

Humus 12 Crowe: Possibilities of Methodical Collaboration

At the conclusion of Humus 5 I noted that we would not venture into exercises in functional talk until after Humus 12, when we would have worked towards a broader perspective of the challenge. Obviously, everything said in that early essay applies now to what we have achieved, to a personal meaning of “towards”. We have used Crowe’s efforts in his little book to help us along, and will continue to do so. Here we pause over his appendix, which gives us the title above. We wish to use that appendix as providing a discomforting contrast with the full challenge, holding nonetheless to our pattern of brief doctrinality.

I have provided my own version of what the possibilities of methodical collaboration are, at some serious length.¹ But I capture those possibilities conveniently in the image of the Tower, a three-dimensional version of the original **W3**.² That image needs revision through the replacing of UV by the combination UV + GS that I talked of in *Humus 8*. In that Humus I considered the manner in which Crowe’s Introduction meshed with that addition, admiring his creative lift of the task of doing history. But now, in his Appendix, he falls altogether short in fantasy and vision, as do the vast majority of those who envisage collaboration.³

I do not enter here into any detail, but make a single point regarding his “proposed general concept,” and “the fertile influence such a concept might exercise” when we “invoke its heuristic function.”⁴ The concept is of the genetic structuring that we attended to in *Humus 8*. But it remains descriptive, massively attached to a past and failed theology, and his suggestions in the Appendix belong to that same past: my ground for this harsh criticism is evidently my own

¹Most evidently in the two recent books, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations* and *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*.

²**W3** is available in various places, must immediately perhaps in the Essay Prehumous 2, where the diagram (or better, metagram) is one a set such images, necessary for the control of the complex meaning of methodological collaboration.

³The most recent courageous but limited effort is that of Fr. Robert Doran. I have consider that effort in various places, particularly in the two works cited in note 1. See Part 3 of the first named, and chapters 9, 10 and 12 of the second. See also *Joistings* 15 and 18 and *Prehumous* 9.

⁴The three quotations are from the consecutive pages 150, 151, 152, of Crowe..

heuristic concept, imaged by W3. No doubt there are reasons for Crowe's light treatment. What would be the point of raising larger issues that would carry the reader into details of *Method in Theology*? Also, in the last analysis, this is really an introductory book, a book of value to undergraduates. Still, some larger pointing to the full heuristic of Lonergan, which I would claim that W3 represents, would have been an expansive conclusion to the work.

One could then reach towards possibilities of collaboration that intimate the full power of an explanatory revision of *Method in Theology*, thus pointing to climbing cycles of the Tower endeavor in this next century. One such instance can help to stretch the imagination.

So, a researcher might find odd the claim, in the newly-available translation of Trinitarian Systematics, that "the light of intelligence is ineffable."⁵ The researcher, good but not that good, suspects that this anomaly might be relevant,⁶ so - like the parallel in physics - passes the new, the news, on to a theoretical interpreter competent in Lonergan. Yes, this turns out to be boat-rocking when lifted into *The Sketch*. Does it shake up the goings-forward, right back 7,000,000 years before *Genesis*? The historians pick up the baton, and slowly pattern an amazing fresh twist on the oddness of desire. The twist lifts, with a lag, *Completion*, and gives a startlingly strange foundationality. There emerge new precisions of theoretical policy regarding human loneliness and laughter. There "comes about", not without collaborative labour, a new front to Genetic Systematics. That perspective feeds into the range of outreaches that follow the last specialty: there is subtler guidance for mystics, larger tolerance for strange searchings, new nudges regarding daily prayer. And the recycling adds to research and renewal, so that the global freshness goes deeper as explanation moves to new remotenesses between 2011 and 2111 and then beyond.

But we must turn to detail, from fleeting glimpses of the 31st place of *Insight*'s chapter 20 to the humic plodding suggested by the first paragraph of its first chapter. However, I would note that the previous paragraph is my foundational functional claim, regarding, guarding, the future.

⁵The phrase occurs in the thesis, in *The Incarnate Word*, on the knowledge of Jesus

⁶The conception and expression of relevance varies as the cycle blossoms: some group thinks to add *De Ente Supernaturale*, or *exigence* as it is treated in *Phenomenology and Logic*. Confucius walks with John, with aboriginal lonelinesses, with Dogen and with Hadewijch.