

An Appeal to Fred Lawrence and Other Elders[†]

Q. 36. (James Duffy) “O.K. Here I stand. There is no room for repudiating functional collaboration, and the predominant de facto repudiation is a sad abomination.” [p.4, Q.31]

A. 36. In this answer to James Duffy’s set of questions, I risk venturing into an article of Frederick Lawrence, “The Problematic of Christian Self-understanding and Theology: Today’s Challenge to the Theological Community.”¹ In the lengthy essay he invites us to climb with him through certain key transformations of German thinking of recent centuries. When I plunge into this world of Fred Lawrence I am reminded of Aaron Copland’s comment on that great lady of music, Nadia Boulanger: “She knew all of music, and she knew it cold.”² Fred is masterly in his weaving climb to his final claim: “The gravamen of this essay is that ‘real’ rather than ‘notional’ apprehension of and assent to *convenientia* or appropriateness in Christian theology demands what Gadamer claims Plato required for philosophy: ‘the Doric harmony between *logos* and *ergon*.’³ This is the existential challenge of religious, moral, and intellectual conversion in the theological community in our, and in any, day.”⁴ The references, ‘real’ and notional’ are, of course, to Newman, but do we not all know these pointers

[†] This essay originally appeared as Question 36 in the website series “[Questions and Answers](#).”

¹ Pages 257-310 of *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology. Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran S.J.*, edited by John D. Dadosky, Marquette University Press, 2009. Hereafter simply **Lawrence**.

² Quoted in Alan Kendall, *The Tender Tyrant. Nadia Boulanger. A Life Devoted to Music*, with an Introduction by Yehudi Menuhin, Macdonald and James, London, 1976, 14.

³ See Hans-Georg Gadamer, “*Logos and Ergon in Plato’s Lysis*,” *Dialogue and Dialectic. Eight Hermeneutical Studies in Plato*, trans. Christopher Smith (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), 19-20.

⁴ **Lawrence**, 310.

from tuning to the vibes of our lives? Lawrence would wish us to climb freshly to that knowing through the struggles pointed to in his 54 dense pages.

And what is my wish? My wish is that we lift that climb and those struggles into a new context.⁵ The new context is the context of functional collaboration and precise functional talk. As these answers to James Duffy state, I have failed to make that wish effective among the vast majority of the Lonergan community. My efforts to make the wish effective turn, in meeting Duffy's questions regarding our Lonergan events, in new uncomfortable directions. I address individuals, and hope for collaborative responses. So, there was, prior to the Duffy questions, a reply to a request to reflect on Bob Doran's new book, *The Trinity in History*.⁶ The reply is really an invitation to Bob to enter the conversation. The conversation I have in mind is quite precise: it is the conversation denoted by me as *Lonergan's 1833 Overture*—lines 18-33 of *Method* 250—and, moreover, here and now it is those lines as focused in the question: **What is your effective position on functional collaboration?**

It is not the first time I have addressed a senior colleague in this matter. In *The Importance of Insight: Essays in Honour of Michael Vertin*,⁷ my essay "The Importance of Rescuing *Insight*" raises that question for him and points quite clearly to the rescue of *Insight* that is through functional recycling. The text is clear: "there is the possibility of his sharing my existential answer."⁸ He, in fact, does not. The trouble with these *Festschriften*, and indeed volumes of essays in general, is that they regularly fail

⁵ The wish was first expressed to the Lonergan community at Florida through the essay on the need for functional collaboration in musicology that is now the second chapter of the Website book [The Shaping of the Foundations](#). Most recently my wish took the form of a series of 25 three-month long seminars—a six year project—but the collaborative effort died in the beginning of the fifth seminar. However, progress was made and it is represented in the [FuSe](#) essays on the website, to which I shall refer occasionally here.

⁶ *Volume One: Missions and Processions*, University Of Toronto Press, 2012.

⁷ Edited by John J. Liptay and David S. Liptay, University of Toronto Press, 2007. Hereafter *The Importance of Insight*.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 209.

ergonomically—to put a twist on Fred’s concluding remarks about Gadamer’s minding of “the Doric harmony between *logos* and *ergon*.” My dictionary tells me that “ergonomics is the study of the problems of people in adjusting to their environment.” My problem with Mike Vertin and Fred Lawrence and Bob Doran and all the writers in the two volumes that I have to hand is that there is a deep resistance to adjusting to the environment to which I point, have pointed ineffectively for forty years, point again now discomfortingly. Furthermore—and this adds a tragic view on Lonergan’s pointing—I do not think that my pointing differs from that of Lonergan. But I do not wish to pause over that old ground and groan here.

Should I try another pointing as I venture into this Q/A 36? Have I not said enough in the Vertin article? I have there sections that reach out to all, especially the elder scholars, sections titled “Function,” “Praxis,” “Norms of Adult Growth,” “A Function of Retirement,” “Vertin’s Challenge,” “The Broader Challenge,” “Here I Stand,” “Ontic Responding,” and finally “Reverierun.”⁹ Still, seven years later, my reverierun is water thundering uphill. The 21 essays called *Posthumous* represent that climb.¹⁰ Besides, *The Road to Religious Reality*,¹¹ from which they sprung, remains unread and ignored: a very strange phenomenon, considering its radical shift of scientific model, something that requires solid rejection by the relevant scientific community.¹² But,

⁹ *The Importance of Insight*, 206-215.

¹⁰ The climb there from [Posthumous 14](#) to [Posthumous 21](#) is central to my effort here to point to a new context of Trinitarian theology, one not only pivoting on the “4-hypothesis” of CWL 12, 471-72, but on the shift towards the kataphatic contemplative context of subject-as-subject, Subject-as-Subject. See note 22 below.

¹¹ This is the reference I shall give regularly. The book was published as *Method in Theology 101 AD 9011. The Road to Religious Reality*, Axial Publishing, 2012.

¹² Note 53 below and the text there mention Herman Weyl’s creative muddling towards what became known as *Gauge Theory*. I like to think that my own creative muddling, which has not been attention-getting, would eventually seed the global omnidisciplinary movement that Lonergan grounded. I would wish to drop the name *Lonerganism*—it does not get favorable responses in the academic world. I fancy the name *Fusionism*, related to the final line of that marvelous paragraph, 60910, “fuse into a single explanation,” with the Christian overtone, “fuse into a single Explanation.”

then, is there a relevant scientific community?¹³ Eventually my decision regarding a viewing of Lawrence’s powerful pages, the seeds certainly of a large book, was to preface my comments on them with a contextualization, a pointing to a larger intellectual environment than German Idealism and its descendants. In section 2 I move into more precise musings on Lawrence’s Essay and Lawrence’s Challenge. In the final short section I focus on the fundamental appeal.

1. Context: Towards a Standard Model.

I have been on this topic, this parallel with physics, for about a decade.¹⁴ But it seems easiest here to introduce the issue by initially attending to the problem of adequate imaging in relation to my comment above about intellectual environment. Lawrence’s first paragraph ends with the phrase, “the kind of intelligible sought by systematic theology.”¹⁵ Think, now, of this in terms of Lonergan’s various reflections on ongoing contexts, overlapping, merging, etc. weaving forward genetically and dialectically.¹⁶ Think? As he says, if we want to do this thinking “without tears,”¹⁷ “if we want to have a comprehensive grasp of everything in a unified whole, we shall have to construct a diagram in which are represented all the various elements of the question along with all the connections between them.”¹⁸ Please pause over this problem of construction, for it is part of the existential challenge mentioned in Lawrence’s last sentence, quoted above at note 3. It is part of intellectual conversion, when that conversion is conceived in its fullness. But we shall come back to that shortly. Meantime we have the problem of creatively constructing a diagrammatic control of meaning, “geared to the empirical investigation of the actual process of emergence

¹³ We are back with the question raised in the first few pages of *Method*, chapter one.

¹⁴ See my website book, [Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry](#).

¹⁵ **Lawrence**, 257.

¹⁶ See the index to *Method in Theology*, under *Context*.

¹⁷ *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, CWL 7, 151.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

and evolution”¹⁹ of global minding. We are on the track of what F.M. Fisher called “a rather grandiose picture of history,”²⁰ a *Gauging What’s Real*.²¹ AND—subject-as-subject²² that you reading this may be, and nudged here to read yourself better—it is a tracking that wishes to lay inner tracks in the neurodynamics of our living, a step in the road to the divinization of molecular being that is the yearning of upper and lower grounds of loneliness.²³

We have met this tracking in Q/A 30, where I emphasized the tracking given by **W₃**. It tracks the full structure of Lonergan’s global collaboration, but the inner tracking also bends our minding to the bent prayer, “Double You Three.” But **W₃** is only one of a complex of needed images²⁴ if we are to have real assent and ascent in history, His Story. How can we rise to being ‘without tears’? Not fully, as pilgrims.²⁵ The *Posthumous* essays were an effort to image better than previously the bottom Trinitarian line of the **W₃** image, filling it out so that subjects-as-subjects could live within Subjects-as-Subjects, cherished in craving Christing. Here I point to a filling in of the seventh specialty’s imaging as a genetics of systems. That filling in is a vital sublation if we are to recycle effectively the minding and Minding of the mystical body,

¹⁹ P. McShane, *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, Gill MacMillan and Notre Dame, 1970, 236. I am quoting from chapter 11, “Probability-schedules of Emergence of Schemes,” a relevant context here.

²⁰ F. M. Fisher, “On the Analysis of History and the Interdependence of the Social Sciences,” *Phil. Sc.*, 27, 1960, 150.

²¹ The main title of Richard Healy, *Gauging What’s Real: The Conceptual Foundations of Contemporary Gauge Theories*, Oxford University Press, 2007.

²² See the index to *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, under *Subject*. Recall note 10, about the novel climb.

²³ I introduced these in [The Shaping of the Foundations](#) (1976) in the first page of the Epilogue, “Authentic Subjectivity and International Growth: Foundations.”

²⁴ See [Prehumous 2](#), “Metagrams and Metaphysics,” for a listing of **W_i**. For a fuller contextualization of them see the Website book, [Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations](#).

²⁵ This is a complex topic regarding the infoldings of pure potency, and the eschatological destiny of those infoldings.

“in our, and in any, day.”²⁶ Systematic theology is a genetic sequence of systems, but it is more, and that more must be conceived heuristically if we and Jesus are to reach the villagers in any day.

How then do we image that task? We are back, alas, with the climb to symbols suggested by Fisher and myself, the world of Markov matrices. But forget about Markov and think of a standard mapped globe with lines radiating out from the center, dated conveniently.²⁷ Perhaps you wish at a given time only to view the post-Incarnation minding of global goings-on. Then time starts on the globe and radiates out in lines through imagined larger mapped globes. The lines can be seen or imagined as cutting little ‘square’ cross-sections. So Antioch is in one square and Alexandria is in another, but the theological systems intermesh in Councils like Nicea; Augustine’s system weaves into France over ages; Marx’s system reaches Tibet; etc. etc. So, one arrives at a larger view of Systematics: a geohistorical genetic complex. And one is ready to conceive the new treatise on the mystical body more complexly than I did in *The Road to Religious Reality*.

Apart from the complexity of external symbolization emphasized there, one finds now room and womb for a meshing of Trinitarian vestige symbolization,²⁸ and that full

²⁶ The final words in **Lawrence**.

²⁷ There is, for example a useful imaging that is on the large scale of the age of the universe, nudging us to think of the long future of the earth under the sun.

²⁸ See *Summa Theologica* I q. 45, a. 7 for the struggles of Thomas and Augustine with this problem. One shifts the context of the problem by adverting to Thomas’ incomplete view of “natural resultance” (see *CWL* 2, the index) and moving into a strange causality of “conditions of presence” that bears fruit in seeking for the molecular resonances, relating to my “five Cs” (see note 35 below) of Trinitarian Personalities. Might there eventually emerge correlations with Superego, Ego, and Id in our grip on the pilgrim journey?

meshing is identified as the inner caul²⁹ of the subject that each of us theologians normatively is, *Existenz*.³⁰

That inner caul relates to Lawrence's aspirations expressed in his first and last paragraphs. So we arrive differently at the loneliness of *Insight 722*, sensing slimly that the love "of God above all and in all so embraces the order of the universe ...that it wills with that order's dynamic joy and zeal," the zeal and joy of Grace-infested molecules 13.7 million years old. So the Christian thinker might grin at the jaunt of German idealism and re-read wholesomely Lawrence's dense comment on its take-off. "This ideal was elaborated at length in Hegel's *Phenomenology des Geistes*, in which the beginning of all being resides in the Spirit, which unfolds all of reality from its own creative power. By the absolute Spirit's diremption, matter becomes that in which the absolute Spirit appears and attains what Hegel believed his own philosophy to have accomplished, so that the unity of both God and world in the unconditioned Spirit achieves its self-actuation in the *absolutes Begriff*."³¹

But no, this Christian thinker does not grin. Hegel's hearsay tramples my Embracing,³² my Grace,³³ my race, my "bright-wings"³⁴ prayer, "Double You Three in me, in all,

²⁹ See note 35 below.

³⁰ I look to a sublation of the reflections on *Existenz* on pages 9-31 of CWL 7, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*.

³¹ Lawrence, 258.

³² I recall Thomas problem (*Summa Theologica*, Q. 37) of naming the Holy Spirit. Throughout the *Posthumous* essays I tackle the problem in various ways. *Embracing* is one naming that could break forward from the troublesome word *love*.

³³ I use the name *Grace* for the third Person of the Trinity as a personal choice of address. I would recall here my suggestions, in the *Posthumous* essays, regarding the contemplative use of analogy: with a focusing of the mystery (see Thesis 5 of CWL 11, *The Triune God: Doctrines*) in "negation and eminence," affirmation can ground an appropriate and appropriated intimacy. There are deep questions here of naked presence and of the psychochemistry of the *moi intime*.

³⁴ The final words of Gerald Manley Hopkins' poem, "God's Grandeur". The last two lines read: "Because the Holy Ghost over the bent / World broods with warm breast and with bright wings".

Clasping, Cherishing, Calling, Craving, Christing,”³⁵ my “yes I said yes I will yes”³⁶: yes, the self-actuation is in the *absolutes Begriff* in so far as one conceives properly³⁷ the “brute beauty and valour and act”³⁸ of the divine achievement, a molecular fusion in the “fuse into a single explanation” of line 9, *Insight* 610, the end of the paragraph that I have named 60910.

Pausing over the seeding prayer and the shocking paragraph 60910 in *Insight* which ends in *explanation*, Explanation, surely lifts one’s life and imaging to new challenges,

³⁵ Here I present, as I did in the [Posthumous](#) essays, the five Cs that focus my effort to bring out the historical dynamics of the divine persons. One context here is an incompleteness in the meaning of the “bottom line” of the metaword, **W₃**. But the fuller functional context is my effort to make a foundational suggestion, “to frame terms and relations” (*Method in Theology*, 290, bottom) that nudge the functional cycle “secondly, from the subject one moves to subjects” (*Ibid*, 291, top). I have not written up my work on this of the past four years, so it is probably little help to make brief suggestions here. Still, a few nudging words may stir. **Clasping** points to the strange historical presence of the Spirit, whose gradual and statistical dynamics is a gold-mine of paracletic tonalities. **Cherishing** relates to the secondary *esse* of the incarnation in its global radiance of Paternity. **Christing** relates to the adoption that lifts us into a molecularized circumincession. **Calling** relates to the active spiration, a bi-Personal intimacy of tri-mutual tugging and hugging the **Craving** of the Third Person—but and now a rescue of “Finality, Love, Marriage’s” ‘craving’ on line 17 of CWL 1, 49—so that there is an ontic and phyletic dynamism of the emergence of temples of Grace and of the everlastingly-incomplete Symphony of Jesus. **Cauling** is a twist on *calling* introduced at the end of chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, before any of these distinctions blossomed, yet that conclusion is worth adding here for the mood it intimates: “All we know is somehow with us ... it lurks behind the scenes’ (*Insight*, CWL 3, 303). Skin-within are molecules of *cos mi c all*, cauled, calling. The rill of her mouth can become the thrill, the trill, of a life-time, the word made fresh. Might we inspire and expire with the lungs of history? But the whole story is you and I, with and within global humanity, upsetting *Love’s Sweet Mystery* into a new mouthing, an anastomotic spiral way of birthing better the buds of Mother.”

³⁶ The concluding words of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*. They end Molly Bloom’s bed-talk with, as it happens, a great Trinitarian twist. It could be helpful here to venture into the two paralleled chapters, one and five, of my Website book (1990), [Process: Introducing Themselves to Young \(Christian\) Minders](#), where are paralleled two summary statements (in the parallel sections 1.2 and 5.2) of Molly’s end-reverie and Jesus reverie of the Gospel of *John*. One sees and seizes *John* thus as great drama with the first stage-entry posing the question, “What do you want?” (*John* 1:38) and the later Proclamation of what he wants, “that they may be one.” (*John* 17:21). That want and orientation to be one has a wondrous eschatological openness, since no human mind—including that of Jesus—can comprehend or dwell fully in the Oneness of God.

³⁷ See notes 10 and 35.

³⁸ I quote a line of Hopkins’ “The Windhover. To Christ our Lord”

to a Windhovered flight, “swift, slow, sweet, sour, adazzle, dim,”³⁹ and the adequate imaging can lift Lawrence’s essay into the new effective explanatory context of subjects-as-subjects⁴⁰ twirled a round-up in Subjects-as-Subjects. That is the task for all of us in these decades and millennia ahead.

But I move too densely fast.

Here it seems best to turn to a simpler general point regarding the human as molecular whatting, and the manner in which the molecular flow “has its own free component.”⁴¹ And best stay even simpler, starting with Lonergan’s identification of “being intelligent” on *Method* page 53. There he writes of it in terms of reaching for unrealized possibilities.⁴² What are iron and oxygen?⁴³ They are possibilities of computers and space-travel. They are the reality of the Christ-tubed Christ-lubed everlasting whirl in the Absolute molecularized Friends.⁴⁴

But let us go simpler still. I have spent decades trying to rescue the “what-to-do?” question. Appendix A of *Phenomenology and Logic* gives two parallel diagrams for knowing and doing.⁴⁵ It pushes a modal distinction, and it is good and needed pedagogy: planning needs to be identified luminously with its openness to being adventurous, whether it is ontic or phyletic. The frontal lobe leans into the loneliness

³⁹ From the near-end of Hopkins’ Poem, “Pied Beauty”.

⁴⁰ See note 22 above.

⁴¹ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, CWL 10, 232. This is the conclusion to Lonergan’s powerful chapter on art. See further my [Bridgepoises](#) 3 and 10 on “Aesthetics as the Heart of Science”. There is the useful much earlier essay of 1995, “Systematics: A Language of the Heart,” reproduced in [The Redress of Poise](#).

⁴² “Being intelligent includes a grasp of hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities.” *Method*, 53.

⁴³ See *Collection*, “Finality, Love, Marriage,” CWL 4, 23.

⁴⁴ Shortly, below, in the text, I introduce global imaging, tubes of history. That imaging is a context for the metaphors here. The adjective ‘molecularized’ no doubt puzzles. It draws attention to the untraveled trail of the supernatural obediencial finality of lower conjugates in the universe, their “dynamic joy and zeal” (the concluding words of *Insight*, CWL 3, 722). Here we are “arriving on the scene a little breathless and a little late.” *Insight*, CWL 3, 755.

⁴⁵ *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 322-323.

of molecules on a daily cramped basis; the Tower of Able leans. But what we need to discover, in these centuries of the elementary discoveries of minding,⁴⁶ is that ‘what’ is just an edge of ‘what might be’.

Let me get simpler still, and return to Q/A 32. In my single-page answer I suggested that conference members might split into groups depending on their answer to the broad bold question:

Do you view humanity as possibly maturing—in some serious way—or just messing along between good and evil, whatever you think they are?

A positive answer, seemingly simple, in fact is the seed of what I call *full intellectual conversion*. There is the intellectual conversion that is normally spoken of, associated with the is-question; there is a conversion which I have talked about endlessly for decades, one I call *theoretic conversion*; but now I wish to bring fundamental depth to these two by talking of the fulsome intellectual conversion that dances, within the elementary two, on the obediencial character of finitude, and steps forth in art and invention and in fullest theory. It reaches a luminosity (about)³ “all that is lacking”⁴⁷ yet flexes its molecules to pattern inner-word possibilities in them, inner patterns of nerves and muscles, outer patterns of human environments.

By *it* I mean here *per se* the persons of the Leaning Tower of Able, in their mutual-self-supporting incarnate echoing of the “*eo magis unum*”⁴⁸ that is the circumincessional destiny of finitude. They are to live in “Position, Poosition, Protopossession,”⁴⁹ where

⁴⁶ It is important to struggle with the fantasy that we are only at the beginning of the search for the meaning of human spirit. See the second Part of my *Sane Economics and Fusionism* (Axial Publishing, 2010).

⁴⁷ *Insight*, CWL 3, 559.

⁴⁸ A relevant context is the final chapter of CWL 2, *Verbum. Word and Idea in Aquinas*.

⁴⁹ These three words first occurred in [Cantower 9](#), “Position, Poosition, Protopossession,” of December 2002. The meaning of the first two words is relatively stable, and the text there remains reliable. The third term, “Protopossession” was intended to designate the character of the Tower community, but the text rambles round the issue. The heuristics of the meaning of

these three Ps take ever fuller humbler and repentant meanings, generating new systematic front-reverierunnings of the Symphony of Christ.

Such running is radically beyond the secular searchings that live outside the assertions of *CWL* 12,⁵⁰ especially as these assertions are to be luminously possessed and possessive in later genetic versions of the axioms of intentionality, infinity and incompleteness.⁵¹

I have been writing here in popular doctrinal fashion of the standard model—so, an eighth specialty outreach⁵²—but pointing, within slim present heuristics, towards an operating later model, much like Herman Weyl did in his unaccepted seeding of Gauge theory.⁵³ It seems best if I now interrupt this effort to venture into Lawrence's essay, from which we resolve to spring forward to envisage blossomings from his and my efforts.

2. Lawrence's Challenge⁵⁴

Our reflections here relate to James Duffy's suggestions regarding our effort to enter into functional collaboration. In particular there the second of his fourteen suggestions:

the mature community is gradually taking shape. See further, the efforts of a decade later: [Posthumous 8](#), "My Story, His Story, Position" and [Posthumous 9](#), "Position, Comparison, Finite Processions."

⁵⁰ The clear positional world, within the Christian seeking of understanding is discontinuous with secular searchings for the meaning of being and becoming. But spelling that out is the matter of a functional history and a functional dialectic of what is and is to be meant by Christian Philosophy.

⁵¹ We have to recognize the elementary character of the identification of "the position" on *Insight*, *CWL* 3, 413.

⁵² What I regularly call C_9 .

⁵³ On Weyl's efforts and the opposition to them see Lochlainn O'Raiheartaigh, *The Dawning of Gauge Theory*, Princeton University Press, 1997.

⁵⁴ It seems best to make the complex challenge clear. First, there is the challenge for all of us, expressed briefly and best in note 58 below. We need to begin to read our efforts within a reach for the fuller context of functional collaboration, and this beginning is concomitantly an effort to

B. Review essays, articles, even books with questions in mind:

What FSs does this suggest?

Does this deserve cycling? Maybe a part? Why? Why not?

If this Q/A 36 is to be an effective help in the struggle, then I need to focus pedagogically on some manageable aspect of the transitions required to place Lawrence's searchings in the problematic of the new context. Lawrence's compact essay hides decades of his work and could be seen as the sketch of more than one very big book. I have already cited the phrase on the first page that gives one of his central aims: "the kind of intelligibility sought by systematic theology."⁵⁵ Immediately after that phrase comes the heading of his first of ten sections: "GERMAN IDEALIST VS. CHRISTIAN SELF-UNDERSTANDING". We are thus plunged into the enterprise of comparison and contrast, genetics and dialectic. Does the imaging of the spherical geohistorical matrix help us? There is the tube of German idealism and a more complex set of tubes of Christian self-understanding, and this imaging sublates Lonergan's writing re contexts that interweave, overlap, merge, etc. The tubes are spatiotemporal tubes of ongoing meanings that are to be massively complex: you can get a sense of this by pausing in fantasy over Lawrence's ten titles as they weave us through personalities and topics as varied as *Schleiermacher* (section 2) and

answer the scientific question, "What is functional specialization?" Secondly, there is the challenge to meet all those who are serious about this, in some shabby form of the 1833 Overture. Thirdly – and this applies to all of us who control conferences, gatherings, Festschrifts, thesis-writing – we need to try to make some transition from the present ineffective, wasteful, old-style paper-reading, paper-writing, thesis-writing, that dominates Lonerganism. Obvious, for Lawrence, this is a direct challenge to do something about the format of the annual Boston Conference.

⁵⁵ Lawrence, 257.

Convenientia (section 9). What to do to begin our methodological grappling, fantasy-fleshed?⁵⁶

Here, oddly and luckily, my mind rambled to a conversation I had with Lonergan in the summer of 1966 at the swimming pool in the Bayview Regis College. I joked him about the parallel between dogs and dogma, between dog-study and dogmatics. It was over four decades later that I really got the joke and tied it in with the dynamics of the mystical body.⁵⁷ Can I give a pedagogical lead-in to the results of that climb that reveals the gap between Lawrence's essay and the seeding of a future theology?⁵⁸ I muse over the presentation of a recent little book and pick a helpful piece:

We are back with the nudges of the Foreword and Introduction: for some of my readers, pretty vague stuff—even if they have heard the phrase 'mystical body of Christ'. I am talking about a reality, like a real dog or—to save us from crazier fantasy—a sequence of the same variety of real dogs studied and cared for over thousands of years. The dog is, of course, a genetic reality, but put that aside for the moment.

⁵⁶ A central task of the fifth functional specialty is accelerating the cycling through systematic fantasy: the product of fantasy however, is non-systematic, even leading to the genesis of evolutionary sports.

⁵⁷ For the secular mind one may speak of a heuristic pragmatics of history: not then, a theory of history in the ordinary sense, not, if you like, Rankian but Burckhardtian. See *Method* 250. We are back at the fundamental issue haunting Lawrence's reflections (see the quotation at note 3 above), and I wind my answer into a quiet yet radical transposition of Aristotle's view of health as the *ergon* of medicine (*Eudemian Ethics*, 1219^a). There are more profound issues here that go beyond my present rambles: e.g. issues of the pragmatics of everlasting bliss.

⁵⁸ In the end, what emerges is more a pointing to the needed context than any serious revelation of the gap. As I labored over Lawrence's dense essay it became clearer to me that the line-by-line reflection was needed. Especially necessary was a pause over every proper name that occurred. Did the proper name occur in a manner that paralleled the occurrence of *Maxwell* in *Maxwell's Equations*, or was it another intake of implicit comparison? Again, shifts of functional specialty can occur even within a single sentence. This is not a distinctive criticism of Fred Lawrence: I can say the same about my own essay in the volume, or any other essay. At all events, as you will see, I gave up on the detailed criticism. But the new context, and the few hints regarding the non-scientific nature of presently-accepted styles of the comparison of views may help us forward towards detecting how we fall short of the norms both of the second canon of hermeneutics and of its sublation into the full science of *Comparison* (*Method*, 250) that is to solve the problem of an ongoing effective pragmatics of history, which in Christian terms is a self-luminous life of contemplative companionship in the omni-tube of Jesus.

We are interested in conjuring up in our minds a sense of the genetic sequence of comprehensions of any of the dogs in the sequence.⁵⁹

The key parallel that I point to in the little book, *The Road to Religious Reality*, comes from a recent television series titled *House*—the name of the lead doctor. Familiarity with it is useful but not required. In each episode the experts gather round a person who has some peculiar sickness. Think first of the character⁶⁰ of the five or so experts. They have a serious up-to-date grip on the genetics of such patients, including a grip on the reversal of aberrations in history and in patients. Their problem is to come up with suggestion about the dynamic of reversal in this particular situation. They hunt out the patient's circumstances and background and eventually each has a shot at suggesting procedures. The others listen. How do they listen? They have a shared standard model, a *verbum* with neuromolecular trimmings. The suggestion of any one is measured, '*nomosed*' by the others against this model. The measuring is a comparison: a search for fittingness.

This last sentence points to the key to the problem of transition from an old methodology of comparison, whether in medicine, literature, chemistry, sociology or theology, to the new dynamics of *Comparison* offered inadequately by Lonergan.⁶¹ Let us stay with the expert doctors. Suggestions they make may be named after someone—thus, traditional in some senses—or, creatively, outside the box of the standard model. The naming of the strategy is a convenience, like naming Maxwell's equations. Whatever the strategy suggested each of the group imagines and fantasizes

⁵⁹ *The Road to Religious Reality*, 33–4. The footnote to the text there reads: "This is clearly a piece of the road to getting to grips with the second canon of hermeneutics, *Insight*, CWL 3, 609-10." I am trying a more pedagogical road in the present effort.

⁶⁰ I recall the occurrence of that word on line 12 of *Method*, 356. Also there is that first paragraph of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia* locating character as key to politics.

⁶¹ I have been round about this topic abundantly in the past decade. The problem relates to the density, yet also the incompleteness, of Lonergan's achievement in *Insight* 17, section 3. Think, for instance, of the difficulty of sniffing out the genetics of theses on the mystical body from the paragraph I named 60910?

the resultant dynamics of procedure towards healing and creating in the patient, and indeed, obviously, towards healing and creating in history. A significant strategy might warrant a naming: *House's endocropic*. There are lots of such namings in medicine, and indeed there is an abundance of named flawed procedure. Yet, as I mention them, I would have you muse over the existence of elements in such flawed procedures that may turn out to be positive: Murphy's old herbal remedy turns out to have a grain of cure.

I wonder whether my parallel is suggestive of the road that Lonergan took when he tackled the methodological problem of interpretation, with shocking creativity, in the third section of *Insight* chapter 17. Or, going back to my little text,

Are you with me? The mystical body is, so to speak, one real dog, weaving its way through the best and worst of times. The treatise on the mystical body that Lonergan longed to see emerging is an integral perspective on the weaving sequence of understandings—more or less effective in history—of that incomplete reality. My identification of that full treatise with the meaning both of *Comparison* and of the second canon of hermeneutics is more like the identification of a major twist in neurodynamics than the identification of the Higgs particle. It is not, was not, an anticipated shift. Perhaps there are better parallels in the evolution of mathematics.⁶²

I pass on, in the book, from that ending of a chapter on Doctrines, to a discussion of Systematics in the new mode, pivoting the discussion of Lonergan's reflection on the genetic system of mathematical systems. Might you see a parallel with the grip of the history of medicine in those experts? And then push on to a fantasy about a group caring for Christ's mystical body? But now, certainly, we are lurching towards a fantasy of "the inception of a far larger"⁶³ effort.

⁶² *The Road to Religious Reality*, 34. The chapter that follows in the book, "Systematics," centers on Lonergan's magnificent compact statement (*De Intellectu et Methodo*) on what a historian of mathematics needs to know.

⁶³ *Insight*, CWL 3, 754.

Let us see how this ramble might help to sift creatively through Lawrence's content and methodology.

We took note of his naming of topics and persons. Think now of the *House* medical scene. The experts are concerned with the sick patient and in their consultations they name topics—places of interest—and persons, these persons being previous experts in dealing with the patient's disease. Note here that I am inviting another ramble round the first two pages of *Method*.⁶⁴ How mature a science is medicine? It is not quite up there with the lower sciences, but it is deemed to be a rung or two up from human sciences. "Theologians finally often have to be content if their subject is included in a list not of sciences but of academic disciplines."⁶⁵ The body named history is ill: there is a naming of diseased places and of reputable persons with views on sickness and health. No one considers the minding of the body-history to be up there even with medicine, but does not the parallel help, "selecting a conspicuously successful science of their time"?⁶⁶ Next, think of the Chinese doctor, Dr. Chi Park,⁶⁷ on *House's* team. Yes, she shares the standard model, but let us suppose that she is totally cool on the success of the "Chinese Ecumene"⁶⁸ of medicine. She will have her store of names, and can talk the talk about that tube of history in dealing with the sub-tube that is this type of patient. She may indeed—as she often did in the series—hit on the right name and the right topic. The others are not lost when they hear her speak: they share a common standard model, with their sub-models, and have lists of competent masters to be called upon. "In the less successful subject there is a lack of masters to be followed and of models to be imitated."⁶⁹ And this indeed is Lawrence's

⁶⁴See [Posthumous 18](#), "Beyond 'Bolder Spirits' in the 'Difficult and Laborious'".

⁶⁵ *Method*, 3.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Acted by the comedienne Charlyne Yi, during 2011–12. "Park" would make her Korean, not Chinese!

⁶⁸ I am thinking of course of Voegelin as he writes at the end of his *The Ecumenic Age*.

⁶⁹ *Method in Theology*, 4.

point right through his article: Hegel, Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Bultman, Heidegger, and Gadamer are not a list of reliable masters of the body history, but they have some good things to say. Add to the list the various members of the Christian megatube that Lawrence mentions. Fred knows that he cannot gather them round the body the way House gathers his team. “We are not there yet. And for society to progress”⁷⁰ I hardly need to quote more of that powerful 1942 page. So, Fred rightly concludes with his final sentence regarding a crisis and a challenge to be met “in our, and in any, day.”⁷¹

Back we go to medicine in its early stages. One may think of potions and leeches, or early copings with malaria. One could write up and discuss such copings. But that certainly would not help in the *House* situation.

Some third way, then, must be found and, even though it is difficult and laborious, that price must be paid if the less successful subject is not to remain a mediocrity or slip into decadence and desuetude. To work out the basis for such a third way is the purpose⁷²

that carried Lonergan through his solitary climb to his coping with Mal Arias in the *Symphony of His Story*.⁷³ The climb is conveniently separated into two pushes for new heights. First he had to deal with the common strategies of interpretation, among them the dominant one being comparison. Then he had to envisage how to effectively structure the climb to a standard model of systematic global collaboration in reaching “cumulative and progressive results.”⁷⁴ Curiously and strangely and luckily the first

⁷⁰ *For A New Political Economy*, CWL 21, 20.

⁷¹ **Lawrence**, 310.

⁷² *Method in Theology*, 4.

⁷³ His own central Aria, for me, is the singing that weaves round the paragraph I name **60910**. In [FuSe 0](#), I compare that singing of *Insight* 17.3 to the “Mad Aria” of Donizetti’s *Lucia di Lammermoor*. See, there, pp. 8-10.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

problem gave him the name for the core of the solution to the second problem: that core is named *Comparison*.

My problem at this stage in my reflections was, is, that I was only at yet another beginning of answering the scientific question, What is Functional Collaboration?, with its sub-question: how does the paragraph that I named 60910 leap to becoming the heuristic of *Comparison*, the heuristic of a pragmatics of history, the glory of theology's ongoing search for the treatise on the mystical body? These all led me to a daft abundant listing of sections in my rambling answer to Q. 36. But it was/is now wiser to drop these sections at this stage, and cut to the core "challenge of ... intellectual conversion in the theological community in our, and in any day."⁷⁵ The Chinese doctor could well sketch out, in a sublation of Voegelin's style, the tube of medical searchings of the Chinese Ecumene. The sketched searchings could find their helpful way into later medicine, much as present medicine is bowing to earlier and strange wisdoms. But that sketching and that help would only be a part of the larger search of medicine, and eventually indeed also be deeply⁷⁶ transposed into a part of "some third way that must be found," the way of integral omnidisciplinary functional collaboration. So, with Lawrence's venture into the German Ecumene. So, as you'll see, the detailed reach fades, or waits for another day, another Question.

My sub-title "Lawrence's Challenge" echoes two sub-titles of the Vertin *Festschrift* article: "8. Vertin's Challenge"; "9. The Broader Challenge."⁷⁷ Of course the text there adds context to the struggle here. Any reader, but especially that part of the Lonergan community in the zone of retirement—section 7 is titled "A Functional of Retirement"—can substitute his or her own name in the title and in challenge of a subject-as-subject intussusception. The intussusception finds its proper intensity, of

⁷⁵ Lawrence, 310.

⁷⁶ All disciplines are to eventually find a unity, through various asymmetric slopings in the functional cycle. Some hints on this are in [Cantower 8](#), "Slopes: An Encounter," section 1.4.

⁷⁷ *The Importance of Insight*, 208-10.

course, in the whirl and skirl of the 1833 Overture. There are many aspects of the challenge, but the one that dominates in these questions from James Duffy relates to conference structuring. Are you involved in such structuring? Are you stuck in old ways? Can you shake yourself and those old ways into a seeding of “a third way ...difficult and laborious”? Can you at least stop dodging that brilliant page 250 of *Method*, and at most turn to orient the next generations towards facing the Impossible Dream?

But here I wish to home in, at least a little, on Lawrence’s challenge, in a way that would be helpful to people taking James Duffy’s list seriously as he notes a task under B. It is a task I adverted to broadly as I commented on Bob Doran’s book, and here I wish to do something about it in regard to Fred Lawrence’s climbing. But I would note that getting down to that task in serious pedagogical adequacy would eventually gestate into a line-by-line heuristics of differentiated writing. What I write here, then, is just an invitational ramble to encourage initial ventures in the difficult struggle for the set of new neuromolecular differentiations of consciousness involved in functional collaboration.

We can begin by doing some of the broad surveying that I recommended in the case of *The Trinity in History*. Can you scribble rough indications, FS₁ or FS₂ or whatever—including what I call C₉⁷⁸—over the sections and subsections of the article? The title often gives initial leads. So, for example, “*Convenientia* in the Theology of Raymund Schwager”⁷⁹ seems to point to interpretation, to FS₂, but recall our struggle with Boyer advising Lonergan, and with the detailing of operations of FS₁.⁸⁰ Then one can read freshly Fred’s first modest and honest sentence: “Although I have read many of his

⁷⁸ See note 52 above.

⁷⁹ Lawrence, 294-7. But Schwager’s views are articulated right through to almost the end of the article.

⁸⁰ See CWL 1, *Grace and Freedom*, xviii. I discuss this in the context of functional research in FuSe 0, “A Simple Appeal for Functional Collaboration,” pp. 12ff.

works, I am not an expert on Raymund Schwager's thought."⁸¹ Is this a fulsome echo of Boyer's remarks to Lonergan, that in functional terms I express in an initiating slogan, "this is worth recycling"?⁸² It is worthwhile recalling, in this context of messing creatively with text and cranium, how I spent years brooding over Fred Crowe's great effort in *Theology of the Christian Word* before beginning to see the work as primarily a great stab at functional research meshed with pastoral guidance.

What, then, of these pages of Lawrence on Raymund Schwager? I focus, focused, on that section because it brings to mind that long struggle with Crowe's *Theology of the Christian Word*, which always impressed me as magnificent pedagogy, and eventually let the brooding push me to figure out better the initial stages of functional research. The identification in terms, of the first and last functional specialties—the latter in its C₉ outreach—helps here, and further I would note that it is of general help in our common venture, this century, in tackling the massive task of bringing theology into effective global collaboration. I think of my own decades of writing, and how those efforts oscillate badly between the first specialty and the outflow from the eighth, C₉. And perhaps it is useful to fantasize on the progress of science: think of Galileo turning from his new *nomos* of measurement in contrast to the cultural climb to Gauge theory, or of chemistry of the medieval Arabs where there is no suspicion of the shifts of the 1870s. At all events, there is nothing shocking about my suggesting that Lawrence's effort in dealing with Schwager here, indeed in this whole section nine and on through the final tenth section, is primitive, tadpolesque, in respect to the strenuous heuristic fantasy of the later science of theology.⁸³ We are all in the same ark.

⁸¹ Lawrence, 294.

⁸² See [Posthumous 1](#), "The Gross Immorality of Lonerganism?" The question mark is yours as well as mine. But think pragmatically of the pointings of notes 58 and 83. And it would of course be good to move into the context of the consideration of the first functional specialty given in [FuSe 0-9](#), and even follow through to *FuSe* 31.

⁸³ See note 58. I finally decided to omit here the detailed analysis that backs my claim. The primitive or tadpole character has to be slowly and self-illuminatingly discovered in these next

I have paused for some days about what else to say here. I know that Duffy would like illustrations of the effort to lift a text into some semblance of the sentence-by-sentence purity of later functionally differentiated talk. Fred Lawrence's essay presents a daunting challenge in that respect, but oddly not as heavy work as Fred Crowe's *Theology of the Christian Word*—for I contemplated and tried both task. Certainly there are more general and obvious points to be made, similar to points made in regard to Doran's *The Trinity in History*. One can get a general sense of the tasks and the divisions of labour from moving through the titles in the essay, a series of names and topics. As I remarked at the beginning, Fred has a unique mastery here, on both topics and names. But how might it all be shuffled out into an effective communal rhythm of researchers nudging interpreters, interpretations being passed on baton-wise to historians, etc.⁸⁴ There is no seriously-common standard model,⁸⁵ yet the effective communal rhythm needs such a model if it is to be effective. But we are back now at the problem of getting the show on the road, one with which these Q/A essays will continue to deal, and I have faced the problems of starting already in so many different ways.

3. The Calculus of Variation

Over decades I have made various attempts to communicate the existential gap between present theological thinking, discourse, writing etc. and the science envisaged by Lonergan. What I consider my most successful attempt, from the point of view of a scientist, is that presented under the present heading in chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway*.⁸⁶ There the focus was on Husserl's work in Berlin, when he was in the company of a great group of mathematicians, led by

decades as we seed the global embracing, are seized by Embracing: theology's goal in its Templing-task.

⁸⁴ See *The Importance of Insight*, 204, Figure 1.

⁸⁵ This emerged quite clearly from the seminar on functional research, the findings of which appear in [FuSes 0-9](#).

⁸⁶ Axial Publishing, 2007.

Weierstrass. Under Weierstrass he wrote a powerful thesis on “The Calculus of Variation”⁸⁷ which, in popular terms, deals with problems such as “what is the maximum area that can be contained within a fixed length of rope?”⁸⁸ There is no point in my going back over that territory now, but it would, perhaps, be an effective education to have the Lonergan community brood over the vast gap between *The Aeneid*’s problem and a contemporary standard-model text on the topic.⁸⁹

The global climb of humanity is in desperate need of a common calculus of progressive variations. Lonergan wrote of that need in his section on Cosmopolis in *Insight*, but that searching metascientific question never really caught his followers’ attention. Sincere strugglers of the 1960s, like Charles Davis, slipped into the view that Roman Catholicism was lurking there, almost identified thus in the final chapter of the book. But Lonergan’s search was in the world of Dawson and Toynbee and the fancy of Isaiah’s hope of swords turned to sickles, “Is this to be taken literally or is it a figure? It would be fair and fine, indeed, to think it no figure.”⁹⁰ Lonergan’s leap was to a

⁸⁷ My copy of Husserl’s thesis is a French translation: *E. Husserl, Contribution a la theorie du calcul des variation*, edited by J. Vauthier, Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, 1983. For more detail on the context of Husserl’s work, see notes 9ff of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, 198-9.

⁸⁸ The problem occurred famously in *The Aeneid*, book 1: 445. “The Tyrians purchased land as large as a bull’s-hide but cut in strips for size.”

⁸⁹ One can search “Dido’s isoperimetric problem” and find introductory mathematics, but for an up-to-date view of the complexity of the topic see I. M. Gelfand, *Calculus of Variation*, translated and edited by Richard A. Silverman, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1993. Such an exercise is a nice nudge towards glimpsing our present theology as an edging and hedging around a shabby beginning.

⁹⁰ I quote here the final words of Lonergan’s early “Essay on Fundamental Sociology,” with, of course, a twist of meaning. He is writing of *Isaiah* 2: 2-4, the shift from spear to sickle. I am writing about the shift to an effective human global care twined into eternal Craving Christing Cherishing.

I ended my final footnote to my final *Posthumous* essay, number 21, with this same quotation and reference and there I went on in a manner that seems worth repeating here:

“But now, amazingly for me, a Benzine Ring of collaboration, a Buckyball around the globe, a Dream of Ganesh or Gerontius (but quite the opposite of ‘shapeless, scopeless, blank abyss’) : a final note that is surely one with “the music of the spheres” (*Pericles*, 5. i. 227). We – or rather I as speaker of the first of those five sections of either *Method in Theology* chapter 4 or chapter 11, or of a melody of the 1833 Overture – have arrived at the core of the solution to the third cycle of

startlingly new first *Quaestio* of a *Summa Theologica*, “in Vico’s phrase, a *scienza nuova*.”⁹¹

In the main, his disciples were not in the world of serious science: that was something I brooded over on the flight back to Ireland after the *International Lonergan* conference in Florida, Easter 1970. They had no personal possibility of appreciating, say, the “What?” effort referred to in E.T. Bell’s brief pointing regarding the mathematics of probability: “The necessary mathematics all developed from the fundamental principles of mathematical probability laid down by Fermat and Pascal in about three months by a painstaking application of uncommon sense.”⁹² My point echoes Lonergan’s point: “People have great respect for the great theoretical names—Newton and Einstein, Aristotle and Aquinas, weren’t they wonderful people!—but they have no personal experience of the intellectual pattern of living.”⁹³ But my point can be discomfiting when I focus attention on Probability as a central feature of the challenge of searching out Cosmopolis. For Lonergan it was a matter of finding cyclic, repetitive structures that would shift probabilities: “In brief, if any of the events ... sum

seminars on world religions which would have occupied the group around *FuSes* 55-79. (On this see the 24 pages of [FuSe 10](#), “Contexts of Functional Interpretation.” The common Tower judgment of religious value, of being in love with God, is to regard and guard “Thought on Method is Apt.” It is the follow-through on the 26th place of *Insight* 19.9, but to be radiantly self-luminous in the context of the 21st place there: “every created agent is an instrument in executing the divine plan.” *Insight*, CWL 3, 687. It is to be a subject-as-subject-as-subjects-as-Subjects embracing of atman in Brahman with Brahman. It is to lift Fred Crowe’s reflections on “the sacrament of the present moment.” *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study in History*, Paulist Press, 1978, 113-15. The whole research-book is to be transposed into a spiraling sacramental dynamics of The Tower. It is to crown the search for authentic secularity and to make regally true, 10,000 years from now or even a little slower, the coming convergence of world religions. So, in this long ramble of months, or decades, you have my section 1, inviting you to join – section 2 – in that global finding, fair and fine: indeed, no figure.”

⁹¹ Lonergan, CWL 20, *Shorter Papers*, in a review of works on the nature of Christian Philosophy. It was 1959, and he had five more years of ‘what to do?’ whatting to do.

⁹² E. T. Bell, *The Development of Mathematics*, McGraw-Hill, 1945, 155. The correspondence is in Fermat’s *Oeuvres*.

⁹³ CWL 6, *Philosophical and Theological Papers* 1958-1964, “Time and Meaning”, 121. See also page 155, “no real grasp of theory of any kind”; “never bitten by theory”; “products of *haute vulgarization*”.

of fractions.”⁹⁴ But what does all this mean to a community that, frankly, has no serious meaning for the word *probability*? Further, the horror is that my claim does not discomfort most of my readers: “McShane has got to be kidding,” or whatever. But I am deadly serious in my accusation of lack of couth. I consider that I am echoing Lonergan broad comment to me in Dublin, Easter 1961, when he talked of Catholic theologates as breeding a certain type of professor, “big frogs in little ponds.”

Sadly, even particularizing Lonergan’s criticism of *haute vulgarization* in terms of the word *probability* that is central to his world view probably—go figure the meaning of *probability* here!—is not going to stir much interest in thinking. So, in these Q/A I am trying to particularize in a different and more stirring way: by criticizing my colleagues of the generation after me. It was something that occurred to me as I finished the little book, *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, and my concluding remarks there are blunt.⁹⁵ Earlier, in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, I talked of the mood of Shakespeare’s Hal, which in fact had taken root in my mind in 1947: “I know you all, and will awhile uphold”, etc. etc.: a full soliloquy winding round to “I’ll so offend to make offense a skill.”⁹⁶ And recently, watching *Les Miserables*, I recalled Victor Hugo’s powerful impression on me in those schooldays. The issue is a risky revolution, *Toilers of the Sea* facing new surges, miserable theology dreaming dreams.⁹⁷ My present simple image, metaphor, of the dreamed transition is caught in the identification of theology as a battered tadpole wagging its feeble tail against the tide

⁹⁴ *Insight*, CWL 3, 144.

⁹⁵ No harm in adding in here my concluding plea there. “I can only appeal to each of us to ask, ‘Is it I?’, in relation to my dialectic and foundational accusation of our settling for rich description, and comparisons of rich descriptions, in place of the desperate global need of the exercise of either of Lonergan’s canons of explanation” (*Sane Economics and Fusionism*, 93).

⁹⁶ Shakespeare, *King Henry the Fourth: Part One*, I. ii. 188-210.

⁹⁷ I am thinking of the theme song of *Les Miserables* in relation to our desperate need for revolution.

of disgusting events in self-protective mode. Might we swiggle that measly wagging and self-protection towards a breast stroke that would reach a global embrace?

But best to end where *Insight* begins, with little things.⁹⁸ And best move from the broad sweep of Gadamer's requirement of "the Doric harmony between *logos* and *ergon*", to that harmony as it is found in the relative harmony of *logos* and *ergon*, in the health-making *ergon* of the *House* of medicine. So, I summarize my rambling advice: take a step by step, sentence by sentence, view of the effective conversation of detecting and coaching. Identify the significant namings and the structure of the comparisons. Namings occur in the identification of successful techniques and comparisons are of suggestions to the Standard Model, the *logos* dominated by the *ergon*.

You may prefer some other zone familiar to you: effective planning-talk in computer-manufacturing, contrasted with coffee-corner talk, or effective football-coaching compared with Monday morning quarter-backing. My muddled essay of comparisons here will be effective if a few elder Lonergan scholars pause, nudged into doubt by my amateur 1833 Overture. They might even join me in those challenging lines of *Method* 250. They might point students in the direction of functional and explanatory talk. They might organize gatherings so as to get us slowly away from the effete and ineffective.

The deep issue, recalling and twisting Lawrence's concluding paragraph, is the genesis of a grammar of ascent.⁹⁹ That grammar, for me, is symbolized in the metaword, **W₃**, and in its isomorphic prayer, "Double You Three in me, in all, Claspings, Cherishing, Calling, Craving, Christing". That grammar of ascent, of inner-wordly and inner-worldly ascent, pivots on the real and Towering apprehension of becoming that comes

⁹⁸ "...apparently trifling problems" (*Insight*, CWL 3, 27).

⁹⁹ My elementary effort of 1974 to foster that ascent is [*Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations: Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*](#).

only from “a painstaking application of uncommon sense,”¹⁰⁰ in positioned fullness,¹⁰¹ to “the desire of the everlasting hills.”¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ E.T. Bell, *The Development of Mathematics*, McGraw-Hill, 1945, 155.

¹⁰¹ Meant here, of course, is pilgrim pragmatic fullness, the integral intellectual conversion that I wrote of above.

¹⁰² *Genesis* 49:27. I use the Douay-Rheims translation. Most other versions give ‘bounty’ instead of ‘desire’. There was no intention, in my thus quoting, of recommending Thomas Cahill’s recent book, *Desire of the Everlasting Hills*, but of course, yes, his *How the Irish Saved Civilization*: what can I say? At all events, my intention was to end with a pointing to the final lines of *Insight*, CWL 3, 722, sublated into a twist of *Genesis* 1:1, Grace hovering in, Claspings, the Big Bang, initiating “that order’s dynamic joy and zeal” (722).