note 24) of the reach for a fuller logic.

²⁷The title of his paper there was "Envisioning a Systematic Theology".

²⁸His presentation there was simply titled "Report on a Work in Progress".

scholarship such as that of N.T.Wright into a systematic context.²⁹

I could not possibly do justice to the facets of his push forward here, nor to the refined disagreements that Bob and I have shared for more than two decades. To the note below I would only add the broad comment that such work as he is doing is desperately needed within a present pastoral effort to bring the subjectivity of a loving Three into the Christian community's lives. But, as a move forwards towards the fresh systematics anticipated heuristically by Lonergan the effort is too hasty and too undifferentiated.³⁰

Doran fails; I have failed; we all have failed to meet the challenge of stumblingly

²⁹I note that he makes no mention, here or elsewhere, of the cleansing process involved in operations of the type suggested on page 250 of *Method in Theology*.

³⁰I would note that I find this true of other good work that is emerging at present. For instance, at that same Boston Conference of 2007, Charles Hefling Jr. dealt magnificently with the topic "Lonergan, Schleiermacher, and Christian Systematic Theology: Possibly Relevant Questions". But he was compactly ranging over a half-dozen specialties: he would certainly admit this, but I would like that admission to emerge operatively, in community, as the central possibly relevant question. On Doran's work there are my extended reflections in Part Three of *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*. See also chapters 9, 10 and 12 of *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*. Finally, *Joistings* 18, "The Field and Unified Field Theories; God and I" and *Joistings* 20, "Identifying Systematic Theology" focus on broader problems of identifying systematic theology. A central key theological problem is his reading of Lonergan's hypothesis regarding graces' relations to the Eternal Processions as blossoming into "a new from of the psychological analogy". I had best quote, in context, from his Los Angeles paper in what I hope is a helpful pointer towards reflection and discussion. "I suggest that the hypothesis provides us with a new form of the psychological analogy for understanding the divine processions, and analogy within the order of graced experience itself. And I propose that systematic theology itself has evolved to the point where it can begin with a position that integrates the divine processions with the divine missions from the outset of the systematic enterprise." There is a problem here regarding the meaning of "from the outset," a problem I dealt with in *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations* by appealing to an analogy between the 4-hypothesis of Lonergan and the 4-hypothesis contained in Maxwell's 4 electrodynamic equations: from the outset, when fully understood, Maxwell's equations contain all the relations that are termed in investigable situations. So with the Eternal Processions' relations to the historical missions. Further, a full genetic systematics of systems would mesh fresh glimpses of the Relations into the entire structure, not as new but as missed, acknowledging the seeds of that freshness in earlier meanings of the tradition.

attempting a climb to the differentiated thinking involved in working in any functional specialty. And have no doubts: the effort is to give rise eventually to precise and differentiated talk and writing, sentence by scientific sentence.³¹

An analogy with the difficulty of the cultural shift of economics helps here. The real crisis of transition in economics is not facing the complexities of a democratic economics that are latent in Lonergan's new political economy. The proximate operable - or should I say inoperable? - challenge is to get the distinction between two functions of money into the elementary searchings of economic realities, presently shabbily muddled.. Similarly the proximate challenge in methodological thinking, in theology, philosophy, or any discipline, is not the facing of the complexities of a remote methodological horizon but the bringing into our present efforts an explicit talking and writing of the distinction between eight functions of talking and writing. We could make a start towards that by taking present written efforts, our own and others, and seeking pragmatic light of how we ramble, prescientifically, sentence by sentence, from one function to another.

There are two broader starts worth mentioning. First, each of us may place ourselves, humbly and incompetently, in the discomfort of the challenge of *Method in Theology* page 250.³² Surely that is a direction of what this self-appropriation business is

³¹There is a further lift involved which is beyond the scope of this short article, the shift noted by Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 88, note 34, towards linguistic feedback in subjectivity's destined reach for subject. This relates to the broad topic of a third definition of generalized empirical method, where the lonely subject is the centre of personal attention (see *Joistings* 21, "Research, Communications, Stages of Method") and also to the topic of education crystallized in the slogan, "When teaching children anything one is teaching children children". [I note, in passing, a second reference to linguistic feedback in *Method*, page 92, omitted from the published texts - the omission is here in boldface: "in the measure that linguistic **feed-back is achieved, that is in the measure that** explanations and statements provide the sensible presentations...."]

³²I would note that the task of the page should now include Lonergan's achievement as expressed in *Method in Theology* pp. 286ff., which is the result of his massive solitary dialectic effort.

all about: taking a luminous stand. Especially there is the issue that is most evidently raised in this paper: where do I stand with regard to functionally differentiated thinking and talking?³³

Secondly, there is the need to push immediately and communally for luminosity with regard to key varieties of dialogue and dialectic. The oval circuit of functional dialogue, within the standard model even in its initial stages, does not turn to speak to other traditions. That speaking is one of the tasks of the eight functional specialization. But what, you might ask, is the nature of the dialogue of the specialty Dialectic? It is, or is to be, dialogue within and towards refinements of the “cumulative and progressive results”³⁴ of the third stage of global meaning, results that are beyond present fantasy.

But what of our dialogue here, mediated by papers such as this? It falls within the tasks of the eighth functional specialty, a task that eventually may be seen as poorly done by me. I am drawing attention, in scattered or some might say scatty fashion, to Lonergan’s answer to the challenge of rescuing *Insight*, both from its present shrinkage as a unified personal challenge and from its unavoidable incompleteness as a contemporary global methodology.³⁵

³³I note that the list on page 287 of *Method in Theology* is incomplete: it is to include now a tenth challenge, (10), functional specialization as the full methodological context of future culture.

³⁴ *Method in Theology*, 4.

³⁵A fuller perspective on the present challenge - though earlier and so less sophisticated - is in my essay “The Importance of Rescuing *Insight*”, *The Importance of Insight. Essays in Honour of Michael Vertin*, University of Toronto Press, 2007, 199-225. The issue of incompleteness is a fundamental theme throughout *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*. But I would draw attention, in conclusion, to that fundamental incompleteness to which Lonergan arrives at the end of chapter 19 of *Insight*, and return in that context to the Morelli essay mentioned above, notes 23 and 24. Morelli concludes the essay thus : “If we are to achieve and inhabit the standpoint of Critical Realism, not only must we reject incoherent realism, but we must enter into and go beyond Hegel’s Absolute Idealism.” Turn, now, in your imagination, to that old chestnut about the half-way house. The three way-stations obviously parallel the three that is matter, form, existence. But is their illumination not also related to the three stages of meaning: so Hegel brings into focus the question of form as a “full objectification

Appendix to Part I : the Paper's Original Outline.

The paper will place the book *Insight* within a culture of the third stage of meaning that I have attempted to sketch heuristically in the two books *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations* and its sequel *Loneragan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry* (both books are on the website). While the paper moves forward within these contexts it will sufficiently indicate their import to make intelligible the character of the relocation. So, it will take its start from the problem posed (in *Insight*, chapter 7, i.e. section 8.5, "Culture and Reversal") in Loneragan's reach for cosmopolis, and move through his later heuristic specification of cosmopolis (File V.7 of February 1965) to the new global cyclic system of culture that is implicit there. That cyclic system is to be redemptive of the cultural achievements of the previous two stages of meaning in a manner that "sees history as better than it was" (*Method in Theology*, 251). The cyclic dynamic is expected, under the laws of emergent probability, to be a slow labour of centuries. The paper will sketch, realistically but within the normativity of foundational fantasy, the core emergent foundational drive of the possible and concretely probable cyclic collaboration of the next fifty years. It will lift Robert Doran's work of these past decades into the context of a fuller system that will cycle current achievements of genetic systematics through a global community of culture. The cyclic aim, and the aim of the paper, is towards a pragmatics of ongoing effective gentle reversal of decline.

of the human spirit" (see the text at note 15 above)? And is the third stage, swinging back to the Christian perspective, somehow related to hope and the luminous absence in history not only of the meaning of "is" but of the First Person? I recall, finally, a conversation I had with Loneragan one evening in July of 1971. "When did you finally reach the meaning of 'is'?" I asked. "When I got that far in *Insight*", was Loneragan's reply. But how far was that?

Part II History's Directions

I would, perhaps, better maintain an evident continuity with the first part if the title of this part were "History's Directors". There are the Three Directors of history collaborating exotically with the multitude of humanity, each with a role in the dynamics of finitude, a vast and rich topic that we spin past in the conclusion.³⁶ But our interest here and now, is in some pragmatics of ourselves as directors.

I begin with an image which does not seem at all pragmatic, yet it seems to me to be massively so, and it is worth pondering more fully, indeed I would say habitually, if we are to reach that humility about which Voegelin wrote.³⁷ First, then, the strange but simple image.

I wrote above of the two times of the temporal subject, and with my focus on phylogeny rather than ontogeny, the obvious image is of linear time. I wish to complexify that image, but hold to the simplicity of a single line. We start with an image on the blackboard that is four meters long, each meter representing one thousand years, indeed the line representing the four thousand years from 1000 B.C. to 3000 A.D. Recall now the earlier discussion of the Axial Period and of the three stages of meaning.³⁸ Does the Axial Period span that four thousand years, something that jives with my suggested revision of the views of Jaspers, Toynbee, Voegelin? That is not what is important for

³⁶After the conclusion I place the diagram that is central to the present text: the metagram called W3, taken from page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue; from Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, Cape Breton, 2000.

³⁷See above, at note 11. This is central to the intussusception into the Tower, or the Standard Model of collaboration, of the image that I deal with here. One reaches for a sense, a taste, of history that sublates Hegel's perspective (see the quotation from Lonergan at note 15 above), that cast a fresh light on these few millennia of Christianity. The time line also raises subtle questions about the longer cycle of decline, the unity of the universe, the place and character of the angels in Old Testament and present traditions (include here reverence for ancestors). These are topic quite beyond a short paper. Some further points are made relating to problems of eschatology in the concluding pages below.

³⁸See above, at note 12.

our present effort, though it is not difficult to image various possibilities. What is important immediately is to go beyond the ends of the line.

The “going beyond” is the catch, the tricky task, strangely related to “the problem of general history, which is the real catch.”³⁹ Certainly, drawing the line out further is not a difficult problem: the problem is in drawing the mind out in a massive slow interior growth. It is not a beginner’s task or even, perhaps, a middle-aged achievement.⁴⁰ I liken the task to the task that emerged peculiarly in chapter 19 of *Insight*: “what, then, is being?” The question “what is being?” emerged earlier, although in strange stages.⁴¹ But my new question pivoting on the odd word, *then*, gives a new twist, indeed, I would claim, a new radical lift to the meaning of generalized empirical method.⁴² But I will cut this identification of a new question short here and get on first with an apparently simple extension of the original image of a four-meter line.

I ask you to extend the four meters in your imagination - I add dots at both sides

³⁹*Topics in Education*, 236.

⁴⁰There is a deep cultural problem involved here: a n axial period rejection of growth that normatively should echo the equation $d/dx(e^x) = e^x$. On this, see *Lack in The Beingstalk, A Giants Causeway*, Axial Publishing, 2007, 161-63; also *Eldorede 4*, “Meaning-Growth”. Adult Growth in the Shakespeare of *Pericles* is magnificently presented by Patrick Kavanagh (see the lengthy quotation from a radio talk in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, 56-64). Adult growth in retirement is the central topic in McShane, “The Importance of Rescuing *Insight*”, *The Importance of Insight. Essays in Honour of Michael Vertin*, University of Toronto Press, 2007, 199-225.

⁴¹The stages of Lonergan’s dealing with the question of being seem to puzzle many, even people of serious authority. I dealt with the matter in “The Contemporary Thomism of Bernard Lonergan”, *Philosophical Studies*, Ireland, 1962. The first stage involves a mere use of the word being; the real challenge occurs in an invitation to consent to the position on page 388[413] of *Insight*. The challenge is that mentioned in notes 24 and 35 above. We return to it below, especially in note 61.

⁴²I title the new lift GEM3, a shift from GEM2, which is defined in the first few lines of page 141 of *A Third Collection*, giving a view which requires a balanced attention to object and subject. GEM3 shifts to a mediation of the subject’s self-appreciation. Further on this see *Joistings 21*, “Research, Communications, States of Method”, and the final chapter of **LLI**, of *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*.

of the diagram on the board. I wish you, in imaginative deed, to extend the line backwards 13.7 kilometers and forwards 2000 kilometers. The deed requires crutches, a human thing worth brooding over. I offer some immediately: take the four meters, in your imagination, and stand it on the ground beside you, like a pike or a spear. The backward extension goes, then, through the ground. How far? It comes out at the other side of the Earth and stands tall a further thousand kilometers. No great problem of measurement here: the Earth's diameter is about 12,700 kilometers. What of the forward extension, representing a piece of the future? Look up there into the blue, up the distance from Melbourne to Alice Springs in the centre of your Australia, or clasp some local distance that makes sense to you at home: a straight line joining the two ends of the coast of Peru, or two familiar cities' separation in Europe, Africa or Asia.

Where do my measurements come from? The backward measurement of 13,700 kilometers comes from the present estimate of the age of the universe: 13.7 billion years. A little mental effort brings one to the measurement 13,700,000 meters and so to 13,700,000,000 years. The forward measurement is related to an estimate of the time left to Earth-life by the sun's goings-on.⁴³

You stand there now, holding your spear, pointing forward. The issue I am raising is the issue of the holding, a heart-holding, sensed and tasted. A strange parallel may help. What is it to hold, be held by, the definition of a circle? You can rest naively in the view that it is given at the beginning of *Euclid*, even adding the self-attention of chapter 1 of *Insight*. But you may grow wiser, rise to the context⁴⁴ of the definition of a circle in a richer geometry, rise even further to hear the nudging image tell you of

⁴³There is, of course, the possibility of colonization beyond the solar system. See, e.g. Paul Davies popular treatment of the topic, *The Last Three Minutes*, Phoenix pb, 2000, 139-146. I refer to this book below as *The Last Three Minutes*.

⁴⁴A key text to ponder here is that of page 238 of *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas* (University of Toronto Press, 1997): "... the concept emerges from understanding, not an isolated atom detached from all contexts, 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".

yourself and of God, so that indeed you have “got the whole thing right in your intellectual paws,”⁴⁵ in your curious bones, in your lonely nerves.⁴⁶

So I bring you to the odd question that parallels that question of chapter 19 of *Insight*: “What, then, is being?” The question is, “What, then, is the empirical residue?”⁴⁷ Are we back at the ABC question of chapter 1 of *Insight*?⁴⁸ Rather we are forward to the question as you had not dreamt of it before, a question about the question, indeed (about)³ the question.⁴⁹ The question? The quest? The “subject as subject”?⁵⁰ Loneliness “will be brought out into the open.”⁵¹

⁴⁵*Phenomenology and Logic*, 357.

⁴⁶Our “infinite craving” (“Finality, Love, Marriage”, *Collection*, 1988, 49) is integral with the finality of the empirical residue. Its ongoing implementable discovery is a matter of the contemplation associated with the third form of generalized empirical method. This point raises a host of questions about completing Aquinas work on “natural resultance” (See, *Verbum*, 1997, page 147, at note 236: but the entire text of Lonergan there is relevant). My concluding pages relate to this completion in the context of eschatology.

⁴⁷I only adverted to this twist in the meaning of *then* in September 2007, but it is an enlargement of a previous reflection on THEN, a lift of metaphysics beyond Ken and Zen. See *Cantower V* (August 2002), “Metaphysics THEN”.

⁴⁸McShane, *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, Cape Breton, 1998, deals with the 4 presentations of this ABC exercise, including the verbatim version of the text from *Phenomenology and Logic*, in chapter 5. That chapter provides an existential reflection on the problem of *Insight*-in-hand raised in note 60 below, the problem of post-Hegelian style of living, thinking, talking. The four presentations of the ABC exercise are *Insight* 27[51], 504[527-8], *Understanding and Being* 57-58, *Phenomenology and Logic* 62.

⁴⁹The peculiar terminology, (about)³, was introduced in *Cantowers XXVIII -XXX*: it relates to the perspective on third-order consciousness that Lonergan reflected on in 1965 (see the quotation at note 16 above and the comments that follow on methodology). A brief account is given in my *ChrISt in History*, chapter 2, “The General Solution to Present Ineffective Fragmentation”, in section 2. (The book is available on the website).

⁵⁰*Phenomenology and Logic*, 226.

⁵¹*Method in Theology*, 250.

But only if we recycle *Insight*, indeed in that recycling which is nature's and history's call, the surround of that page 250 just quoted.⁵² We have, after all, had several generations of Lonergan studies to which the question, as thus posed, poised, is quite foreign: an evolutionary sport if it does occur, a random occurrence. "If there are such random occurrences, then there is an instance of the merely empirical residue on the level of conjugate acts."⁵³ It could "occur systematically in virtue of the schemes, S_i ", where the flexible circle of schemes are those that surround page 250 of *Method in Theology*. So, with luck - and it becomes alas a matter of luck - 700 years later some Lonergan-like lady in the Orient may find Lonergan as Lonergan found Aquinas. This, surely, is no serious human control of emergent probability? What do you think? What is your stand?

There is, as my quotations about it in the previous paragraph hint, a richer and stranger view of the empirical residue in *Insight* than anyone has called attention to in fifty years.⁵⁴ It points to an embrace of the order of the universe in and with "that order's dynamic joy and zeal". It longs for a Tower identification of our "Empirical Residence"⁵⁵ that would usher in the third stage of meaning, the second time of the temporal subject.

I had in mind to carry forward here towards an identification of functional specialization and the regional culture of The Tower of Able as Lonergan's solution to

⁵²I treat of history's call in chapter one of *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*.

⁵³*Insight*, 438[464]. I would note that the references in that section to the empirical residue need inclusion in the index.

⁵⁴The problem of energy's identification with the residue is another and more difficult matter. You may be consoled by the length of my own struggle there: a matter of forty years puttering. I treated the topic in the concluding section of *Cantower XXX*, "the Conservation of Energy", and repeat that treatment in Chapter One, Part 3, of *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*.

⁵⁵The title and topic of *Cantower XXXII*.

“the problem of history”. But it is a fresh topic, needing lengthy discussion. I have introduced it, all too briefly, elsewhere.⁵⁶ What is best is to conclude with that challenge of the next million years - why not start in this century? – placed in a more suggestive yet strangely precise context.

A first context, of course, is to be the positional context, transformed into a poositional context⁵⁷ by a post-Hegelian existential collaboration⁵⁸ of Tower conversations that liberate Jack and Jill,⁵⁹ you and me, from the pressing and oppressive naivete of lecture hall and handed book.⁶⁰ We live and move and have our being in the reality pointed to by the patterning of the given⁶¹ given by the simple time-line. Does that time-line not merit the status of an added metagram?⁶² But it is there already,

⁵⁶In the final chapter of *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leaading Ideas*.

⁵⁷**Cantower IX**, “Position, Poosition, Protopossession” is central to this discussion and problem.

⁵⁸I recall Morelli’s challenge, mentioned in notes 24 and 35 above. See also his article, “Obstacles to the Implementation of Lonergan’s solution to the Contemporary Crisis of Meaning”, *The Importance of Insight. Essays in honour of Michael Vertin*, University of Toronto Press, 2007, 22-48, which relates to the issue of Protopossession referred to in the previous note..

⁵⁹Jack and Jill are characters in “Cognitional Structure”, *Collection*, 216, 219.

⁶⁰This, so to speak, places the problem literally and discomfotingly in your hand. Where is the book in your hand, and the print that surrounds, and is surrounded by, your curiosity? “As the electron, so also the tree [and the book], in so far as it is considered a thing itself, [and nouns function that way] stands within a pattern of intelligible relations and offers no foothold for imagination” (*Insight*, 250[275]).

⁶¹*Insight*, 382-3[406-7]. But one must ferment in the mood pointed to in the previous footnote and in footnote 48..

⁶²I have made the case for metagrams regularly since the reflections on them in **Cantower XXXIII**, December 2004. The key appeal is to Lonergan’s own appeal for adequate diagraming on page 80 of *De Constitutione Christi*, now available in English and Latin in volume 7 of his *Complete Works, The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, University of Toronto Press, 2002, 150,151. A brief consideration of the need for such control is in my “Metaphysical Control of Meaning”, *Method. Journal of Lonergan Studies* 24 [2006].

raising deeper problems: for there is to be no last three minutes, nor mindless recyclings.⁶³ It is, or is to be, a heuristic but thoroughly mysterious⁶⁴ spear that pierces not the body of Jesus but the mind of Christ. That mind of Jesus, adequate in its pilgrim content for the befriending of you and me,⁶⁵ is the central meaning of that graced dynamic content,⁶⁶ but the dynamic must grip, be gripped and clasped,⁶⁷ by the glorious everlasting incompleteness⁶⁸ of that Jesus-minding, to which we are called,

⁶³See e.g. *The Last Three Minutes*, the last two chapters.

⁶⁴The thorough mysteriousness is not, however, diffuse, in a fully explanatory context. See thesis 5 of Lonergan's Doctrinal Work, *De Deo Trino I*, on the Trinity. Add the context of the first section of *Insight* Chapter 17.

⁶⁵Relevant here are Lonergan's theses in *The Incarnate Word* on the knowledge and care of the pilgrim Jesus. The incompleteness of Jesus' comprehension of the divine essence is a general theorem of Aquinas regarding human minding's relation to the divine essence. He did not exploit this perspective in treating of eschatology. See also note 46 above.

⁶⁶*The Redress of Poise*, (available on website), chapter 7, "Grace: The Final Frontier" focuses on the centrality of the secondary *esse*, creations glorious participation in the Divine Speaker's Relating.

⁶⁷I recall here my reach for contemporary names for the triplicity of the divine mystery in *Joistings* 23, "Teaching, Preaching and Cherishing the Triune God": *Speak, Spoke, Clasp*.

⁶⁸We need to think here of theorems of incompleteness both in the zone of the empirical residues and in the reach of finite mind for the complexly-infinite divine essence. The book *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry* (on the website) has incompleteness as a key topic.

cosmic-cauled.⁶⁹ The Eschaton is a state of Infinite Surprise⁷⁰ in which all⁷¹ instances⁷² of the empirical residue are wafted into a Trinitarian spiral.⁷³

⁶⁹See *Lack in the Beingstalk*, 66. “Skin within are molecules of cosmic all, cauled, calling”. Add the context of note 40 above. See also note 73 on page 183 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, where the meaning and significance of *anastomosis* is raised.

⁷⁰The phrase “Infinite Surprise” concludes the Epilogue to my *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations. Axis of the Great Ascent* (available now on the website), “Being and Loneliness” but the meaning is altogether more complex now. One moves in that direction by following up, within the strategies of GEM3, analogies with the various infinities and incompletenesses associated with the empirical residue.

⁷¹“All” raises Origen’s question of inclusivity freshly, and grace’s effectiveness in an open eschatology.

⁷²This is a large and complex question, ranging, in Thomas’ early efforts, from growing toe-nails on resurrected bodies to sexual activities. But the deeper issue is the possibility of a type of Eucharistic supernaturality in which acts of lower beings are gloriously lifted beyond substantiality and sustained, in the infinite surprise, through Divine Incarnational causality.

⁷³The context is Lonergan’s Systematics of the Trinity, especially the discussions of circumincession and its finite imitations.

W3

