

**Part**

**Three**

**Existentialist**

**Incompleteness**

---

## Communications : An Outreach to Lonergan Students

### Introduction

At a lunch with Lonergan in the late 1970s the topic of Matt Lamb's *Festschrift* came up.<sup>1</sup> I remarked that Matt had asked me to do something on mathematics, but I said that I had done something in that direction already. Lonergan's response was, "we'll, give it to him again".

I did not do that, of course. Instead I attempted a broader sweep entitled "Features of Generalized Empirical Method. A Bridge Too Far". Later on Matt asked me to add something on economics, since he was not happy with the article that had been offered. This I did, and the result is in the volume under the title "Features of Generalized Empirical Method and the Actual Context of Economics". That article, and certainly the first part, was directed to the Lonergan community, an appeal for a change of pace. I might well have taken Lonergan's advice about that article by repeating it here. Certainly it has the full challenge as I saw it then, and has the advantage of pushing for some shared effort to understand and implement a correct economics. As I saw it then? It was a decent view of the challenge for a 55 year old, but I have moved on. Still, that is the rub, the Proustian rub. The notion of such moving on, neatly caught in Lonergan's view at 50, is not a current ethos. So that notion needs further airing. Is there an effective way of airing that or any other component of the challenge?

Oh yes, as effective as it humanly gets in this millennium: the challenge is to go gently global in a slowly-widening effort at collaborating functionally. But that was the single message of my previous book, *Molecules, Minding, Meaning*.<sup>2</sup> And I suspect that it could be as ineffective

---

<sup>1</sup>I mentioned this conversation in the Preface. The volume edited by Mathew Lamb, mentioned already in this book, is *Creativity and Method*, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 1981.

<sup>2</sup>To appear in 2008 from University of Toronto Press.

as *Method in Theology* of 37 years ago.

The present book is more rambling, quite incomplete, and moving at a level of bluntness very different from that previous book. I ramble in and out of special areas in a way that, I hope, points more concretely to the need briefly expressed, say, in the first chapter of *Method in Theology and Botany* or in the third chapter of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*. So, my final decision about this final chapter of this final book was, yes, to take Lonergan's advice, but to make the again-saying a creative ramble that just might nudge a disoriented following of Lonergan to take his central advice.

Is there much that is new here, besides of course the creative order and pattern of the selections? Well, there are two new sections, sections 1 and 7, that you might indeed attend to on a first reading: they represent you and I talking about the gross failure to read *Insight* in the past fifty years. Might you take an effective stand regarding that? Then you might note the oddity of the final four sections, a few lines each, pointing to tasks that are way beyond our generation and the catch of present history. What of the other eight sections?

Let us take them one by one. From section 1, on the failure to read *Insight*, I leap, in the second section, to Joistings 22, which should help the astute reader to place that failure in the context of the need for Cosmopolis that is at the heart of that neglected book. When will *Insight* be read properly?: when it circulates globally, functionally, much later in this millennium. And at that stage in history there will be a shift "in kindergarden and in graduate class"<sup>3</sup> towards the existentialism of the third definition of generalized empirical method, the self-cherishing of finite loneliness. That is the heart of section 3.

Section 4 moves to a particular struggle of a wonderful, impatient, twentieth century man, who found philosophy irrelevant and death boring, but who stands for a glow of scientific inquiry that gives the lie to present cultures of science.<sup>4</sup> The key pointing of the section is that there is a solution to the mess of 20<sup>th</sup> century quantum mechanics, but the context is the pointing of the

---

<sup>3</sup>See the beginning of chapter 1 of my *Lonergan's Challenge to the University and the Economy*, University Press of America, 1976. Available on the website.

<sup>4</sup>See John Gribben and Mary Gribben, *Richard Feynman. A Life in Science*, Plume Penguin pb, 1998.

previous section: the solution needs to be circulated. And section 5 returns to that need as I expressed in the context of *Insight* 's puzzling about the possibility of ethics. Functional specialization is the central ethical problem of academic living.

Section 6 places that powerful challenge in the context of history. This middle period of history of fragmented consciousness bubbled up with Plato's problem of running the town and is to be lifted towards the third period of history by Lonergan's solution to the problem of running the globe.

I remark on the seventh section already, where you and I might meet in a significant Hello. But where to go from there? I might well have ended there, with the challenge of taking a stand, whether a commonsense stand, or in a push towards the sophisticated stand that is to belong eventually in the global foundational village of page 250 of *Method*.<sup>5</sup> But it seemed as well to hang in with my initial plan of 13 sections, with section 7 an obvious middle.<sup>6</sup> So there is the symbolism of the climb that is given in the following sections. Sections 8 and 9 focus attention on the famously unread stuff on interpretation in *Insight*: *Cantower IX* in section 8 is pretty direct on that. Section 9 brings you into the context of chapter 9 of Chapter 9 of ChrISt in History, which edges you towards my view, in chapter 10, of the problems of detecting the goings-on of two periods cutely paralleled, 325-383 and 1925-1983. So, you might regard the move here as back round to section 1, and the need for a *Beginagain* Wake. That back-round notion leaves the final sections dangling out there in their own space, but more precise certainly than what Campbell suggests about a post-*Wake* book of Joyce.<sup>7</sup> Thirteen sections, then, with the

---

<sup>5</sup>That dialectic page requires that the participants move to stating their foundations.

<sup>6</sup>See note 1 of the Introduction above.

<sup>7</sup>See Joseph Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words. On the Art of James Joyce*, edited by Edmund L. Epstein, Harper Collins, 1993, the section on Joyce's Dantean Model, 19-21. The last work would have paralleled the *Paradiso*. "What the heavenly language was to have been for Joyce's unwritten fourth book, we do not know, by Joyce is reported to have said that it was going to be lucid, simple, and clear. Which is as it should be for Paradise" (Ibid., 21). I intend to have a final work that is to be "lucid, simple clear": a final series of essays entitled *Eldorede*, beginning June 2007. The overtone of Eldorado is obvious; less obvious, perhaps, the notion of elder-speaking. On the various meanings of the title see *Eldorede* 1, section 3.

last four not even sketched: but their brevity at least ensures that the lengths of the Three Parts balanced, a fundamental aim.

But a fundamental aim also was an appeal to the young searching women of this millennium, something that has been a reach now for quite some time. “I don’t care what anybody says it’d be much better for the world to be governed by the women in it you wouldt see women going and killing one another and slaughtering .”<sup>8</sup> You hear their Molly Bloom’s voice, but the voice you hear in this chapter - and I recommend that you hear it - is the voice of Sinead O’Connor, a gutsy Gael, out of Ireland come in so many ways.

The voice that predominates, of course, is the voice of Bernard Lonergan and it leads me, in conclusion, to recall the writing of “Features of Generalized Empirical Method” for that Festschrift edited by Matt Lamb in celebration of Lonergan’s 75<sup>th</sup> birthday. That article concluded with a short addendum, a quaint little story about Nora Joyce. She was asked, at Joyce’s funeral as I recall it, her opinion of various twentieth century authors. Her reply: “Aw sure why would I be bother with those fellows when I was married to the best of them”. Matt managed to leave it out in various proofs of the volume, in spite of my appeals and protests. As I joked once, it was not for lack of space; the next page was blank. Was it that Matt thought there was a tonality of gay-relating there? At all events, I have the contentment of adding the story here as a suitable conclusion. On that same Birthday in 1979 of Lonergan, we were together at a party in Montreal. As I entered he met me with a grin and the single word, “Nora!” We both knew that the issue was living within the quest for meaning, the quest for The Dark Tower.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Joyce, *Ulysses*, Penguin, 1983, 640.

<sup>9</sup>*Cantower IV* ends with a reflection on The Dark Tower sought by Childe Harold, but it turns the poem towards the feminist perspective that dominates that *Cantower*.

## 1. Spinning-Bucket, Spinning-Brain

“I have a universe inside me  
Where I can go and spirit guides me  
There I can ask oh any question”<sup>10</sup>

The universe inside me is a dark positional heuristic reaching, ontogenetically and phylogenetically for positional, positional, proto-possessional and circumincessional luminosity. But what could that sentence possibly mean?<sup>11</sup> Spirit guides me, and so you, to ask oh elementary questions, questions about our success in reading two short sections of the book *Insight*.

We had best begin with representative extracts from the two sections: section 3 of chapter five and section 7.3 of chapter 15. Let us for convenience label the two extracts **A** and **B**.

**A.** “Newton performed his famous bucket experiment to show that true motion relative to absolute space could be detected. A bucket of water was suspended from a twisted rope. The bucket spun, and for a while the surface of the water remained flat. The surface then hollowed out into a paraboloid. Eventually, the bucket ceased top spin, but the surface remained hollow. Finally, the surface became flat again. Now the hollowing of the surface of the water was due to the rotation of the water, and as this hollowing occurred both while the bucket was spinning and while the bucket was not spinning, it could not be merely an apparent motion relative to the bucket. Therefore, it was true motion relative to absolute space.”<sup>12</sup>

**B.** “With the development of intelligence the reader already possesses some familiarity. The lower, otherwise coincidental manifold is provided by sensible presentations and imaginative representations. In accord with the principle of correspondence, insights emerge to unify and correlate elements in the sensible flow, to ground formulation of such unifications and

---

<sup>10</sup>From the first song of Sinéad O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD. © 2000 Warner/Chapell Music LTD.

<sup>11</sup>Section 8, below, contains an extract from *Cantower IX*, “Position, Position, Protopossession”, which gives leads.

<sup>12</sup>*Insight*, 153[176-7].

correlations in concepts, thoughts, suppositions, considerations, definitions, postulates, hypotheses, theories, and through such conceptual constructions, or their deductive expansions, or their concrete implementation, to give rise sooner or later to further questions. Clearly, as the conceptual construction is the formulated higher system as integrator, so the emergence of the further question effects its transition into the operator. For further questions lead to further insights only to raise still further questions. So insights accumulate into viewpoints, and lower viewpoints lead to higher viewpoints.”<sup>13</sup>

My strategy here is to associate with each section or extract a contemporary book, and the challenge for you is to consider how you might handle the confusions of these texts against your comprehension of **A** and **B**. The two texts....

Let us begin with **A**. Greene deals with the problem on and off right through the book, but in a manner that is trapped in conventional confusions regarding physics, what is real, etc etc.<sup>14</sup> But at least the first mention of the problem points us in the right direction: “... not quite something to get the heart racing. But a little though will show that this bucket of spinning water is extremely puzzling. And coming to grips with it, as we have not yet done in over three centuries, ranks among the most important steps toward grasping the structure of the universe. Understanding why will take some background, but it is worth the effort.”<sup>15</sup> Dealing with the confusion, however, is not a matter of some few comments; indeed, it is a matter of a book that counters the messing in **Greene**, a book that could be a very good doctorate: any takers? I give only one lead from the messing of **Greene**: “The conclusion we draw is that even in general relativity, empty spacetime provides a benchmark for accelerated motion.”<sup>16</sup> Perhaps, if you

---

<sup>13</sup>*Insight*, 468-9[493-4].

<sup>14</sup>A recent volume, in honour of John Archibald Wheeler, gives a broad impression of the confusion: *Science and Ultimate Reality. Quantum Theory. Cosmology and Complexity*, edited by John Barrow, Paul Davies and Charles Harper Jr, Cambridge University Press, 2004. Especially interesting is the bundle of muddles about emergence in Part VI.

<sup>15</sup>Brian Greene, *The Fabric of the Cosmos. Space, Time, and the Texture of Reality*, Alfred A.Knopf, New York, 2004, 23. The book is referred to below as **Greene**.

<sup>16</sup>**Greene**, 74.

know your way round *Insight*, this nudges you to go to where Lonergan treats the issue in a fuller context: “Space and Time, if real, are determinations within being; and if they are determinations within being, then they are not the containers but the contained. To put the issue more concretely, there are extensions and durations, juxtapositions and successions. Still, such affirmations are descriptive. They have to be transposed into explanatory statements before one can ask legitimately for their metaphysical equivalents; and when the transposition takes place, then from the general nature of explanation it follows that the metaphysical equivalents will be conjugate potencies, forms and acts that ground the truth of spatiotemporal laws and frequencies.”<sup>17</sup>

Immediately Lonergan expresses the central challenge involved here, and involved indeed in the entire book, *Insight*. It is a challenge that I have drawn attention to more than once, the challenge of what I call the “come about”, a challenge which is much more apt as a slogan than what Lonergan gave in the Introduction.<sup>18</sup> “***So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extensions and experiencing duration gives place to the subject orientated to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies.***” That challenge is a matter of a dishearteningly long climb. I think, in my own case, of a forty year effort, but for you I would hope there is to be the lift and the shortening of community support. And to be also the support of what I would call a metagrammic beginning. What do I mean by that?

We are here at the heart of my inner battling of these fifty years, but to help you it is best stay in the relative present. There was, for me, great leap when I was tackling *Cantower XXXIII*, which was written for the centennial of Lonergan’s birth in December 2004.<sup>19</sup> If Lonergan, and serious philosophic discourse, was to be rescued from *haute vulgarization* it needed the stilts of

---

<sup>17</sup>*Insight*, 513-4[537].

<sup>18</sup>*Insight*, xxviii[22]. For a further comment on the slogan on that page, see the Epilogue at note 13.. What follows above, is , of course, the Frontispiece quotation of this book.

<sup>19</sup>That *Cantower* is worth perusing, repeating twenty years later my eulogy of 1984, and then moving towards this new perspective on the place of metagrams.

stilted soul-saving symbols.<sup>20</sup> If that leap was for me a leap in my seventies, its communication to you is to be a matter, not of reading this or *Cantower XXXIII* or anything else, but of the emergence of a new culture that catches out “the catch of history.”<sup>21</sup> But this is all too much for section 1 of this final chapter: it is, indeed, the catch of the final quotation of this chapter. And that final quotation meshes oddly with **B**, the second text quoted above.

The second text lifts one into the zone of neurochemical dynamics. If you have been reading the text **B** in what may be called conventional Lonerganesque fashion, this could be far from obvious. “The reader already possesses” little familiarity with “sensible presentations and imaginative representations”<sup>22</sup> as compounded of such dynamics. Yet that is the “actual context”<sup>23</sup> of **B** at this stage in the book. Enlarging on this would be another book - another good doctorate thesis! As with **A**, so here with **B** I suggest associating the task of grasping intellectual development with a book on the topic: *Neuroscience. Exploring the Brain*.<sup>24</sup> A book on the topic! Am I serious? Well, exploring the brain is what Lonergan is talking about! The text named, of course, is way off here: it somewhat resembles those heavy books on zoology in which no live animals feature.<sup>25</sup>

We are confronted here with the same “come about” challenge that we met with **A**. And

---

<sup>20</sup>A brief account of this need is in Philip McShane, “Obstacles to the Control of Meaning”, *Method. Journal of Lonergan Studies*, 2006.

<sup>21</sup>*Topics in Education*, 231: the problem was introduced in note 3 of the Preface above.

<sup>22</sup>Do please re-read **B** with humour. This has to become a traditional element in this century’s reading of *Insight*: the solitary typist of mid-twentieth century speeding along with such phrases as “the reader is now familiar with.....”

<sup>23</sup>See *Method in Theology*, 163-4, 183-4.

<sup>24</sup>Mark Bear, Barry Connors and Michael Paradiso, Baltimore: Lippencott, Williams and Wilkins, 2001.

<sup>25</sup>Chapter 3 of *The Shaping of Foundations*, deals with aspects of zoology.

the home of that challenge is the universe reaching for the unity of its own energy,<sup>26</sup> indeed bracing the finality's exigence for which "the universe bring forth its own unity in the concentrated form of a single intelligent view."<sup>27</sup> Is not this something like "exploring the brain", something like *The Supreme Adventure*?<sup>28</sup> Is this evolutionary throw-up of 13.7 billion years, human minding, a fully genetic dynamic, a four million year adventure that is only beginning?

But it is human minding that poses that question about human minding. It is an empirical question of brain within brain's thrust and trust, self-searching molecules. We need a pause over what we might mean by empirical method in the fullness of its global minding.

## 2. Cosmopolis and the Longer Cycles of Incline

"My friends think I'm alone but I've got secrets  
I don't tell everything about the love I get  
I've got a lovin' man but he's a spirit  
He never does no harm never treats me bad"<sup>29</sup>

You may well prefer to pass immediately to section three, where you find what might be expected, a musing over various perspectives on generalized empirical method, leading up to where we left off implicitly in the previous section: on the edge of our loneliness. But I wish to plunge us right into the heart of the present global crisis: the need for an integral global empirical method.

---

<sup>26</sup>See *Insight*, 16.4.1. *Cantower XXX* deals with the problem of climbing to Lonergan's view of energy.

<sup>27</sup>*Insight*, 520[544].

<sup>28</sup>This probably strikes most readers as an odd reference: it is one of the many books of Robert Crookall, representing a tradition of inquiry into survival. The full reference is *The Supreme Adventure. Analyses of Psychic Communications*, Attic Press, Greenwood, 1974.

<sup>29</sup>From the second song of Sinead O'Connor's Faith and Courage CD.

***Joistings 22* Reviewing Mathews' *Lonergan's Quest*, and Ours.**

This is not at all a review of Mathews' mighty work. Certainly I can give a brief personal reaction to it which could be helpful in your reading of it, your benefitting from it. To do that I think it best to lead you first to Bill's last sentence. "As, slowly, our attunement to it [the vision quest] grows, it leaves us, progressively, with a sense of a startling strange and irreducibly mysterious dimension to the desire at the heart of the human, the desire that quests and authors."<sup>30</sup> Bill and I grew up in this attunement over decades, but I can claim an earlier start. It is now fifty years since I began reading Lonergan, with *Insight* coming a year later, and I have stayed with it, progressively finding it increasingly startlingly strange and mysterious. Even this week, as I finally broke through in the central problem of quantum mechanics, which I have grappled with since 1956<sup>31</sup>, I had to conclude that Lonergan's efforts in *Insight* - especially in chapters 5 and 16, were and are at a remoteness that was quite beyond the reachings of Einstein, Feynman, Hawking, Bell, Penrose, etc etc. But that is another story, to be told in chapter 14 of a forthcoming book, *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*. My topic here is that Standard Model, where the name brings in a clear reference to present physics, though the standard model of Lonergan sublates fantastically that standard model.

But before I get to the question and the quest of sublation, I must recall my acquisition of Bill's book at the Lonergan Conference at Loyola Marymount, Los Angeles, in March 2006. First there was the shock of finding what I might call the cut-off, a halt with the completion of *Insight*. Some moments later there was the delight at the cunning of the cut-off: that cut-off leaves the book as a clear challenge to the philosophical tradition.<sup>32</sup> Will the challenge be met,

---

<sup>30</sup>William A. Mathews, *Lonergan's Quest. A Study of Desire in the Authoring of Insight*, University of Toronto Press, 2006, 477.

<sup>31</sup>I might well have typed *1949-50* there, in the clear memory of pausing over a book in a public library in Dublin that dealt with the famous Balmer hydrogen lines, sensing the want to make sense of them. The want remains, and I am getting there.

<sup>32</sup>In my Introduction to *Phenomenology and Logic* I point (see pp. xxii-xxiii and the notes there) to the mess to be associated with Bill Mathews focus on judgment and truth.

taken up? The point of my viewing, reviewing, however, is, oddly, not the problem of such a taking up.<sup>33</sup> My viewing here is, I would suspect, a viewing that is read only by disciples of Lonergan interested in getting Mathews' perspective on the man and his struggle. Well, you wont: Or should I say, you will, if you climb with him towards the meaning of his last sentence. What do I mean by "climb with him"?

I climbed with him in memory through his dense delineation of the climb, thinking also of his slow laborious climb towards that delineation.<sup>34</sup> How does one climb with him? In the full sense, that question and that invitation points to a Proustian cherishing of that cup of tea, that piece of cake<sup>35</sup>, on which you might strive to take a stand: is it your cup of tea, are to up to cognizing that it is not a piece of cake, not a ramble round a familiar problem? That same summer of 1953 in which Lonergan gathered the story of his climb for publication, Hillary and Tensing climbed Everest. That climb is now almost a popular excursion, but in contrast Lonergan's climb was a climb to the invention of a mountain, a mountain that vanished in the print, to be reinvented by some few in this century, by a community in millennia to come. Is it

---

<sup>33</sup>Oddly, because of course that *is* my problem, to which my answer is No, the challenge will not be taken up in the present context of culture. My thesis is, and has been for some decades, that functional specialization in a minimalist sense is to be the pragmatic context of that taking-up. Chapter 3 of my *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism* gives indications, but the issue has the complexity of the "catch of history" mentioned below. Here I can only draw your attention usefully to the way in which my view shifts the bent of Lonergan's *Insight*. Yes, "there is needed, then, a further manifestation of finality" (*Insight*, 633[655]) but it is not just the Incarnation of the Spoke of history - which so far does not seem to have worked too profoundly. And No, on my pragmatic view it is not now the case that "the possibility of cosmopolis is conditioned by the possibility of a critical human science, and a critical human science is conditioned by the possibility of a correct and accepted philosophy" (*Insight*, 690 [712]). Yes, Lonergan's view jives with mine when possibility is taken as "within human reach" but I am here taking it as within the context of emergent probability. The concrete possibility - or probability-scheduling - of the serious intussusception of either *Insight* or Mathews' book is the emergence of a general cultural acceptance of global cyclic functional collaboration. This is the condition of the emergence of critical and accepted human science and philosophy.

<sup>34</sup>See, as just one of many examples, Mathews' dense precise presentation of Lonergan's doctorate work towards *Grace and Freedom*.

<sup>35</sup>The reference is, of course, to the tea and the little cake of Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past*.

your cup of tea, your bucket of being? I am thinking now of Newton's spinning bucket and of the title of the first section of chapter 14 of *Loneragan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*: "Spinning Newton's Bucket." How well did you climb with Loneragan through that dense couple of pages he wrote about Newton's bucket?<sup>36</sup> Mathews' climb is much more densely expressed than that. Where does this leave you? I would ask you at least to entertain my paralleling seriously. Come to sense the parallel: reading about Everest's conquest is clearly a different venture from putting your best foot skyward.

Mathews' book, will not, I suspect, be read with Proustian seriousness by the present generation of Loneragan students, much less taken seriously by the wider tradition. Its fate, in our times, is to be the fate of *Insight*. The longer cycle of decline does not slope up abruptly.<sup>37</sup> How, then, might one envisage an effective turn for the better?

Notice that we have reached, in this question, an expression of the other half of Loneragan's quest, one that was - as I know from Bill - part of his earlier text. Bill might well have written in his Epilogue, as Loneragan did in the beginning of his Epilogue to *Insight*, of "the inception of a far larger" work. But Bill has done his bit, and there is a profound sense in which that far larger work has to be taken up as a task of community in history facing "the real catch"<sup>38</sup> of history: the improbable shift to the emergence of a general global taken-for-grantedness of the

---

<sup>36</sup>*Insight*, 152-5[176-79]. Contrast Brian Greene's messing around with the bucket (see his *The Fabric of the Cosmos*, Knopf, New York, 2004, the pages around his index references to *bucket of spinning water*). Our quest, as we seek to glimpse, is to help towards the institutionalization of their recycled corrective togetherness.

<sup>37</sup>I am presenting in this brief paper a simple image of the longer cycles of decline and incline, but part of the "catch of general history" referred to below is to make **general** both as a theoretic and as an incarnate street-presence a view of human history as beginning with the strange emergence of a graced organic reality witted yet witless in the guarding of its inner light. The quest, what-to-do with the cosmos, is lost in the branches of its swinging trees. There is a millennium-long theological road of recycling ahead to a serious perspective on the journey from Eden to Eschaton.

<sup>38</sup>*Topics in Education*, 236.

“many members of that one body” in “satisfactory”<sup>39</sup> care of emergent probability.

We come now to the question of our pragmatic quest, which is the question of the August 2006 gathering in Vancouver. That is a quest for the beginnings of functional specialization. But the quest here is for a core motivation to pursue personally or at least promote communally that quest. The motivation comes from recognizing that the deeper quest of Lonergan was to change history. My conviction is that the heart of the dynamics of that changing was his discovery of February 1965, the invention of functional specialization. But he had characterized what he was looking for more than a dozen years before when he gave his five-point sketch of Cosmopolis at the conclusion of chapter 7 of *Insight*.

The exercise that I now invite is a creative reading of that sketch. Bear in mind, of course, all that I have said about the denseness of both Lonergan and Mathews: this packed conclusion to section 8 of chapter 7 of *Insight* is the result of a quarter century of climbing. I regularly paused with students, in my two decades of undergraduate teaching, over the problem of reaching for meaning here, by taking a single phrase of the section, “the social situation deteriorates cumulatively.”<sup>40</sup> The suggested question - for you now - is for the meaning of that phrase, a meaning that should have some growing bone-bent marrow-mesh. Is that deterioration such as to “make human life unlivable”<sup>41</sup> for you, nerve-edged by “the monster that has stood forth in our day”<sup>42</sup>: or are you just puttering along fairly contentedly numb in this evil low point of the long axial period?

There is little point in my summarizing the five characteristics. What I would prefer to do is to expand them considerably and to add to them a sixth characterization: the one implicit here:

---

<sup>39</sup>The implicit reference here is to Joistings 8, “Recycling Satisfaction”, where I mesh the emergence of functional specialization with the theology of satisfaction and the dynamic of collaborative needs expressed by Paul in *First Corinthians* chapters 12 and 14.

<sup>40</sup>*Insight*, 229[254].

<sup>41</sup>Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 232.

<sup>42</sup>*Method in Theology*, 40.

the answer to Lonergan's quest is functional specialization.<sup>43</sup> Further, what is meant by "expand" can be gleaned from my efforts to enlighten the community on that sixth characterization and gleaned too can be the seeming futility of the effort in the face of what I refer to as "the catch of history."<sup>44</sup> One escapes that catch by rising in the Clasp of history to genuine fantasy and the mention of that rising and that Clasp allows me to lay aside an obvious feature of Cosmopolis: the problem is not the divine collaboration but ours, and that is my focus.<sup>45</sup> We must do everything, to recall Ignatius of Loyola, as if the result depended solely on that effort.

But I must leave you to the exercise of reading those few pages, catching here and there little insights within what has to be a slow humble effort to embrace history within the Clasp of history.

Does functional specialization, in the longer cycle of incline, "force and cajole,"<sup>46</sup> but not as police? As a global dynamic of inquiry, is it not "to witness to the possibility of ideas"?<sup>47</sup> Is it not extremely practical in going about its own non-busybody business of recycling, so that it "does not waste its time and energy"<sup>48</sup> on controversy and pseudo-dialogue? Is not that recycling also relentlessly self-critical of its future and ours? Finally, fifthly, is not the implementation of

---

<sup>43</sup>I would note that this addition corresponds to my usual addition of (10) to Lonergan's list of (9) in *Method in Theology*, 287.

<sup>44</sup>The sixth characterization has been a life-work, beginning with pointers regarding musicology in 1969. One outstanding instance of expanding is the 200 pages of SOFDAWAREs and *Quodlibets* written about that single page 250 of *Method in Theology*: so far, a massively ineffectual appeal. It awaits recycling.

<sup>45</sup>The relevant diagram here, named later W3, is that of page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue*. There my focus can be seen to be the essential tower of collaboration, rolled out as a rectangle. The bottom part of the diagram points to a Trinitarian perspective on history. Above I am using my more recent expression of Trinitarian personalities: Speak, Spoke, Clasp.

<sup>46</sup>See *Insight*, 398[423].

<sup>47</sup>*Insight*, 239[264].

<sup>48</sup>*Insight*, 239[264].

that fantasy of a global integral omni-disciplinary collaboration “not easy”?<sup>49</sup>

So we come to my additional characterization, one that merges with Lonergan’s remarks in his “Conclusion”. “A final observation has to do with method.”<sup>50</sup> He recalls his view of generalized empirical method, which for me is the first of the three definitions pointed to in Joistings 21. Then he writes “in the present chapter, the nature of this generalized method has come to light” The light is his limp ineffective view of dialectic, a dialectic that in its developed form would be as effectively relevant to global progress as “the operator equation is to recent physics.”<sup>51</sup> It would bring conscious subjects in their neural basis together in an “integration for specialized studies” that would be “adjustable to any course of events.”<sup>52</sup> One may think of that togetherness in the context of his 29 mentions of **collaboration** in the penultimate section of *Insight*. And then one might muse over that weak final section of the book, where he leans so heavily on a slim intimation of the relevance of the Speak and Spoke and Clasp of history: “The

---

<sup>49</sup>*Insight*, 241[266].

<sup>50</sup>*Insight*, 243[268].

<sup>51</sup>*Insight*, 244[269]. The five words at note 11 above provide a challenge to your sense of how well you are reading *Insight*, but these seven words give you a much more discomfoting challenge. Obviously, they come from his creative and critical reading of Lindsay and Margenau. They brilliantly point to the reach beyond the differential equations of classical physics - just mentioned there by him - to the problem of concrete reference. Classical equations express heuristically forms, “an abstract relational field”(*Insight* 494[517]), normally reaching for continuous secondary determinations. The muddled crisis of twentieth century physics was a matter of handling the non-continuity of such determinations. Heisenberg, in 1925, hit on matrix operators that would reach in that direction of concrete verifiability and implementability. Lonergan, in 1965, hit on the matrix of collaboration,  $C_{ij}$ , (see *A Brief History of Tongue*, page 108), that is to reach for the concrete of human possibilities when it is gradually put in global place. This is in deep contrast with present Lonerganesque thinking regarding categories, where the thinking with regard to concrete implementation, not reaching secondary determinations like Laser (“Lightwave Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation” ) technology, seems old and classical and “effete”( *Method in Theology*, 99). Lonergan’s Lightwave Stimulation technology is a new and beautiful and efficient metaphysics.(On efficiency as central to metaphysics, see *Topics in Education*, 160, line 16).

<sup>52</sup>*Insight*, 244[ 269].

problem of general history, which is the real catch”<sup>53</sup> had thus far defeated the fifty year old genius. It would be more than a decade before he would bring forth his location of dialectic in a new set of differentiations of human consciousness. He was then to sketch, in those tired years of the late 1960s, briefly and at times badly, what for me is his final achievement on method: the fourth definition of generalized empirical method.

### 3. Existentialism

“I don’t deserve to be alone”<sup>54</sup>

We return here to that question that was bubbling up at the end of section 1, the question of molecules minding themselves, organisms that ingest and tinker with the cosmos. Time magazine this week - October 9, 2006 - has a cover about chimps and humans sharing 99% similar DNA, with the statement there “How We Became Human”. Here we have the question, How are we to become human?”, an ontogenetic question that is phylogenetic. The rather silly article in Time ends with a silly sentence”Within a few short years, we may finally understand precisely when and how it happened”. Still, the second last sentence is to the point: “After 3.5 billion years of such (genetic) randomness a creature emerged that could ponder its own origins - and revel in a Mozart adagio.” At the root of the reveling is the source of the third definition of generalized empirical method.

### *Joistings 21*

#### **Research, Communications, Stages of Method**

This essay, written in early 2006, is, in its proximate meaning, related to the gathering of August 14-18, 2006, in the University of British Columbia, a gathering that seeks to reach larger

---

<sup>53</sup>*Topics in Education*, 236.

<sup>54</sup>From the third song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

light on two functional specialties that are seemingly neglected by Lonergan: research and communications.

The essay was, originally, much lengthier affair. I was pushing on, seeking refinements of foundational searchings. But the conference challenge is to get something going towards a beginning, and indeed my own challenge in these next few years is in line with that challenge. It does not seem a time for pushing forwards but, so to speak, for pushing round. So, this cuts back to the August project. But I kept the title, and keep also brief pointers that could help us along, even if they were part of the reach for a larger subtler view. Two brief sections, then: one on the broader view, the second on preparing for and benefitting from the conference. At the end of this essay, in an Appendix, I place the general invitation to the Conference which contains a short list of suggested topics and some details of our leisured style of procedure and our avoidance of formal reading of papers.

### **1. Three Definitions of Generalized Empirical Method.**

First, a creative pointer here regarding the title, stages of method. Think of three views of generalized empirical method as associated with the three stages.<sup>55</sup> Basic spontaneous method is present from the beginning, the early methodologist being the human who has as yet not planted nor harvested not even found a shell convenient for gathering berries. In the first stage of meaning, in its generic purity, attention is on the object: there emerges empirical method, a spontaneity that can invent instruments of survival. It is unanalyzed, but eventually it takes descriptive shape in a talk, a linguistic trick, that leaves out the source of that shaping. There is, then, talk of empirical method that has the characteristics of the later talk, a contemporary talk, indeed, that has its screening roots in truncated subjectivity.<sup>56</sup> From that sort of talk and thinking

---

<sup>55</sup>*Joistings 22* concludes to a fourth obvious view, but let us leave it simple here, in line with *Insight* and with foundational work. I note - have you also noticed? - that I repeat here something included in section 5 of chapter 1. But does it - you - not read differently, here, and now?

<sup>56</sup>You recall Lonergan's comments on page 73 of *A Second Collection*? "The neglected subject does not know himself. The truncated subject not only does not know himself but also is unaware of his ignorance and so, in one way or another, concludes that what he does not know

one can arrive at the expression of Lonergan in the third chapter of *Insight*: “We have followed the common view that empirical science is concerned with sensibly verifiable laws and expectations. If it is true that essentially **the same method could be applied to the data of consciousness**, then respect for ordinary usage would require that a method, which only in its essentials is the same, be **named generalized empirical method**.”<sup>57</sup> This may be taken as a first definition of generalized empirical method.

Next comes Lonergan’s later definition of generalized empirical method, that should dominate these next centuries. It still does not seem to have much influence on Lonergan students.

**“Generalized empirical method operates on a combination of both the data of sense and the data of consciousness: it does not treat of objects without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject; it does not treat of the subject’s operations without taking into account the corresponding objects.”**<sup>58</sup>

The Third Definition of GEM is my suggestion, though you can find it lurking in some of Lonergan’s writings: e.g. in “Mission and Spirit,”<sup>59</sup> Or in his view of leisure as an emergent of a new economics.<sup>60</sup>

**Generalized empirical method still operates within the second definition, but the focus is now on the roots of the operations of the subject, the loneliness that is the heart of history.**

---

does not exist”.

<sup>57</sup>*Insight*, 72[96].

<sup>58</sup>Lonergan, *A Third Collection*, 141, top five lines.

<sup>59</sup>*A Third Collection*.

<sup>60</sup>See the index, *For A New Political Economy*, under *leisure*.

Should I leave at that, with the invitation to brood over the two shifts?

Let me see can I give some uncomplicated hints. But I would note that digging out the meaning of the two definitions is a matter of new research into history. So, one finds the third definition verified in a vague way in aesthetic reachings, in primitive poetic yearnings. On the other hand, one finds in the recent history of Lonergan studies a massive neglect - or dodging - of the second definition. Too many Lonergan pseudo-disciples incline to write of conscious operations, say, in physics or psychology, without venturing into the data of sense. Let me be extremely simple here: what data of sense do I wish to draw to your attention? Yes, of course, it is the data that physicists study, the data that psychologist study. But think now of the data that these people produce: print about physics and about psychology. What is being neglected is the mediation of an understanding of the operations that is being made available in history by the venture called the scientific revolution.

The third definition of GEM seeks to carry forward all that mediation of humanity's reach for explanation into a new culture of leisure and luminous loneliness. To fantasize forward about it is a massive foundational undertaking. Suffice it to say that it will lift the meaning of the first section of chapter 17 of *Insight* into a quite new context. *Haute vulgarization* is to be replaced, with statistical success, with a common sense of mystery, human living will reach new levels of privacy that is intimately global, and the mystery of human death will be a mystery of hope.

## **2. Conferring about Research and Communications<sup>61</sup>**

It will take us a little work to glimpse better the meaning of the third - or even the second - definition of GEM. But that glimpse will come with hum-drum practical considerations on how the distant aspiration that are in those two definitions can help us towards a discontinuous shift in Lonergan studies and in our own work. As I have been envisaging it, and was going to envisage it here in the original essay, it is quite a fantastic yet obvious shift. It is a lift associated with the

---

<sup>61</sup>The orientation is towards the initiation of these two specialties, but obviously is not restricted to them. Each of us has a bent towards one or two specialties, already perhaps identified, or waiting in our loneliness to be identified. And, of course, the conferring is a foundational search meshing into the tasks of the fourth and fifth specialties.

weak treatment in *Method in Theology* of the two specialties. Yet it is also related to the minimalism that I have been advocating for some time now, and to concrete possibilities and probabilities in what I might call our ordinary lives of marginal scholarship.

This latter minimalism and ordinariness is what the conference conferring is about. Indeed, such is my present minimalism that I do not wish to burden you with readings on previous efforts to say what specialized work in the first and last specialties is. I list some such readings in the last footnote and here and there as we ramble along together, but I do not ask you to follow up on them: I wish you only to follow up on simpler possibilities that come to you either from among those touched on by me here, or that dawn on you through the present nudging of your life.

Still, I presume that you have some notion of my minimalism. Quite simply, it advocates the division of labour advocated by Lonergan without its grounding: grounded rather in noticing the muddled presence of that division in contemporary studies in all serious domains.<sup>62</sup> Now, not only do I presume that you have some notion but I also wish to presume that you are taking sides about it, taking a stand on it. What stand do I desire? Here, oddly, I am stepping away from minimalism to the fantastic. At least, viewing current Lonergan studies, it could strike you as something in the realms of fantasy.

The fantastic minimalism stand is that what Lonergan suggests is something that could take over the globe, become the dominant ethos of all learning, its sharing, its implementation. This, after forty years of brooding, is not fantastic to me: indeed it was pretty evident to me in the late 1960s. But what is growing ever more evident to me as we move along in Lonergan studies these decades later is that Lonergan achievement has at best a place in scholars' minds as a convenient filing system for the individual. Nor do I see this placement as something they consider as a temporary strategy.

So, I am asking for a stand on this fantastic minimalism. I can, of course, have a shot at persuasion, and this in three basic ways that can be intertwined. There is the heavy way of

---

<sup>62</sup>You would find helpful the reflections of chapter 3 of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism* and of chapter 1 of *Molecules, Minding, Meaning*.

dialectic about which I have written at some length<sup>63</sup>; there is the commonsense way that lurks in my appeal to history or my appeal by illustration from difficulties in various disciplines<sup>64</sup>, and there is the third way that consists in drawing attention to the manner in which the fantasy fulfils the conditions for cosmopolis set out by Lonergan.<sup>65</sup>

Now if you are with me in this stand, even in a commonsense fashion, then we can proceed to envisage strategies that relate to commonsense versions of the specialties research and communications. This should, at first glance, seem odd to you: the specialties in their maturity require subtle differentiations of consciousness. How are we to manage the envisagement while operating in a commonsense mode?

We do so because we hang in with one of the facets of these specialties. We do research, but have no intention of going further: we are like lab attendants in physics, screen watchers on a warship, capable of handing on the baton by saying “hey: look at this!” Similarly, we do Communications but we are not leaning on the massively-developed cyclic support of the future: we are simply saying “hey, look at this!” But note the difference in the Hey-saying. The researcher is nudging those in the community of Lonergan students: the communicator is nudging the general community in particular zones.

But what commonsense helps you to notice what you say “hey” about? It is a business of layers, the identification of which is a task of our collaboration, but in my effort to get us into this task I would have us get thinking about the main characteristic of the commonsense bent that I have in mind, that I wish you to have in mind, in character.<sup>66</sup> It is the bent that wishes not only to

---

<sup>63</sup>I refer especially to the SOFDAWARES and the *Quodlibets*.

<sup>64</sup>I refer you to the writings mentioned in note 8 above.

<sup>65</sup>These are well worth brooding over in this context: give section 8.6 of *Insight* a fresh reading..

<sup>66</sup>I think of character as defined in the beginning of the Aristotelian *Magna Moralia*, or the meaning of *character* as mentioned in section 1 of chapter 14 of *Method in Theology*.

see results, but to be the agent of some results.<sup>67</sup>

This may not seem much to ask, but in fact it asks much when viewed in its fullest sense.<sup>68</sup> But let's not go there: think at present of a bubbling up of a commonsense ethos, say, in the midst of a conference on Lonergan, pushing the existential question, the molecules of the participants, towards the question of efficiency ... **Where is this going?**<sup>69</sup> For instance, 'Is this paper that I am listening to going to hit the streets?'. You find this, perhaps, an unfamiliar attitude? An unwelcome, disconcerting attitude? Even more so when the asking is 'Where am I going with this? Is this leading me, us, anywhere as "a practical view of history?"'<sup>70</sup>

So we get closer to the mood of our involvement with withdrawal, a withdrawal that I would identify as contemplative, not a prayer of quiet, but an Augustinian "restless heart", a Theresian adventure.<sup>71</sup> And now, re-view the definitions of generalized empirical method in this light and notice new light, a new control of meaning.

But I wish to hold to brevity here. Where are we going with, in, from, this August gathering? Are we tuning to cherishing freshly, pragmatically, cunningly, the loneliness that is the heart of history? Are we ready, "ever ready,"<sup>72</sup> to make Hey while the Son shines?

---

<sup>67</sup>The final section of chapter 3 of *Method in Theology*, with its contextualization of effeteness, is relevant here and I would draw attention to the two comments (pp. 121, 155) on *haute vulgarization* in Lonergan's *Collected Works*, vol. 6.

<sup>68</sup>The viewing is the distant reality pointed at e.g. in chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

<sup>69</sup>The context of this question should eventually be the unity, beauty and efficiency of the new metaphysics that is serious about efficiency (see *Topics in Education*, 160, line 16) and about implementation as the core of the definition of metaphysics. God's concept is an eternal practicality: see note 18 below.

<sup>70</sup>*Insight*, 233[258].

<sup>71</sup>In Joistings 4, on "Personality Types", I reflect on the three Theresa's of India, of Liseaux, of Avila. There are deep issues here of the character of contemplative reaching but the generic point is made in Cantower 21, "Epilodge"

<sup>72</sup>*Insight*, 726[747]. A matter, you might sense, of becoming a "specialized auxiliary" with "an effective determination to discover and to implement in all things the intelligibility of universal order that is God's concept and choice." God's concept is the Son, shining in the

The Hey depends on where we are and stand in a common sense, with perhaps a tincture of theory, of our own participation of history's loneliness? So, we must attend together to our opportunities to lift the ordinary of our quest into the rhythms of an extraordinary recycling of meaning that is yet to be, by taking note - Research - and giving notice - Communications - of simple agonies of our classrooms, streets, conferences, collaborations.

Of what do we take note, and where do we take it? Of what do we give notice and to whom? What is your fancy? Certainly I have my own fancy, indeed a massive list of fancies that, in a broad sweep, were expressed in the remote doctrines of my last Cantower.<sup>73</sup> But it seems better to await our interchanges before, during and after the August gathering

#### 4. Recycling Quantum Mechanics

“Long time I’ve been thinking about this  
Can this really exist?”<sup>74</sup>

The impossible context here is Cantowers 27-31, which parallel *Insight's* first five chapters with the first five chapters of Feynman's three volume introduction to physics. And might you not push your fantasy to envisage, in a hundred years or so, a community comfortable in a new version of the first two volumes of Feynman, reading this section as all too obviously a struggle with elementary difficulties of the Standard Model?

But our present difficulty is the cycling and recycling of the effort here. Certainly some accident could bring it into the hands of a reputable physicist capable of the subjectivity it

---

darkness of today's opportunity.

<sup>73</sup>Cantower 41 dealt with the functional specialty Doctrines, but it also was the beginning of a new pragmatism that I saw as necessary: so, I ended the million word project after 400,000 words. The doctrines noted there are remote in meaning, but the present move is towards an intussusception of them within common sense. But I would wish that move to be a communal effort.

<sup>74</sup>From the fourth song of Sinead O'Connor's *Faith and Courage* CD.

demands, but also capable of turning the community inwards and onwards. But the concrete hope of effective success is the pattern of collaborations described elsewhere.<sup>75</sup> Still, you might like to sense, here and now, the distant meaning of a revised text on quantum mechanics based on such a new contextualization of Feynman's third volume as I sketch here. So, enter, if you wish, my reaching in this third last *Joistings*.

### ***Joistings 25: Rescuing Quantum Mechanics***

This essay was originally altogether more complex. Indeed, it was beginning to look more like a book, mainly a detailed commentary on Volume 3 of Feynman's *Lectures on Physics*. What follows was previously the third of a penultimate draft containing four sections dealing with the problem and with my problem of presentation. That previous draft contained a chapter by chapter commentary on Feynman's 21-chapter volume. Might I say briefly and helpfully what my problem was, and is? For I have not solved it.

The solution lies in the future, in a developed functional specialization that will place my muddled "Interpretation of Feynman Volume 3" in the full swing of a mature cyclic physics. It is not just that my interpretation is muddled: it is that it is trapped, herenow between us, in a culture of communication and of physics that is a shambles. That, of course, you find hard to believe. If you are a contemporary physicist, you find it unacceptable. If you are in the business of pop-physics - whether you are Hawking or Green or Davies - you leap from the conviction that we are doing quite nicely in physics to a destructive science fiction, a fiction about human understanding and about the elusive beings of physics. But I should halt immediately: you rightly smell another book. Have a preliminary look, if you like, at note 30 below. Let us begin, then: and I am eccentric enough to retain the reminder of the full context of the 'disappeared' other sections 1, 2, 4, by holding to the number three for the "central section" of this *Joistings*!

---

<sup>75</sup>Especially relevant is the pattern of converging disciplines described in *Molecules, Minding, Meaning*, chapter 7. And to the context of that book one might well add the context of the reflections on Communications and Collaborations in *ChrISt in History*: see especially Chapter 5.

### 3. “No Matter; Try Again; Fail Again; Fail Better”<sup>76</sup>

This final effort has been perhaps sufficiently contextualized now by the previous *Joistings 24*, and the previous sections here. So let me get to the job of giving some pointers that would help forward the serious reader of volume three of the Feynman lectures towards sublating Feynman’s view into an anticipation of an adequate quantum mechanics. By the serious reader I mean someone who has got down to the task the way Lonergan suggests one get down to the task of creatively reading Aquinas.<sup>77</sup>

My reader, at all events, is struggling to understand in a way that would carry him or her beyond Feynman towards what I call *The Standard Model (of 2111)*<sup>78</sup>, quite beyond the present mess.<sup>79</sup> Feynman, battling gallantly forward, is part of that mess of history, so I might help further, encourage patience further, by noting that his twenty chapters with the Epilogue of “A Seminar” is in a way much tougher than the twenty chapters and Epilogue of *Insight*. In a way: for, Lonergan in *Insight* has both shaken off the chains of conceptualism and put on the armour of empiricity in such a manner as to take him out of twentieth century. In a way, then, Feynman is tougher work. Still, I would note that a relative mastery of *Insight* is required to serious follow through on my hints.

Now you may recall that I already faced a parallel task, in the *Cantowers*, with regard to

---

<sup>76</sup>I am quoting Samuel Beckett from memory. No doubt someone will help me out here with a precise reference.

<sup>77</sup>I am referring to the Epilogue reflections in the famous Verbum articles, Lonergan, *Word and Idea in Aquinas*, University of Toronto Press, 1997. A short text from page 223 should jog the memory. “Only by the slow repetitious circular labor of going over and over the data, by catching here a little insight and there another, by continuous adjustments and cumulative changes of one’s initial suppositions and perspectives and concepts can one hope to attain the development of one’s own understanding as to hope to understand what Aquinas understood and meant” and what Feynman understood and meant.

<sup>78</sup>I have appealed regularly in the past decade to a fruitful parallel between Lonergan’s model of global inquiry and the Standard Model that dominated chromodynamics at the end of the twentieth century. See *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry.*, available on the website [www.philipmchane.ca](http://www.philipmchane.ca) from January 2007. Why the date 2111? See note 99 below.

<sup>79</sup>On the mess, see note 105 below.

*Insight*. I am referring in particular to those Cantowers that parallel chapters of *Insight*, like 14-21. What was my “Try Again” there? Consider chapter 17 of *Insight* and its parallel *Cantower 17*. A serious commentary on *Insight 17* would be a very large book, so my effort consisted in commenting on selected bits and pieces. Did the comments help? There was no follow up, so I cannot say. But I did try again and failed better in chapter 9 of *ChrISt in History*.<sup>80</sup> Here, at 75, there is unlikely to be such a follow-up with a better failure.

So I proceed by selecting for comment bits and pieces of four chapters of Feynman. I comment with brutal brevity: **F7, F8, F16, F20**. Indeed, my comment in the text below is really only on a single page of **F8**: the others are merely given pointer-mention in the notes. It is quite clearly a matter of brutal brevity and I frankly enjoy Fermat’s marginal comment, “.... cujus rei demonstrationem mirabilem sane detexi. Hanc marginis exiguitas non caperet,”<sup>81</sup> on regard to not only Feynman but also the larger project of reaching an eschatological contextualization of physics. More prosaically I recall four unwritten Cantowers, which would have lifted a serious reader forward regarding quantum mechanics. Here we have only a piece of one Joisting. “No Matter”.

In the previous Joisting I asked you to struggle with the first three chapters of **Feynman III**, with an eye on the meaning both of probability and energy, and you were uncomfortably thrown back there to my own earlier struggles with both these topics. Might I presume that you carried forward similarly on those two topics through the other 18 chapters of Feynman? Perhaps the **you** that reads this now is a **you** of 2106, A Wiles with ten years work behind him or her, amused at my marginality?

---

<sup>80</sup>The essay (available on the website [www.philipmcs Shane.ca](http://www.philipmcs Shane.ca)) is well worth a visit, even if it seems quite a different context. The aim there was to throw light in the relationship between *The Sketch* of the task of interpretation (*Insight*, 579-81[602-3] and the canons of interpretation. I would note that the task of interpretation comes up first as a topic in chapter 5 of *Insight*(162-4 [186-88])

<sup>81</sup>Pierre Fermat (1601-1665) wrote this (“I have a marvelous solution to this problem, but the margin is too small for it”) on the margin of Diophantus’s *Arithmetica*. Andrew Wiles quotes it at the beginning of his 108-page solution to the problem: “Modular Elliptic Curves and Fermat’s Last Theorem”, *The Annals of Mathematics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ser., Vol.141, 443-551.

Let us then skip to the third section of **F8**. The title question is “What are the base states of the world?” Perhaps the title reminds you a little of Laplace and the possibility of a deductive determinism, and the reminding is useful. But now we are better off than Laplace: we have better mathematics, better physics, better techniques and symbolisms. We have - easily fitting into a margin -  $H_{ij}$ . What might you mean, and what do I mean by  $H_{ij}$ ? Of course, what Feynman means nudges both of us along, and what he means carries us way beyond this struggle to teach a second year university class. Indeed, it may very well have carried you forward to push for a better meaning than Feynman of Dirac’s strange suggestion that leads to associating the task of “getting from” the state at  $x,y,z,t$  to a neighboring future (again, recall Laplace) with an exponential function of  $S$ .<sup>82</sup>

Let us stay with the elementary text. You might simplify - but dangerously - by thinking of just of “getting from”  $t$  to  $t + dt$ . It is handy to have before us here two key paragraphs of Feynman.

“The idea, then, is that to describe the quantum mechanical world we need to pick a set of base states  $I$  and to write the physical laws by giving the matrix of coefficients  $H_{ij}$ . Then we have everything - we can answer any question about what will happen. So we have to learn what the rules are for finding the  $H$ ’s to go with any physical situation - what corresponds to a magnetic field, or an electric field, and so on. And that is the hardest part. For instance, for the new strange particles, we have no idea what  $H_{ij}$ ’s to use. In other words, no one knows the *complete*  $H_{ij}$  for the whole world. (Part of the difficulty is that one can hardly hope to discover the  $H_{ij}$  when no one even knows what the base states are!) We do have excellent approximations for nonrelativistic phenomena and for some special cases. In particular the forms that are needed for the motions of electrons in atoms - to describe chemistry. But we don’t know the full true  $H$  for

---

<sup>82</sup>**Sakurai** introduces this topic on page 118, but you need to venture into Feynman’s book, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*, McGraw-Hill, 1965 (edited by J.A.R.Hibbs) to move towards its meaning and significance. A brief introduction to that meaning is given in Feynman’s very fine lecture on “The Principle of Least Action” (**FI**, chapter 19, page 9). The  $S$  here is not, of course, the  $S$  of an  $S$ -matrix mentioned on page 8 of **F8**, but it would be worthwhile for you to push towards grasping the relationship between them. Follow up note 86 below.

the whole universe.

The coefficients  $H_{ij}$  are called *the Hamiltonian matrix*, or, for short, just *the Hamiltonian*. (How Hamilton, who worked in the 1830's, got his name on a quantum mechanical matrix, is a tale of history.) It would be better called the *energy matrix*, for reasons that will become apparent as we work with it. So the problem is: know your Hamiltonian!"<sup>83</sup>

Those last two sentences of Feynman give us a great lead. Yes, know your Hamiltonian, but now *know* can have, at its best, all the twistedness of that symbol (about)<sup>3</sup> that I introduced in various places.<sup>84</sup> Let us, oh so briefly, push it within the scope of the second definition of generalized empirical method.<sup>85</sup> Then, yes, it is better called the *energy matrix*.<sup>86</sup> In each

---

<sup>83</sup>**F8**, page 10. It would be a large distraction to develop that slogan in relation to the Einstein's or Bell's paradoxes. You need to seriously follow up the pointers given by Feynman in **F18**, pp. 8-9. You have to get to a precise grip on the entire section 3 there, "The Annihilation of the Positron". But the full context requires a sublated version of Feynman's book. E.g. to correct his view that "the principles of quantum mechanics are not only interesting, but so deep that by adding only a few extra hypotheses about the structure of space, we can deduce many properties of physical systems" (**F6**, p. 2). One must push towards precision about spacetime being, not some container, but constituted by the conjugates of things. A helpful key in your reflections is the conclusion of section 4 of **F16**: "If there are two particles in nature which are interacting, there is no way of describing what happens to one of the particles by trying to write down a wave equation for it alone. The famous paradoxes that we considered in earlier chapters - when the measurements made on one particle were claimed to be able to tell what was going to happen to another particle, or were able to destroy an interference - have caused people all sorts of trouble because they have tried to think of the wave functions of one particle alone, rather than the correct wave function in the coordinates of both particles. The complete description can be given correctly only in terms of functions of the coordinates of both particles"(p. 11 of **F16**).

<sup>84</sup>See, for example, the most recent presentation in section 2 - titled "(about)<sup>3</sup> " - of chapter 2 of *ChrISt in History* (available on the website).

<sup>85</sup>This is presented briefly in *Joistings 21*, but it is given in Lonergan in *A Third Collection*, the top lines of page 141. *Joistings 21* pushes its meaning towards the fullness of the third and fourth definitions of generalized empirical method.

<sup>86</sup>The connection with the "usual" S-matrix is developed on pages 8-9 of F8: the limiting case of the "change of state operator,  $U(t_2, t_1)$  as the two  $t$ s are taken infinitely back and forward (page 8.4: you are to think here of a scattering problem: the out-of-range-at the two ends states). Then (page 9.6) identifies  $H$ : "the terms of  $H_{ij}$  are just the derivatives with respect to  $t_2$  of the coefficients  $U_{ij}(t_2, t_1)$  evaluated at  $t_2 = t_1 = t$ ". Following that up in the Feynman book mentioned

hamiltonian case it is a matrix, and I must presume that you have somehow these cases “in your paws”<sup>87</sup> from repeatedly struggling with the whole 21 chapters of **Feynman III**. That pawhold, with the other paw of self-attention, lifts you towards the reading that “I have in mind” of the first Feynman paragraph I quoted. Does the hamiltonian give “the physical laws”? Get back to our lead into the Feynman quotation: the matter of getting from  $t$  to  $t + dt$ . Now I would have you brood sufficiently over the matrix to get you away from standard perspectives like “transition probabilities” to a perspective that would grasp the hamiltonian as relating  $t$  to  $t + dt$  in a fresh way. You may think of the relating as a type of rotation, but it is a peculiar rotation in a peculiar symbolic space.<sup>88</sup> The important twist is the rotation, the twist, the self-rotation, towards the meaning of each element of the hamiltonian, each matrix element. A matrix is an originating pattern, and here the origination is an asymmetric<sup>89</sup> pattern that correlates sequential patterns -

---

in note 82 is a larger challenge!

<sup>87</sup>I am connecting in here Lonergan’s comment on control of meaning in *Phenomenology and Logic*, page 357, where the topic is Euclidean geometry. A text of broader significance in the matter of control is *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 151, which I have quoted regularly these past decades. It is part of the metagram W3, where the reference is to the Latin text, *De Constitutione Christi*, at page 80.

<sup>88</sup>**Sakurai** is good, working with the “Analogy with Polarized Light” (6-10) in getting the beginner towards “the main goal of this section: to introduce the idea that quantum-mechanical states are to be represented by vectors in an abstract complex of vector space” (10), but a verified real geometry demands a great deal more, a pointing that emerges in our final notes here. Feynman’s reflections on the complexity of a classroom’s radiation helps here ( See Volume II, chapter 18, pages 8-9) and you might pause over the fact that the twinkle in your eye last week is a light week on the road to distant stars.

<sup>89</sup>I am pointing here the discomfoting topic of entropy, introduced by Feynman on the first page of **F7**: “.... Why does the atom radiate light? The answer has to do with entropy. When the energy is in the electromagnetic field, there are so many different ways it can be - so many different places it can wander - that if we look for the equilibrium condition, we find that in the most probable situation ....” Feynman pauses over the problem of entropy earlier in these volumes are worth brooding over. See, Volume 1, chapter 44, section 6 “Entropy” and chapter 46, section 5, “Order and Entropy”. In Volume 2 there is the magnificent pedagogical effort in chapter 19 on “The Principle of Least Action”, climbing to his final note regarding a minimum for energy generation and of entropy generation. “....does the same principle of minimum entropy generation also hold when the situation is described quantum-mechanically? I haven’t found out

massively interlocked with other patterns - of energy formation.

Here I find brevity the only way to go, for the moment. It is either brevity or a book: do I again bring to mind the Fermat problem of giving a marginal note?! In energy, “in potency there are at least two aspects of its proper contribution to the constitution of proportionate being, and, on the other hand, its relation to the other contributions of form and act.”<sup>90</sup> So here there is a

---

yet.” Add the context, mentioned in at the end of the previous *Joistings*, of Sir Arthur Eddington’s remark (*Space, Time and Gravitation*, Harper and Row pb, 1959, 178):”We combine probabilities by multiplying; but we combine the actions in two regions by adding; hence the logarithm of a probability is indicated. Further, since the logarithm of a probability is necessarily negative, we may identify action provisionally with minus the logarithm of the statistical probability of the state of the world which exists.” We are back at the complex context that I mentioned in note 32 of *Joistings* 24. Another context that I would add here, though it is not available to me, is that of Feynman’s Ph.D. thesis of 1942 in Princeton: *The Principle of Least Action in Quantum Mechanics*.

<sup>90</sup>*Insight*, 450[476]. Here again I would suggest that you add in the topic of entropy, and indeed the topic of negentropy (I am thinking here of Schrödinger’s popular lectures given in Trinity College Dublin, titled *What is Life?*). It would have been a topic in the *Cantowers* that followed the four (42-45) on Quantum Mechanics: *Cantower 46*, “Energy and Entropy” and *Cantower 47*, “Heuristic Thermodynamics”. This is a zone that was not developed by Lonergan and I suspect that he did not have the time and ‘energy’ to intussuscept and sublimate the relevant sections of Lindsay and Margenau, *Foundations of Physics*. One would best, now, add an up-to-date context such as that pointed to by Ian Lawrie, *A Unified Grand Tour of Theoretical Physics*, ICP publishing, 1998 pb, chapter 10.

relating of two proximate spacetime sets of actual-possibilities<sup>91</sup> of potency, of energy.<sup>92</sup> This, I hope, brings you back to thinking about the suggestion of the previous *Joistings*, the apparently simple suggestion of replacing the word *amplitude* with *aptitude*.<sup>93</sup> But now perhaps you are in a

---

<sup>91</sup>We come here to the heart of the problem. Instead of a Fermat type note, what I add are notes that point to tasks that are to lead the global community cyclically through and beyond *Insight*. I use above the odd expression *actual-possibilities*. It is as odd and as suggestive as Lonergan's use of the expression *capacity-for-performance* in chapter 15 of *Insight*. We are in the presence - luminous perhaps to the initiated - of the absence of the developed metaphysics that is to emerge eventually from that cyclic development of the hints of chapters 15 and 16 of *Insight*. Have a personal shot, for instance, at sublating Margenau's view, mentioned in note 96 below, of 'latent' quantities in terms of the distinction between primary and secondary determinations mentioned, without development, in *Insight* chapter 16. Throw in Feynman's Path Integral approach to bring you - and perhaps the community if it listens to you - closer to form's actual dispersedness in an elusive geometry. The full heuristic of that geometry should include a grip on the character of "diverging conditions" (see *Insight + Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*) and the ground of entropy in the dynamics of the cosmos. We are back in the context pointed to in note 89.

<sup>92</sup>There are broad problems here, but it is best to keep the focus "small" as Feynman does. Think, then, in terms of the two-state systems that he considers. For example, start with the two equations of chapter 8, labeled (8.43), giving rates of change of two  $dC/dt$  in terms of  $H_{11}$ ,  $H_{12}$ ,  $H_{21}$ ,  $H_{22}$ . (8.52) and (8.53) give you solutions to these that enable you to think more definitely about aptitudes, and about the peculiar "probability suggestions",  $\cos At/h$ ,  $\sin At/h$ , that come out of all this. You can follow up particular versions of the two equations and their solutions in later chapters of Feynman e.g. equations (9.36). You can then ask about the character of the resulting functions in comparison with the usual functions of traditional probability theory: are these functions more **projections** belonging to strange spaces than the usual Gaussian etc functions? So you find yourself back with the questions posed in note 32 of *Joistings 24*.

<sup>93</sup>See *Joistings 24*, in the paragraph leading up to note 32.

position to add and twist forward<sup>94</sup> a larger context: Bell's pointers regarding beables;<sup>95</sup> Redhead's recalling Aristotle writing of *form*;<sup>96</sup> Bub's reach for refinements of Bohme's hidden variable view.<sup>97</sup> The main difficulty is to lift your own thinking, at whatever level it is at, towards the "(about)<sup>3</sup>" that is involved in the "come about."<sup>98</sup> But the full lifting that would solve the

---

<sup>94</sup>Perhaps **you** are, later in this century. In the longer cycle of incline there is the process of page 250 of *Method in Theology*, with its discomfiting twists of such views as are referred to in the following notes, with the twist especially toward a self-attention that asks the historian of physics to be "at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay his cards on the table" (*Method in Theology*, 193), but the non-concealing pain is the grim bone-climb to metaphysical equivalents of, literally, the tracks described and explained in the history of physics and concealed precisely by the biased language of those accountings: we find ourselves in the discomfiting task of note 105 below.

<sup>95</sup>I am thinking here of the title of one of Bell's essays, "The Theory of Local Beables", one of many round the topic in J.S.Bell, *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics: collected papers in quantum mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, 1987. There is a further volume regarding Bell's work that you might find useful as context: John Ellis and Daniele Amati, *Quantum Reflections*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

<sup>96</sup>Chapter 2 of Michael Redhead, *Incompleteness, Nonlocality and Realism. A Prologomenon to the Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics*, Clarendon Paperback, 1992, gives a good account of the various views. I quote a relevant passage here: "The idea of potentiality was central to Aristotelian physics - crudely, that the acorn 'possessed' the potentiality of becoming an oak tree, and that all change consists just of the actualization of potentialities. Heisenberg, in his later writings on the philosophy of QM, was particularly concerned to stress the Aristotelian affinities of this type of interpretation. Another way of expressing this view is the concept of 'latent' quantities due to Margenau, which he contrasted with 'possessed' quantities considered in classical physics. Measurement of an observable not an eigenstate of that observable is supposed to convert latent values into possessed values." (p.48)

<sup>97</sup>Jeffrey Bub, *Interpreting the Quantum World*, Cambridge University Press, pb,1999, is a more complex and detailed discussion of the problem. Chapter 6 begins with a discussion of Bohmian mechanics, and then goes on to treat of "the modal interpretation": "The idea behind a 'modal' interpretation of quantum mechanics is that quantum states, unlike classical states, constrain possibilities rather than actualities"(p.173). The dominant present ethos is, of course, that of the Copenhagen Interpretation: a complex of muddles that I touch on only generically in this short essay.

<sup>98</sup>The (about)<sup>3</sup> refers to the to-be-developed third order consciousness of the Tower community ( see above, note 84). Membership in that community would "cajole, force" (*Insight*, 398[423]) the adult growth towards the "come about". No harm, now in repeating that challenge

problem of history in physics and physics in history, is a task for “a hundred years or so”.<sup>99</sup> The larger lifting and the larger context is the global cyclic division of labour described elsewhere.<sup>100</sup>

Still, I can lift forward this marginal note a little in various ways, indeed in many ways that bubble up and send me off on a silly optimism of possible communication.<sup>101</sup> After a day’s brooding pause, however, I settle for a few twisting footnote comments round the heart of two of Feynman’s chapters: “The Dependence of Amplitude on Time” and “The Dependence of Amplitude on Position.”<sup>102</sup>

The comments require your struggle with the manner in which Feynman, the skilled pedagogue, reduces “the world” conveniently to a focus on little worlds with lesser states, particularly to a focus on two-state systems.<sup>103</sup> But he starts in a manner that is worth following up in the context of the problem of **F7**, with “a system for which only one base state is required

---

here: give you a chance to see how you measure up to its startling unrealism. “So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extension and experiencing duration give place to the subject oriented to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies”(*Insight*, 514[537]). *Cantower 9* could be a help in your first decade of that struggle.

<sup>99</sup>I am recalling here a song-poem of Patrick Kavanagh, which expresses a favorite theme of his: “If ever you go to Dublin Town in a hundred years or so”. I mark the date, from now, as 2111.

<sup>100</sup>The previous notes are obviously a brief recall, but it has been my central topic since I enlarged on its relevance to musicology in 1969 (See chapter 2 of *The Shaping of the Foundations*). Chapter 5 of *Method in Theology* is the obvious place to start, but with a push to taste the eightfold division as an elementary global need. That elementary need is pushed forward pedagogically beginning with chapter one of my recent *Molecules, Minding, Meaning*.

<sup>101</sup>The dynamics and illusions of this optimism are massively complex topics, lifting issues of *haute vulgarization*, popularization and pedagogy into later treatises on organic adult human growth. Those treatises are to include a dialectic analysis of Lonergan’s thus-warped *Opera Omnia*.

<sup>102</sup>Respectively chapter 7 and chapter 16 of **FIII**.

<sup>103</sup>Feynman’s strategy, which runs through the book, is very seriously helpful. You might think of it as somewhat paralleled by the two-body problem (or Fermat’s theorem in relation to the power of 2!). See note 92 above.

for the description; it is an approximation we could make for a hydrogen atom at rest, or something similar.”<sup>104</sup> So I would point you towards puzzling towards asking about the similarity between the hydrogen atom and the universe, the universe of now or the universe of 13.7 billion years ago. My footnote merely adds a few further pointers that nudge you towards seeing the deep flaws in Feynman’s heuristic, common cancers of contemporary physics.<sup>105</sup>

Finally, swing to the conclusion of that quite brilliant chapter 20.<sup>106</sup> Eventually, perhaps,

---

<sup>104</sup>**F8** -10.

<sup>105</sup>What might I write here that would lift you beyond impressionistic hints? Perhaps start by reflection on the flaws lurking in the statement of the first page of **F7**:”An electron alone in empty space can, under certain circumstances, have a definite energy”. Where is Feynman coming from here? Etc, etc. Might we spin that electron like Brian Green spins Newton’s bucket in *The Fabric of the Cosmos: Space, Time and the Texture of Reality*?(Knopf, New York, 2006: see the index there, under bucket: compare this mess with Lonergan’s brief treatment in *Insight*). I could add a solid list of experts from Einstein to Bell and Feynman muddled about spacetime, especially as they talk of those terrible traveling twins. You get a larger perspective on the muddle from the recent Wheeler-memorial volume, *Science and Ultimate Reality. Quantum Theory, Cosmology and Complexity*, edited by John Barrow, Paul Davies and Charles Harper, Cambridge University Press, 2004. Especially check out the utter shambles of Part VI, on Emergence. On emergence and aggreformism see **Cantower 29**, against the background of *Insight* and *Randomness Statistics and Emergence*. I would note that you are up against “the problem of interpretation” as it is first posed, in chapter 5 of *Insight*. But you have the larger challenge of pushing for metaphysical equivalents of Feynman’s statements, or anyone elses. A huge job in the transposition of physics in this century. I would note also that there is the question of a large book supplementing the brief treatment of measurement given in *Insight* chapter 5. Room here, certainly, for a cheeky Fermat-margin comment! But, seriously, I think it should be evident that the thinking about things and their couplings in present physics is dominated by the cloudy business of “bodies”. Is radiation a spread of bodies of little bodies? And so on. See the final footnote of this *Joistings*.

<sup>106</sup>You might begin by noting similarities to standard discussions of the relation of the Hesienberg and the Schrödinger views on quantum mechanics, such as **Sakurai**, 80-89. In my work on **Feynman** and **Sakurai** I found it convenient to do a detailed comparison of the two tables of contents: I would advise you to do the same with **Sakurai** or other texts. A context for your reflection here, and indeed for your entire effort, is provided by John Gribben and Mary Gribben, *Richard Feynman. A Life in Science*, Plume Penguin pb, 1998. “One of the strange features of quantum mechanics is that right from the moment it was invented (or discovered) in the mid-1920s, there were two completely different descriptions of the quantum world. One was Schrödinger’s approach, based on waves; the other was Heisenberg’s approach, based on

you will whisker paw that conclusion within your spontaneous hunting bent of section 6.6.7 of chapter 3 of *Insight: A Principle of Uncertainty*. An axiomatic structure for statistical laws will involve an uncertainty principle.”<sup>107</sup> And so you may come to pause, paws, come about to pause, in a held and holding spacetime that is not anyway out there, over “The Dependence of Amplitude on Position.”<sup>108</sup> You will come, contrastingly, to grip the dependence of space and time - think of their odd relations to Space and Time<sup>109</sup> - on amplitude, aptitude, a grip that is a holding of a concrete and impossibly complex geometry,<sup>110</sup> a geometry that bows to dispersedness as granting

---

particles. Both versions of quantum theory had been shown to be exactly equivalent.... Now Feynman had found a third approach to quantum mechanics, based on action .... But this approach never caught on. In universities around the world, even today, half a century after Feynman’s insight, students are still taught classical mechanics on the old-fashioned way.” (*op. cit.*, 88-89) My suggestion in these two *Joistings* is that a student can profitably supplement the conventional texts with the Feynman approach given elementarily in **FIII**. There is, of course, a fuller challenge, as Carver Mead points out (*Collective Electrodynamics. Quantum Foundations of Electromagnetism*, MIT Press, 2000, xii-xiv). Chapter 21 of **FIII** has the seeds in it of another angle on the whole business, which could be profitably followed up in Mead’s text. See also the final footnote of this *Joistings*.

<sup>107</sup>*Insight*, 99[123]. But one has also to lift that text into the context both of chapter 16 of the book and the fuller concrete view of a meshing of probability theory with the concrete divergent entropic - and negentropic - energy-splicings that pattern fundamental dispersedness. Notes 14 and 15 above already raised this issue.

<sup>108</sup>The title of that of **F16**, but the pointing here, and in these final footnotes, is towards a massive sublation analogous to the sublation offered present economics by Lonergan’s *For A New Political Economy*. Recall the comments earlier on the short quotation in note 105 from **F7**.

<sup>109</sup>The bow, in the later culture of the third stage of meaning, is to be an incarnate and luminous bow to the already-in-here- now of organic neurodynamics as the empirical residence of our organic journey. Place the problem, as far as you can, in the context of *Insight* chapter 19, section 7. But you must struggle towards being self-tastingly up-to-date. A help here are *The Feynman Lectures*, Volume 1, chapter 35, “Colour vision” and chapter 36, “The Mechanics of Seeing”. You might even pick up on *Scientific American*, July 2006: “What Birds See”: ““Colour is not actually a property of light or of objects that reflect light. It is a sensation that arises within the brain” (p.72).

<sup>110</sup>You can get a taste of the move towards and achievement of such a geometry in Lochlainn O’Raifeartaigh, *The Dawning of Gauge Theory*, Princeton, 1997) and *Group Structure of Gauge Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1986). More elementarily there is Ian Lawrie, *A*

to our loneliness a mathematics of qualified continuity<sup>111</sup> and a physics of history that doubts the existence of points and strings.<sup>112</sup>

---

*Unified Grand Tour of Theoretical Physics*, chapter 8, “Forces, Connections and Gauge Fields”. But the personal self-tasting work needs the bracketing of the bracketing footnotes here, notes 109 and 111.

<sup>111</sup>Recall notes 14 and 15 above. I would note the openness implied in my pointings here. After Aquinas there seems to have been little regard for the mediation by theory of metaphysics. So, for example, present scholasticism, and I include the scholasticism of Lonergan, would not connect the struggle with the meaning of **aether** in the two volumes of Sir Edmund Whittaker, *History of Theories of Aether and Electricity*, (Harper, New York, pb,1960) with a push towards a richer grasp of the empirical residue, our empirical residence.

<sup>112</sup>*Cantowers 42-81* (September 2005 - December 2008) were to have been an initial stab at this full cultural shift. Central to the above topic is Cantower 62: “Quantumchromodynamic Bags: No Strings Attached”, but the fuller cultural shift would have been tackled in Cantower 53: “The International Search for Enlightenment”. More on **this** issue in the following *Joistings*. But on the present issue there shall be no more from me. Circumstances and foundational orientation point me elsewhere. So, to previous notes that end with “and so on”(note 105) or “follow up” (note 107) I would add this final appeal to follow up and on.. What I have written here is very compact, nor have I ventured much out into the literature. So, for example, there is the question of non-point, non-line physics: strange mathematical and real topologies probably quite beyond the reachings of Whitehead and Grzegorzczuk (see Loredana Biacino and Giangiacomo Gerla, “Connection Structures: Grzegorzczuk’s and Whitehead’s Definitions of Point,” *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 37 (1993), 431-39). Again, there are the issues I raised regarding complexity, probability, entropy, measurement, and a growing literature on problems of layered randomnesses. It seems good to end here on an open note of “follow up” “and so on”, where such following-up needs the slowly emergent context of *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*. I end by referring to a worthwhile context of nudges, *Studies in the Sciences of Complexity*. Volume VIII, edited by W.H.Zurek, Addison-Wesley, 1990, contains various good articles but I limit myself here to a single page (385) of an article on zero-point energy (E.T.Jaynes, “Probability in Quantum Mechanics”, 381-403) which brings us right back to the key problem from which we began. Jaynes writes of “the supreme self-confidence of the Copenhagen interpreters”, of “Richard Feynman’s honesty to admit , ‘Nobody knows how it can be that way’”, and of “the failure of quantum theorists to distinguish quite different meanings of ‘probability’. And so, On. If I were to select one other nudging page in that volume it would be 433, which gives “Figure 2. A schematic structure of the space of sets of possible histories for the universe”. The page is from the article by Murray Gell-Mann and James B.Hartle, “Quantum Mechanics in the Light of Quantum Cosmology” (415-457). Try lifting that muddle into the context of a schematic of emergent probability. And so, On. Sow on.

## 5. Recycling Effectively Viewpoints

“Dublin Town.

Where there was not much going down”<sup>113</sup>

I might well have plunged you here into my reflections on Dublin Town in 2004, with a recall of the parallel reflections on Manhattan that are to be found in *Cantower XIV*.<sup>114</sup> The number 14 should or might bring to mind the Lonergan roots of these reflections in the two chapters 14 of *Insight* and *Method in Theology*. *Insight*'s chapter fails and has failed: a cosmopolis was as yet to be identified that would lift the possibility of urban transformation from a matter of major and minor premises to the invasion of the premises of pub and politics and puberty by heuristic characters of Standard Model meaning. That final chapter of *Method in Theology* has its rich moments, but it need the complexity of city and street to give the sense of the enormous task of transforming a world “where there is not much going down” expect “the usual”<sup>115</sup> where the usual can include the subtle taming of the shift to self-discovery to which Socrates and Aquinas and Lonergan nudged us. How do we effectively recycle these nudges globally? The answer has been named and described, but walking the ways of a town and its gown can lift one down to a sense of hopelessness that brightens the solitary hope of that final place, the 31<sup>st</sup> place, with its “heightening of the tension”<sup>116</sup> between now and THEN<sup>117</sup> of the actual advance of antecedent willingness within decent scheme-probabilities. So we might come to read freshly of the specialized auxiliary that was named and described. Might the simple final reach of *Insight*'s chapter 20 read freshly even now, context-nudged? “The antecedent willingness of hope

---

<sup>113</sup>From the fifth song of Sinead O'Connor's *Faith and Courage* CD.

<sup>114</sup>See the third section, “Founders of Manhattan” of that *Cantower*.

<sup>115</sup>See the paragraph before note 99 in chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

<sup>116</sup>*Insight*, 726[747].

<sup>117</sup>The title of *Cantower V* is “Metaphysics THEN”

has to advance from a generic reinforcement of the pure desire to an adapted and specialized auxiliary ever ready to offset every interference with intellect's unrestricted finality."<sup>118</sup>

The issue is the auxiliary that would help us to absorb and carry forward what is going down or up or on in the sapling of history. The auxiliary has been my preoccupation since 1966 and I have covered abundant pages with my reachings about it. What to add here? A simple pointing, from the end of my Cantower 18, towards the discomforting fact that the auxiliary is a new ethical imperative, a serious possibility of an effective academic ethics.

### ***Cantower 18: The Possibility of a Cultural Ethics***

#### **Section 3**

#### **18.3 The Problem of Liberation**

There are, of course, a variety of existential and global contexts of liberation, problems that have emerged in the fifty years since the eighteenth chapter of *Insight* was written. The only one that concerns me here is the ongoing fragmentation of academic and cultural responses to such problems: on the academic side one may think of liberation and feminist theologies; on the cultural side one may think of shifts in movements, be they dance movements or the various NGO efforts. In so far as you are familiar with, embroiled in, any such movement, well and good. But that *good* is now placed, at least tentatively, descriptively, in the new context of section 1: how does it fit in effectively with will-to the ongoing genesis of human meaning? Further, the issue is more existential in that it is a question of How do I and it fit in? Section 2 gives you a glimpse of the possibility of luminous deliberation in that context.

The present difficulty is to come to grips with the faintness of that glimpse, the feebleness of the description. The difficulty is an echo of the same faintness with respect to the final section 8 of chapter 7 of *Insight*. How is that difficulty to be faced by you, by the human group?

That is the problem of deliberation that emerges in this final section. I have, of course, my suggested answer: it is the reason for these 117 *Cantowers*. And the answer, too, can be faintly

---

<sup>118</sup>*Insight*, 726[747].

and feebly glimpsed, described. The answer, within theology, was thus feebly and ineffectually described by Lonergan in the 1960s.<sup>119</sup> I described it for the broader culture, perhaps just as ineffectually, last year.<sup>120</sup> Last year, too, I added<sup>121</sup> the context of “Satire and Humour”, a context which sits in the middle of the five sub-sections of the third section of chapter 18 of *Insight*. And now I add this further short expression of a context that weaves together the other four sub-sections of the corresponding section 3. The issue is impotence, ineffective striving, self-imposed and group-imposed conditions of “effete”<sup>122</sup> reflection that show no support for Warsaw ghettos in a world at war.

Lonergan writes that “the elements in the problem are basically simple”<sup>123</sup>: indeed yes, they are, as simple as missing the beam in one’s own eye: if there are “illusory causes to fascinate unwary wills”<sup>124</sup>, my cause is not one of them. I, alone or with my group, am bent on the evident good of feeding the poor or founding a theatre, on promoting this poetry or that painting, on teaching these classes or evangelizing those natives.

Now I have nothing against feeding the poor or teaching chemistry. But if you are reading this then you have some interest in the culture of your bent, and it is the culture of any bent that is the core issue. Your bent may even be considered by you as a core bent, a central theological advance, a global economic reform: and still, the culture of that bent is the present issue. The corresponding section 18.3 in *Insight* begins with the sentence, “The difference between essential and effective freedom is the difference between a dynamic structure and its operational range”. I

---

<sup>119</sup>Published in *Gregorianum* 50 (1969), 485-505, which became chapter 5 of *Method in Theology*.

<sup>120</sup>I am thinking particularly of the third chapter of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism*.

<sup>121</sup>In *Cantower XI*.

<sup>122</sup>The context is *Method in Theology*, 99. There is the larger pointing of the first four chapters of *Topics in Education* that needs sublation into the richer context of the Latin works.

<sup>123</sup>*Insight*, 630[653].

<sup>124</sup>*Ibid.*

wish to change the meaning of that sentence and so colour your reading of the entire section.

My contention is that a dynamic structure has emerged in slight idea, but that its eventual operational range is the totality of cultures, however slimly reflective. You may well say that this is nothing new, that this has been the contention since *Cantower I*. But what is different and discomfiting here is the “Practical Reflection” to which you are invited. In section 5 of *Cantower IX* I pin-pointed the key moment, “the scientific moment”, in dialectic, indeed in the entire hodic enterprise. Here I wish to bring you towards your own version of that moment.<sup>125</sup> From my point of view I wish to persuade you, “cajole”<sup>126</sup> you “to genuineness and openness”<sup>127</sup>; I wish to bring you towards **getting with it** on the analogy of Meyer or Mendeleev persuading the community of chemistry to settle into the hodic table as the way of chemistry. By the mid-1870s only freaks and strange amateurs were outside the new culture of chemistry, odd enough not to be embarrassed. What I am talking about now is, not a culture of chemistry, but a culture of cultures. The parallel “operational range” in hodic culture is to be a molecular presence, a neurodynamic twist to the estimative sense.

When I write thus of “is to be” I am evidently not writing of these next decades: I am writing of the sloping and the cycling that will so slowly raise consciousness to this “still higher integration of human living”.<sup>128</sup>

Here a digression is doubly necessary. The drive of chapter 18 of *Insight* is towards the thesis of the need for a higher integration of human living. That drive looks back to the need, reached in the conclusion of chapter seven, the need for a cosmopolis, and looks forward to the meeting of that need by a “higher integration”. The key transition paragraph, in chapter 20, is worth quoting fully.

“It was to this point that we were brought by our study of common sense and by its revelation of the scotosis of the dramatic subject and of the threefold bias of the practical subject.

---

<sup>125</sup>*Cantower XXV* will offer a fuller context for that reaching.

<sup>126</sup>*Insight*, 398[423].

<sup>127</sup>*Insight*, 624[647].

<sup>128</sup>*Insight*, 632[655].

Then we appealed to a higher viewpoint, to an X named cosmopolis; and we indicated some of its features. But if the need of some cosmopolis makes manifest the inadequacy of common sense to deal with the issue, on a deeper level it makes manifest the inadequacy of man. For the possibility of a cosmopolis is conditioned by the possibility of a critical human science, and a critical human science is conditioned by the possibility of a correct and accepted philosophy."<sup>129</sup>

My digression is doubly necessary. I am going here in a direction that seems to differ from Lonergan's. That direction has a first, relatively superficial, benefit, of getting us away from debates about the drive of *Insight*, debates that erupted at its first appearance and that carried forward through the Florida conference of 1970: Lonergan is hustling us towards theism, even towards Roman theism. Here I am nudging you - hustling you if you like - towards a quite secular solution to the problem of the non-existence of a critical human science. The deeper, second, benefit, of my direction is reached by pausing over the character, characters, of the hustle. It is not my hustle, but history's.

I would note four aspects of history's hustle.

First, it is not terribly important to track back to the beginnings of that hustle: so, one could put a lot of energy and disagreement into a question like, When did "the longer cycle of decline"<sup>130</sup> start? Conveniently, one may think of the hustle as associated with the fragmentations of the last millennium, whether they be separations within scholarship or states or religions. There is the hustle, too, of convergences, a global networking altogether more subtle than the internet. Etc etc. One can push for a larger perspective, as I have done - a necessity of staying sane in a wretched century - so reaching a perspective on axiality and on a pre-adolescence of humanity that grounds long-term optimism. At all events, I do not wish to attempt some summary of something I have written about for over thirty years. The dynamics of human questing has forced on us a eightfold fragmentation of cultural reflection, and the fragments hustle us towards their own ordering.

In the second place, that ordering shares the first six properties that Lonergan identifies

---

<sup>129</sup>*Insight*, 690[712].

<sup>130</sup>See *Insight* 7.8.

with the heuristic structure of the solution to the problem of evil.

“First, then, the solution is one. For there is one God, one world order, and one problem that is both individual and social”. Such is Lonergan’s first property. Here, I slide God out of the picture: there is one world in a cultural disorder that eats up the heart of the individual and the soul of society. There is one uniquely-plausible solution of global reach.

That solution has the second property of being universally accessible and permanent. Hodic collaboration may well generate subdivisions, but it is here to stay, reaching beyond particular classes and particular times.

It is in harmonious continuity with the world order, a ferment of emergent probability which is not a divine afterthought but a fact about the form of history.

It has, as a fourth property, the character of being quite human: not an addition of some mythology of change of genus, but the addition of a mess made by the genus that invites the genus to a change of art and heart.

That change, fifthly, requires new conjugate forms of intellect, will, and sensitivity. Those new forms have been our topic now for eighteen *Cantowers*, perhaps best imagined and thought of as the fresh molecular structuring spoken of in *Cantower IV*, or as the less oddball “Fresh Pragmatism” of the third chapter of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics*.

Finally, the sixth property: the change involves the introduction of those forms that are to be “habits that are operative throughout living”,<sup>131</sup> a collaborative bent from before kindergarten to beyond coffin. The character, characters, of that introduction, that implementation, that global unity and beauty of the human group, is the home-going home-growing of history’s hustling “passionateness of being”.<sup>132</sup>

So, I am led to my third aspect of history’s hustle. Lonergan carries on in that section of chapter 20 of *Insight* from a seventh to a thirty first property of his envisaged solution: properties that are identified as supernatural. That further list does not belong here. But it is not a matter of denying its value: it is a matter of going another way. Nor am I saying that this other way is the

---

<sup>131</sup>*Insight*, 697[719].

<sup>132</sup>B. Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit”, *A Third Collection*, 29.

way Lonergan would have gone had he identified functional specialization in the 1940s instead of in the 1960s. The issue is far too complex for the corner of an essay. A few points may help.

Evidently, I do not have the same interest in an apologetic twist that Lonergan had fifty years ago. I am interested in the properties and the potential and the promotion of a very practical solution to the global mess of stupidity and malice. That practical solution has emerged in history. What of the solution about which Lonergan writes? That solution also emerged - I use the past tense - in history: and again, as I mentioned above, let's not fuss too much in the present context about tracking back to beginnings.<sup>133</sup> The solution to the problem of humanity's inadequacy has been with us, operative in us, through a portion, if not all, of human history. Within that history there has emerged the self- appropriation that I have named hodic. Whether one wishes to call it a development of Christian philosophy is another matter, and indeed a matter of fact, that can be viewed as of importance to its emergence and implementation.

*De facto*, the precise meaning of *is* and the idea of hodic collaboration both emerged out of the Hebrew-Christian tradition. But it seems more important culturally and psychologically to acknowledge that there are two times of the humanity's quest, two times separated by an axial period in which we live.<sup>134</sup> A central importance of this perspective is that it gives secular grounds for hope, grounds that twine round facts of revelation. So, here, it can be envisaged as swinging round the twenty five characteristics of Lonergan's heuristic to merge with the 31<sup>st</sup>-placed property: "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".<sup>135</sup>

I will only refer here, once again, to the sweep of Lonergan's identification of that

---

<sup>133</sup>Tracking back and forward to the "two ends" of creation in Trinitarian fashion is a goal of the total enterprise, though of course the core of the enterprise is delineating the vortex process of the communal tracking. Here our concern is with the general ethics of that vortex tracking.

<sup>134</sup>Lonergan, *De Deo Trino, Pars Systematica*, Gregorian Press, 1964, 199.

<sup>135</sup>*Insight*, 726[747]. One need to add here reflections on the significance of leisure and of the centrality of the **Tomega** principle introduced in *Cantower IV*.

interference.<sup>136</sup> It suits my purpose rather to fix your eyes and awes on its neighbourly pettinesses, nicely disguised faces of general bias and commonsense eclecticism, mixtures of cleverness and wickedness or of goodness and stupidity.<sup>137</sup>

“Is my proposal utopian? It asks merely for an interdisciplinary theory that at first will be denounced as absurd, then will be admired to be true but obvious and insignificant, and perhaps finally be regarded as so important that its adversaries will claim that they themselves discovered it”.<sup>138</sup> But the opposition I am thinking of now is not the sweeping opposition of thinkers of various camps but the opposition - perhaps even an admiring opposition, as surely Lonergan followers are - that takes a writing or a research or a classroom stand against history’s hustle. To this I shall return after the next paragraph.

The fourth and final aspect of history’s hustle can be quite briefly described as history’s anti-foundationalism. History takes a stand, or lays in wait, against Aristotle and Aquinas, Descartes and Husserl: there are no secure axioms. History invites a humble humdrum re-cycling of the confusion of our efforts, identified as best or worst or mediocre as we muddle along. In the file that contains Lonergan’s identification, in February 1965, of the cycling process there are notes from the beginning of Aquinas’ *Summa Theologica*.<sup>139</sup> I like to think, though it can be written off without bother as a flight of fancy, that Lonergan, startled by some version of my claim, went back to Aquinas to ponder that genius’ view of foundations. And I like to think that from that vortex view there blossomed his opposition of a simple and a complex manner of conceiving foundations.

“The simple manner is to conceive foundations as a set of premises, of logically first

---

<sup>136</sup>See note 122 above.

<sup>137</sup>I am recalling Lonergan’s reflections on the views of Russell and Popper in his essay, “Healing and Creating in History”, *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, edited by F.Lawrence, P.Byrne, C.Hefling Jr., University of Toronto Press, 1999, 97-98.

<sup>138</sup>*Ibid*, 106.

<sup>139</sup>Available in Darlene O’Leary, *Lonergan’s Practical View of History*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2002, chapter two.

propositions”.<sup>140</sup> The complex manner settles for “an ongoing developing process .... which aims at decreasing the darkness and increasing the light and keeps adding discovery to discovery. Then, what is paramount is control of the process”<sup>141</sup>, a control towards which history hustles. “This control of the emergent probability of the future can be exercised not only by the individual in choosing his career and in forming his character, not only by adults in educating the younger generation, but also by mankind in its consciousness of its responsibility to the future of mankind”.<sup>142</sup>

And that curious “not only... but also” leads me back to the previous topic, the possibility of pettiness in the individual’s choice, character, and choice of character. Notice the twist here, related to the odd twist in the quotation from Lonergan. We are both, I presume, interested in humanity’s grip on humanity’s responsibility and education. What is the character, what is our character, of that interest? One can read chapter 18 *with interest*, or the whole book: but is that a reading with the will to progress? What, really, is the existential meaning of the strange challenge of Lonergan, “one has not only to read *Insight* but also to discover oneself in oneself”? Is it not a matter of reaching for a sufficiently cultured self, tuned in spirited appetite to the driving rhythms of an unfinished symphony?

So, you and I may turn now in our own ways to discern pettinesses, disguised pettinesses, that block that tuning. I use the word “discern” to bring to mind the sublation of Ignatius of Loyola’s reflections on discernment. That sublation was first introduced by me in the essay “The Value of Lonergan’s Economics for Lonergan Students”, where I wrote of the discernments of discernments,<sup>143</sup> a triplicity which was given some sense in the first section of the previous *Cantower*. Here my focus is on an elementary existential meaning<sup>144</sup> best conveyed by

---

<sup>140</sup>*Method in Theology*, 269.

<sup>141</sup>*Ibid.*, 270.

<sup>142</sup>*Insight*, 227[252-3].

<sup>143</sup>Chapter one of *The Redress of Poise*, conclusion. Available on the Website.

<sup>144</sup>The mention of **existential** - brings in the context of the existential reflections in *Phenomenology and Logic* : see the index there under *Existential Gap, Anxiety, Dread*.

recalling what was for me a very impressive distraction in one of Lonergan's lectures on economics in the spring of 1978, when he spoke of the search for perfection: you reach for perfection by struggling to remove the largest obstacle to it in your life.<sup>145</sup> I am thinking here, you must know, of your life as cultural: but if your life is integral, Dogenesque, then that is not some separate life, and if it is separate and can be discerned as such then you may already be on the way to pinning down your obstacle.

So, there is the existential context with its existential gaps: "Insofar as you are beyond your own horizon, your own reality is hidden from you, and if it is hidden from you, that is not entirely without any fault on your part".<sup>146</sup> There are then the broader contexts that you have read about, but perhaps not read yourself into. There is a positive context of discernment in whatever glimpse you have of the strange project of these *Cantowers*, the reach for the Tower<sup>147</sup> or the Bower<sup>148</sup>, for Poise or Protopossession,<sup>149</sup> for a home in hodic method.<sup>150</sup> There is a negative context read about and round about: the general bias that eats your soul in a commonsense eclecticism of research, teaching, writing.<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup>The strategy parallels that of cleansing one's belief-structures which Lonergan describes in chapter 20 of *Insight*.

<sup>146</sup>*Phenomenology and Logic*, 283.

<sup>147</sup>In the final section of *Cantower IV*.

<sup>148</sup>The drive of *Cantower V*.

<sup>149</sup>The topic of *Cantower IX*.

<sup>150</sup>*Method in Theology*, 14, 350.

<sup>151</sup>Need I add that this context needs discomfoting, perhaps dreadfilled, ingestion. (See *Phenomenology and Logic* on dread, 284-8. +++). I am not thinking here of the flirtation or marriage with cunning that regularly goes with thesis writing. I am thinking more of the 'settling **down**' that can occur in one's cultural living "by taking care not to lose the common touch, by maintaining one's sense of reality" (*Insight*, 417[442]). One now has the chair of Moses, teaching say, introductory philosophy or business ethics or Christology. Are you teaching self-appropriation without exercises, dodging generalized empirical method? Are you settled in the vague descriptive context of *Method in Theology*? Are you following the line of least resistance by surveying opinions with the odd silly comparative connection to Lonergan? Lonergan, of

There is, finally, that fullest context, a *Shobogenzo* sought or found but still a seed. It is the theist context that will occupy us in the next *Cantower* on Ultimates, a context which perhaps is already yours but trapped in a prior culture. It is, for the Christian, the context of a boggling intimacy - the topic of *Cantower XX* - that calls global culture to a *theoria* which is identically a person. Christianity itself, in its cultivation of directions of morality and mysticism, has prejudiced us against that identification, an identification that calls us to reach for an inner word of the Word's company.<sup>152</sup> "History, heredity, personal experience, all combine to rivet my prejudice upon me. Under their influence, I gradually outdistance the disturbing echo of His words, spoken without reservation to me as to everyone else who should believe in Him, until at last I hear it no more".<sup>153</sup>

## 6. Modernity

"If you've never seen a good time  
How would you recognize one?"<sup>154</sup>

So we reach a little further towards recognizing the third stage of meaning. Reaching for the imagination of that good time is a massive decade-long undertaking to be increasingly bolstered by neuromolecular self-analyses that would lift gown and town into new streets, new

---

course, is not relevant: what is relevant is the mutual self-mediation of students and teacher that would remove both from the schizothymia of present culture and lift them into history's hustle.

<sup>152</sup>The topic is the high and difficult theology of a ground reason for the incarnation of Word: that we might move to an intelligible emanation in us by which we speak our word of the Divine Word, thus wafting forward luminously to the "annotaste of throat" that I wrote of in *Cantower II*. See Lonergan, *De Deo Trino. Pars Systematica*, Gregorian University Press, 1964, 256, and the questions leading up to that point.

<sup>153</sup>R.H.J. Stuart, *The Inward Vision*, London, 1929, 113. I pick up this quotation from a previous context, relevant here: the conclusion of chapter 2, "Ultimate Concern", P. McShane, *Music That Is Soundless. A Fine Way for the Lonely Bud A*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2002.

<sup>154</sup>From the sixth song of Sinéad O'Connor's *Faith and Courage* CD.

noisings abroad of human meaning.

I go back to my own initial discovering of the character of our time more than twenty years ago, which I wrote of in the quaintly-titled first chapter of *Searching for Cultural Foundations: “Middle Kingdom: Middle Man (T’ien-hsia: I jen<sup>155</sup>)”*. The Preface to that book written by me as editor has a similar odd title which perhaps is worth putting in here as a further nudge: “Distant Probabilities of Persons Presently<sup>156</sup> Going Home Together in Transcendental Process.” The Preface took me an entire free sabbatical year, in the early 1980s, to think out and write, and its pointings are even now bursting out into the startlingly fresh meanings of that Going Home that are so briefly touched on in the final section 14.13 here. But I will say no more here: let you focus on the early reachings. So, we plunge into the ninth page of the essay in this next paragraph.

Jaspers, in his *The Origins and Goals of History*, places a basic axis of history in the period between 800 and 200 B.C. when humanity reached significant differentiation in Greece, Persia, Israel, India and China.<sup>157</sup> In the context of a later discussion of contemporary culture, he raises the question of a second Axial Period.<sup>158</sup> Toynbee took issue with Jaspers in his last work, *Mankind and Mother Earth*: “It would be misleading to set a chronological limit to the Axis Age that excluded those two mighty epigoni (i.e. Jesus and Muhammad) or Zarathustra and ‘Deutero-Isaiah’. Thus the Axis Age expands from a period of about 120 years to one of about seventeen centuries running from c. 1060 B.C., down to A.D. 632, which is the date of the Prophet Muhammad’s death.”<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup>“Above the *min* and the *jen* there rises the King, distinguished as the *I jen*, the One Man .... the King ruled over all ‘below Heaven’, *tien-hsia*.” (Eric Voegelin, *The Ecumenic Age*, Louisiana State University Press, 1974, 289.) I was originally led to the topic by an invitation to speak at the Boston Conference of 1982, under the general title, “Mind and the Mystery of Christ”.

<sup>156</sup>The intent of the Preface is to give an intimation of the future communal academic heuristics towards which the spiraling of foundations through eight specialties turns subjects.

<sup>157</sup>K.Jaspers, *The Original and Goal of History*, London, 1953, chapter 1.

<sup>158</sup>*Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>159</sup>Arnold Toynbee, *Mankind and Mother Earth*, Oxford University Press, 1976, 178.

In the fourth volume of his projected six-volume work, *Order and History*, entitled *The Ecumenic Age*, Eric Voegelin moves to a fuller view of the historical process which broadly resembles the one presently proposed. A central feature of Voegelin's view is his emphasis on the 'In-betweenness' of human existence, to which he gives a Platonic name, the *Metaxy*. The emergence into consciousness of that tension of 'In-betweenness' he associates primarily with the noetic differentiation of consciousness in the Greek tradition and the pneumatic differentiation of consciousness in the Hebrew tradition. For reasons that will appear shortly, I am led to rename this 'In-betweenness' of historical reality, constitutive of the mysteriousness,<sup>160</sup> the *Vertical Metaxy*.

Clearly, Voegelin would consider this emergence into consciousness as in some sense axial, but it seems to me that the key to the resolution of the debate regarding axiality lies in his recurring question of the meaning of modernity. So, in noting the parallel falsifications of history in the Sumerian King List and Hegel's *Philosophy of History*, Voegelin is led to the 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?"<sup>161</sup> In a later context he remarks: "A 'modern age' in which 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 mankind with its humility."<sup>162</sup>

I might bring his remark nearer our academic hope by noting Leo Strauss' related view of contemporary academics as liontamers.<sup>163</sup> The liontamers and imperial entrepreneurs cannot

---

<sup>160</sup>There is a lengthy note in the original which I omit here. You might add instead the context of the final chapter of *The Redress of Poise*, "Grace: The Final Frontier" The book is available on the website [www.philipmcsane.ca](http://www.philipmcsane.ca).

<sup>161</sup>E. Voegelin, *The Ecumenic Age*, 68; see also 7, 27-28, 173.

<sup>162</sup>*Ibid.*, 192.

<sup>163</sup>Leo Strauss, *Liberalism: Ancient and Modern*, Basic Books, New York, 3.

indefinitely dodge the convulsions of adequate differentiation of consciousness.

To give sufficient meaning to the word *modernity* I would recall the meaning of the classical Latin word *modo*: ‘merely’, ‘just’, ‘directly’, and the derived medieval word *modernitas*, ‘present-dayness’.

I would recall, indeed, the extreme presentmindedness quipped at by Joyce in *Ulysses*: “sufficient for the day is the newspaper thereof.”<sup>164</sup> What is going forward, I suspect, in a period of fragmented consciousness that would call *modern*, is a transition between what Lonergan calls the two times of the temporal subject: a prior time dominated by a spontaneity found best in compact consciousness, a later time with at least a dominant authority of the mediation of generalized empirical method.<sup>165</sup> The prior time, too, can be associated with Lonergan’s first stage of meaning; the later time with the third stage of meaning. Then one may expect the transition period to be one of fragmentation and specialization of consciousness in opaque forays into the second stage of meaning, with concomitant unenlightened displacements of the control of meaning out of historical compactness. Within such forays and displacements is the problematic that invites a mediating integration of hard-won genuineness in the noosphere.<sup>166</sup>

This middle kingdom of historical reality needs to be mediated to academic subjectivity by something resembling what Jaspers would speak of as *Existenz* in communication with *Existenz*.<sup>167</sup> It leads to a psychological presence in what I would name the *Horizontal Metaxy*. Psychological presence in the Vertical and Horizontal Metaxies would be the modern counterpart of the reaching of Classic experience of reason, as described by Voegelin, towards humanity as

---

<sup>164</sup>James Joyce, *Ulysses*, 129.

<sup>165</sup>The original gave the second definition of generalized empirical method given above at note 58.

<sup>166</sup>On the types of genuineness cf. *Insight*, 475[499]. The view there is ontogenetic; the present effort is towards some phylogenetic indications. Chardin’s noosphere is now related to a post-modern third stage of meaning.

<sup>167</sup>See Jaspers’ “Reply” in A.Schilpp (ed), *The Philosophy of Karl Jaspers*, Library of Living Philosophers, New York.

self-appreciatively social and historical wonderment.<sup>168</sup>

[This essay continues for another 32 pages, but I have put here sufficient of it to give a beginning nudge towards this fuller glimpse of history's sapling state in our time. So, I jump now, as a conclusion to this section, to the end of the Preface to *Searching for Cultural Foundations*.]

What I have stressed in this preface is my suspicion that we are only at the beginning of history, that the next million years in on the side of the epiphany of quest and goal. Still, might we not end soon in a nuclear holocaust?

Part of the glory of history is the human envisagement of its schedule of probabilities and possibilities. If the sapling of history is cut down from within, still it can have, within, a vision of the temporal noosphere that, paradoxically, redeems God. The envisagement is the core of future academic growth: its opposite is an elderhood that is the fraud of being in reality "not old folk but young people of eirhteen, very much faded."<sup>169</sup> Our molecules, "our arms and legs filled with sleeping memories,"<sup>170</sup> passionately demand that we fly after the butterfly.

"There the butterfly flew away over the water, and  
the boy flew after it, hovering brightly and easily,  
flew happily through the blue space. The sun shone  
on his wings. He flew after the yellow and flew over  
the lake and over the high mountains, where God  
stood on a cloud and sang."<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup>E. Voegelin, "Reason: the Classic Experience", *Southern Review*, July, 1974, 240.

<sup>169</sup>Marcel Proust, *Remembrance of Times Past*, Random House, New York, vol. 2, 1042.

<sup>170</sup>*Ibid.*, 874. The original text has a longer footnote comment here.

<sup>171</sup>Herman Hess, *Wandering*, translated by James Wright, Farrar, Strau and Giroux, Ne York, 1972, 89. The Preface had begun with the translation of a *haiku*: "I though I saw the fallen lower / returning to the branch / only to find it was a butterfly".

## 7. You and I

“What will become  
Of you and I  
We had a dream  
Don’t let it die”<sup>172</sup>

This section is the central section of the chapter, raising the central question that Sinead raises. I had an e-mail from a young woman as I struggled this week with the problem of bringing the chapter together and I quote, anonymously, one of her questions. “how does each person develop their own Cantower, in as much as they can, so that they don't contribute to the worldly babel”. That is a deeply personal question, and it is eventually to be answered, perhaps so so slowly, from within.

You and I? We are having a one-sided conversation, but of course that need not be. I am only an e-mail away. But the important feature of your reading of me and you is that you need to find you in your concrete potential.

This section was planned as a much longer section. One idea was to include another “centre piece” here, the central chapter of *Redress of Poise*, “Turners: Strategists of Survival”, a strange and complex invitation to “you” written in the mid-1990s.<sup>173</sup> But it is just one of a series of such invitations. I think back to my first enthusiastic sweeping invitation of 1961, “The Contemporary Thomism of Bernard Lonergan.”<sup>174</sup> How could his departure from stale nominalism not be noticed and acted upon? Then there was that heavier appeal, “Image and Emergence: Towards an Adequate Weltanschauung”<sup>175</sup> that I presented at the International Florida Conference

---

<sup>172</sup>From the seventh song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

<sup>173</sup>See note 1 of the Introduction above.

<sup>174</sup>*Philosophical Studies* (Maynooth, Ireland), 1962.

<sup>175</sup>This paper was later published as chapter 1 of *The Shaping of the Foundations*, University Press of America, 1974. The second Florida paper, “Metamusic and Self-Meaning”

in 1970, of which Lonergan remarked to me at the time “it opens up area after area”. Well, it didn’t!

The mid-1970s invitation was more demanding, more directly pushing for that strange pastmodern authentic subject, “Authentic Subjectivity and International Growth: Foundations”. And so on, till I went the crazy way of Ezra Pound’s 117 Cantos for I-change and wrote the first four of a ten-volume work of 117 Cantowers, an invitation to “The Dark Tower,”<sup>176</sup> the title of which bubbled out after about thirty *Cantowers: Roun Doll, Home James*. I halted at the 41<sup>st</sup> Cantower which was on Doctrine or Policy in a reach to convey the remoteness of the meaning to be achieved in that specialty from the conventional commonsense meaning that dominates theology, management, sports and wars.

But that is all obviously **me** in this odd final shot. Here I steal from Lonergan’s ending of his first week of lectures in that strange two weeks of “Mathematical Logic and Existentialism”. “In other word, this is our last slap at this problem, and people may have questions of one kind or another that they want to raise.”<sup>177</sup> “I had a dream”; but what about you? Black, white, brown, yellow, coloured wholes bubbling out from the Big Bang, are all oppressed by the axial rot. Might you do a good turn, a good “come about”?

The next two sections will go on to speak - perhaps discouragingly - of the difficulty of that turn about, that interpretation of self that, in the third stage of meaning, will be the radiance of street and school.<sup>178</sup> But the present appeal may be, for you and in you, quite modest. If you have been sweetly brutalized into being a commonsense Lonerganite, perhaps my oddness gives you a little pause. The come-about may be quite beyond you at present because of age, time,

---

became chapter 2 of that book. (Available on the Website).

<sup>176</sup>A topic of *Cantower V*.

<sup>177</sup>*Phenomenology and Logic*, 138.

<sup>178</sup>I would add the context of the first section of *Insight* chapter 17 here. But the task of fantasy is enormous, and the full context is that of the reach of chapter 20’s solution.

talent, preoccupations. But if you suspect that even your best rich sophisticated teaching is off,<sup>179</sup> then there are minor turn-arounds in your teaching and your thinking. Perhaps you might at least notice that there is another fantastic way, one, for instance, packed by Lonergan into that single startling page 250 of *Method in Theology*. Was I quite out of my mind to write 200 pages about that single page? I was just trying to get people to pause on a turn-around of a page. Yes, “people may have questions of one kind or another that they want to raise”, but I would have you, sometime soon, raise the lonely question that you are in the turning of page 249 to 250, the turning from *Assembly* to *includes*. What should our ontogenetic and phylogenetic assembling include that we, might make lightsome, in later millennia, “living human bodies linked together”<sup>180</sup> in cosmic spin-on?

## 8. Starting Strangeness

“I’m Irish, I’m English,  
I’m Muslim, I’m Jewish,  
I’m a girl, I’m a boy”<sup>181</sup>

And you and I are among the strangest things.

The reference of the title is evident to any one who has dabbled in the book *Insight*. It points the reader towards the climb to The Position.<sup>182</sup> I add here a reflection on the position, followed by pointers regarding its incarnation in the spontaneous subject: an enormously difficulty follow-up that firms the position’s dominion in the neuromolecules. The reflection is the first third of the long *Cantower 9*, the latter part of which brings us into the territory of

---

<sup>179</sup>We are back, of course, to the suspicion created, hopefully, by the undertow of the critique of rich description that is in *Cantower XXIII*.

<sup>180</sup>*Insight*, 723[745].

<sup>181</sup>From the eight song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

<sup>182</sup>*Insight*, 388[413].

Interpretation, our next topic. But, of course, that other 2/3rds of the *Cantower* are worth visiting. It moves around what I hope will impress you as an amazing gathering in the last century, a gathering of scholars on the topic of interpretation in Lonergan which skipped past or round his pointing.<sup>183</sup>

The previous section posed for you the existential question of your joining this climbing group. Here I wander reflectively back to my own biography of that climb and it could be spelled out in a way that could be helpful, encouraging. In a later culture, with more climbing companions, you may not take as long as I did to get to first base. I recall again the business of repeating a previous expression of an achievement with which I began this fourteenth chapter, but now, in your **now** later, repeating has an increasingly richer meaning. In a developed positional culture of the third stage of meaning, that business of repeating will have become a business of bones, the bridge of bones referred to in the article mentioned there, a bridge **now** not too far but heartily molecularized in the community.<sup>184</sup>

### *Cantower IX*

#### **Position, Poission, Protopossession**

**December 1<sup>st</sup> 2002**

He had the knack of making men feel  
 As small as they really were  
 Which meant as great as God had made them  
 Though as males they disliked his air<sup>185</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup>As I note in that *Cantower*, there were good contributions. But in the main it fits into the astonishing stream of neglect of Lonergan's magnificent achievements of chapter 17 of *Insight*.

<sup>184</sup>"The Bridge of Bones" is the fourth of seven bridges discussed (pp. 549-50) in "Features of Generalized Empirical Method and the Actual Context of Economics", *Creativity and Method*, edited by M.Lamb, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 1981.

<sup>185</sup>Patrick Kavanagh, *If Ever You Go to Dublin Town*.

## 1.1 Preliminary Years

So we come, at the end of this first year, to the other or new beginning mentioned in note 2 of *Cantower I*. There I promised to replace a brief doctrinal statement with foundational conversation. But obviously that conversation is limited. Foundational conversation,  $C_{55}$ , is conversation between two strugglers of that specialty reaching within their developed categories for envisagement, fantasy, of advances. The one may be more advanced than the other: then you may view the conversation as teaching. But a cautionary note is required here. The conversation of generalized empirical method is always a self-reaching. There is feedback: one is always climbing. So, both climb together, the more advanced normatively at a larger pace so that at the end the distance has grown between the two climbers. This is part of the reality and the obscurity and the mystery of foundational adult growth.

Then there is Foundational Address:  $C_{5x}$ , where  $x$  refers to any other functional specialty, or indeed can be '9', an address to non-members of the cultural effort, an ex-planeing in the strict sense.<sup>186</sup> But when it is that type of address it does not expect much of the non-doctrinal response that is actual climbing. Think of a climber addressing an audience about the difficulties of the North Face of the Eiger. The audience are there to be thrilled at some level: but they are not about to venture to some climbing wall or ice-face.

One of the handicaps of the present developed axial decayed culture is that foundational address, or address that requires climbing, is that it is not recognized as such. The classic instance of this problem, for me, is the manner in which many readers of the 1940s read the *Verbum* articles: they were the audience that Lonergan had to address in the Epilogue of the work. Are we much wiser in the new millennium? The question, surely, is yours here now. My regular analogy here, and elsewhere, is my own teaching of mathematical physics. You may find it better to think of the Master classes of Nadia Boulanger with which we began in *Cantower I*, or of Cello Master classes given by, say, Yo Yo Ma. One has to go home and work, perhaps ten hours for every hour

---

<sup>186</sup>I introduced the meaning ex-plane first in section 3.6 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*. It gives a more precise image and meaning and lift to *haute vulgarization*.

of the class.

The difficulty of the present topic is that it is what I would call a core lifework, especially for a foundations person. But it is also the core, the eye of the storm<sup>187</sup> of the pilgrimage in culture, for any hodic collaborator. Indeed, I might say that it is the core of the non-hodic world of any contemplative: but that is a topic for *Cantower XXI*. At all events, the present address is not, then, like a master-class or a class in any year of mathematical physics studies: it is like a pre-degree address, sketching the climb. It could be like pointing towards the heights of ice-skiing or concert-performance to enthusiasts whose enthusiasms are quite generic.

I am presuming now that you are enthusiastic, and not a beginner. Indeed, you may be up there beyond me, protopossessed, delighting in my struggle to present your homeground. I think now of my very first conversation with Lonergan, still vivid to me after 41 years. It was on this topic, in a way that is very relevant for us now. I asked him about “startling strangeness”<sup>188</sup>: when he reached it. We were in a room overlooking Leeson St. in Dublin, in the days before he gave the lectures of Easter 1961. I sat as he paced the floor and talked in his strange vocal rhythms, up in pitch at the end of sentences. “When I got that I had to go and ask someone”. He never did tell me When. But, as you may remember, he regularly recalled to audiences how it took Augustine ten years to get somewhere equivalent, like the halfway house of Platonism. But the point that he made is significant when you connect it to the first page of chapter fourteen of *Insight*, which he begins with the personal problem of metaphysics and ends with the interpersonal problem of conversation. One can arrive at “The Position” described a few pages later, but when you go and talk to someone, even to someone who has arrived at the position, both of the conversants are - or may be - already-out-there-real. I had managed to break through, in an elementary sense, to the Position at the end of the previous decade.<sup>189</sup> Lonergan had that achievement years earlier, and it

---

<sup>187</sup>See the Bacchus page at the conclusion of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

<sup>188</sup>*Insight*, xxviii[22].

<sup>189</sup>From 1952 to 1956 I had been working in mathematics and mathematical physics, ending in the autumn of 1956 with a Master’s degree. Then I was led into a pretty high-grade scholastic philosophy: Marechalian stuff, German epistemology, Hoenan’s cosmology. The teacher of the third year course in Philosophy of God, Fr. John Hyde, was interested in Lonergan.

is interesting to puzzle about whether he had pushed on to what I call the Poision, the overcoming of the interpersonal problem described at the bottom of that first page of his fourteenth chapter.<sup>190</sup>

Indeed, the puzzle can be extended historically, and you, like I, may spend time puzzling over people like Aristotle and Plotinus in regard to the same point. The puzzle is eventually a matter of functional specialist work, and the refinements that I am indicating here, in these next sections, become refinements that need the sifting of p. 250 of *Method in Theology*. If you have been with me through the previous *Cantower* and through the equivalent fourth chapter of *Lack in the Beingstalk* then you can imagine and envisage, fantasize forward to, the circulation and sloping upward involved in lifting the hodic enterprise up to new towering levels where displacements and transformations are more precisely specified.<sup>191</sup> Instead of Lonergan's few conversions there are to be species and genera of displacements, within each of which there can be genetic and dialectic order.

Certainly the last paragraph is a type of foundational conversation: I am writing in direct voice and in definite fantasy of future performance, I am hinting at some of my meta-doctrines of

---

I battled with *Insight* in the second and third years of philosophy but it was while I struggled with the *Verbum* articles - in particular with the passage, "dogs know their masters, bones, other dogs, and not merely the appearances of these things" (p. 20 of the University of Toronto edition) - that the shock occurred and I looked out the window at the farm yard in a fresh strange way, inwardly.

<sup>190</sup>This is a difficult problem of interpretation, especially when one considers the moving viewpoint of *Insight*. Perhaps I can place the puzzle nicely for you by quoting a central text of the protopossession which is only introduced below: the Tower protopossession is indeed the topic of the 117 *Cantowers*. But heart-hold the following sentence, and think of the years swept up in the four words, 'so it comes about'. "So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extension and experiencing duration gives place to the subject oriented to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies". *Insight*, 514[537]. Does this text of 49 years ago bear witness to the 49 year-old's solitary drive towards protopossession? *Cantower XII* will focus on a discomforting component of the drive away from visualized extensions and experienced durations.

<sup>191</sup>I regularly prefer to use 'displacement' instead of 'conversions' and 'transformation' instead of 'differentiation'.

foundations. But it is not our present topic. That topic is your personal climb up to and through the Position described on the top of that so-memorable page 388 of the old *Insight*, laid out in three clear points.<sup>192</sup> Above I mentioned an interest in whether and how Lonergan or Aristotle or Plotinus struggled ‘through and beyond’ to what I call a Poosition or even to what I call a Protopossession.<sup>193</sup> Again, not a present topic, but relevant to our conversation, since this interest haunts me these days in regard to all the Giants who stepped away from the already-out-there-now-real, and it will colour my present pointing. But this may not haunt you, at least not yet! I recall a conversation I had some years ago with a respected Lonergan scholar, one in which I slipped into hints that will be developed in section 3 regarding positional conversation, eye to eye talk that involves a mutual self-mediating struggle against “objectivity spontaneously becoming a matter of meeting people and dealing with things that are ‘really out there’”.<sup>194</sup> My very honest companion remarked to me with a grin: “Phil, I’ve no idea what you are talking about!”

Now, you may be in the same state when we get to my hints about The Poosition: well, that’s O.K. You may even be in some such state with regard to The Position. No problem: come, enjoy the ride. Or perhaps just the weird description of the ride: for it is not everyone’s climb in life.

I am hoping, of course, that there are some few who have the strange bent that makes it possible, vital, necessary, to push the “self-study of the organism” towards larger luminosity. And I think it best to address what I have to say to them: to you, then. If YOU, my present reader, are not of the bent - and there is no reason why YOU should - then You can consider yourself as listening in, like Tucker in *Cantower I* listening to Nadia Boulanger.

It is time to halt these introductory reflections and get down to business, the business of a lifetime if you aspire to foundational control.

In section two we will ramble round the problem of The Position described in *Insight* and I

---

<sup>192</sup>*Insight*, 388[413].

<sup>193</sup>The topic **Protopossession** is complex and difficult. I introduce it in section 3, but it has a fuller meaning relating to the search - oriental and occidental - for enlightenment that will be faced more fully later, after *Cantower XXI*.

<sup>194</sup>*Insight*, 385[411].

will struggle to lift it, for you and me, into a better biographic perspective. The third section, as I mentioned, will deal with The Position in a way that will reveal it as central to this whole enterprise, if this is your Way, your Calledness. The fourth section will carry that reflection forward to the odd third word in the title, Protopossession, something that parallels Enlightenment in the East, that sublates various traditions of contemplation in the West. The fifth section, Possession Procession, envisages on-going self-mediations and cycles of positional searchings. The second last section, Pro-Positions was originally intended as a return to the incomplete statement of the Position in *Insight* so as to take up the challenge of axiomatics proposed in *Phenomenology and Logic*. But I postponed<sup>195</sup> that task in favour of carrying forward the work of *Cantower VIII*, section 5, in what I hope is an enlightening and complementing fashion.<sup>196</sup> The final section will hover over the problem of the goal and the problem one might associate with that odd statement of Lonergan, “God is not an object”<sup>197</sup>, but it points to the larger issue of reaching for a heuristic of “destiny”.<sup>198</sup>

So, you have here my favourite number - seven - of sections, calling to mind the stages of a human life, calling to mind also the noble search for the Tower of *Cantower IV*, the loving search for the bower of *Cantower V*. The whole gentle description of a particularly strange life - for that is what it is - at least makes biography a topic, indeed conversion to a certain type of life-style a topic. It is easier to read in that its invitation to an Arctic Grail<sup>199</sup> may not be yours. But you may, on the other hand, in this ninth *Cantower*, find a discomforting calling, embrace of the universe, that makes you ask, like that daft Irishman Stephen McKenna asked on his 36<sup>th</sup> birthday, in sensing the challenge to translate Plotinus’ *Enneads*, “Is this worth a life?”

---

<sup>195</sup>Some progress will be made in section 2 of *Cantower XVII*, and the topic will be formally treated in *Cantower XXXVIII*.

<sup>196</sup>A fuller discussion will occur in section 1 of *Cantower XVIII*.

<sup>197</sup>*Method in Theology*, 342.

<sup>198</sup>*Ibid.*, 292.

<sup>199</sup>“The Arctic Grail” is the title and topic of chapter three of *The Redress of Poise*, available on the Website.

## 1.2. Position

I very deliberately used the phrase ‘ramble round the position’ about this section because it seems to me that a ramble, indeed an autobiographical ramble, is a good place to start. Recall Lonergan’s answer to me, in 1961. In note 5 above I recalled for you my bump into “startling strangeness”. A bump, not a transition. Very much the business described at the beginning of chapter fourteen of *Insight*. I could then - after seven years of mathematical and philosophical studies - resonate somehow with the problem of Plato’s cave, and with Descartes’ and Kant’s problems. I would have been, I supposed, in a position to write an essay much like chapter five of *Wealth of Self*, though that came a decade later. What I could not have written was the small hint about the notion of thing that I gave at the end of the third chapter of that book, the hint contained in the story about Jonah. Certainly, I had some grip on the ising (is?is!is.) activity, and developed a way of gesturing that conveyed the difference between ‘is.’ and ‘out-there-iness’: a vertical hand-yes as opposed to an outreach-pointing, and I associated the vertical with the ising and nodding that belongs to religious conviction as expressed in a Creed. But the notion of thing, the key point of chapter 8 of *Insight*, baffled me. This may well have been an eccentric personal block, not part of your struggle, but I mention it for what it is worth, as an encouragement. The struggle with chapter 8 of *Insight* was something that I undertook during a year in France 1964-65, and the break-through was in fact associated with my ponderings about Jonah inside the whale. Somehow my imagination took off on all the surroundings he could see - he must have had a lamp or a flaming torch (poor whale!) to view all the smelly surface of the ‘cave’. Then there is the dawning, nudged perhaps by a shudder of the ‘cave’, that led him to ‘pull together’ all the ‘things’ and properties. Etc: this may help you, or you may recall your own personal illustrations.

But it surely should encourage those that are slow like myself. After eight years of reading *Insight* very seriously and very continuously I got, to some degree, the point of chapter 8. And I suppose I could claim that I was, to some degree, in The Position. To what degree? This is a matter of personal self-judgment on one’s own advancing standards. I think of a conversation I had with Lonergan one evening in Dublin in the summer of 1971, when I asked him when he became clear on the meaning of ‘is’. His reply: “when I got that far in *Insight*”.

But I should pause here and express some doubts about the pedagogy of The Position as I

have experienced it, through reading, lectures given and heard, conversation etc, in the past forty years. Bluntly, I do not find people either talking about it or writing about it as if it were a massively difficult business: which, I claim emphatically and foundationally, it is. What do you think? My suspicion is that Lonergan would agree with me. I am not going to collect texts and do a shabby run through the first four specialties. I simply point to the 1957 lectures of Lonergan for remarks that resonate with my Position about the Position - a doctrine about foundations. Central to both the sets of lectures in *Phenomenology and Logic* is the problem of truth and objectivity. It is an unsolved problem of all modern philosophy and all modern science. Surely it is not the sort of problem the solution to which can have become the possession of a community of enthusiasts who have read Lonergan? And it seems that the Lonergan of those lectures agrees with me. "The problem in philosophy is to start off from the average naive realist and bring him on to something that involves a fuller grasp of all the issues and a more profound understanding of what his real basis is. The problem is not having people repeat with Augustine that 'the real is not a body, it is what you know when you know something is true'. The problem is to get people to *mean* as much as Augustine meant when Augustine spoke about truth. And that is a transformation of the subject. It is bringing the subject up to the level of thought of a Plato and an Aristotle and an Augustine and an Aquinas. And that is a terrific development of the subject."<sup>200</sup> Undoubtedly people will disagree with me on this, especially as I add something like the famous Maslow statistic "less than 1% grow" in regard to position, poosition, etc. Perhaps I might make the disturbing suggestion that less than 10% of Lonergan followers have seriously been shocked to an intellectual awakening by "startling strangeness" and that fewer still push forward from that to a coherent stand on The Position? If nothing else, my proposal "will make conversion a topic and thereby promote it", so adding the random nudge of dialogue to dialectic. Or will it? But that is not the point in our conversation. The point, perhaps, is to encourage you. You may have had lectures on Lonergan that never pushed you on this strangeness issue. And here I introduce my

---

<sup>200</sup>*Phenomenology and Logic*, 132.

back-up reading for this *Cantower*: V.S.Ramachandran's *Phantoms of the Brain*.<sup>201</sup> "Like most people, you probably take vision for granted. You wake up in the morning, open your eyes and, *voila*, it's all out there in front of you. Seeing seems so effortless, so automatic, that we simply fail to recognize that vision is an incredibly complex - and still deeply mysterious - process."<sup>202</sup> As I woke up this morning, reaching out of the dreams of morning into the topic of The Poosition, there flickered from my memory a story told by the great late Anthony Quinn. It was about his sea-voyage to Europe where he was to make the first version of the film, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*. He had been working on the character, his walk, his poise. He had to get up during the night to take a leak and found himself actually walking in character, with strange rolling gait. "I knew I was ready". When *you* wake up like *that* in The Poosition then you have arrived. Go, then, find someone to talk with! But we are getting ahead of ourselves. We have slid into the topic of The Poosition.

And perhaps it is as well so to slide. The last thing I wish to do here is to give any impression of communicating the relevant moods and insights. The first thing I wish to do is to make this shocking change in oneself a topic, a topic certainly for yourself: but it is massively useful not to be alone in this struggle. The two zones in my own writing that you might find useful are chapter 5 of *Wealth of Self* and the more sophisticated invitation - it, like this section, slides towards positional analysis - of chapter five of *A Brief History of Tongue*. Certainly, I could make a third attempt, or gather pointers from Lonergan's work, or turn back to Plato and Kant, or reach out to Oriental searchings. But I am interested in local living, in a democracy of minding. Minimally, I am interested in making a topic of my meta-doctrinal claim: **This changing of your mind is not easy.**

### 1.3 The Poosition

I have been concerned about this reality, even though I had no name for it then, since I

---

<sup>201</sup>V.S.Ramachandran and Sandra Blakelee, *Phantoms of the Brain. Probing the Mysteries of the Human Mind*, William Morrow and Company, New York, 1998. To be referred to below as **Phantoms**.

<sup>202</sup>**Phantoms**, 65.

read Proust's *Remembrance of Times Past* in the early 1970s. The issue was *memory*, and the focus was on that word as it occurred in Lonergan's statement, bracketed in the old *Insight*, "and one has not made it yet if one has no clear memory of its startling strangeness".<sup>203</sup> Michel's search, spanning decades, was for the early taste of tea and little cake; his final stature pivoted on the memory of it. Was there not a parallel with the first taste of self, relatively early - for me, at the age 27? It was not a matter of "clear memory" in the sense that the event could be forgotten. It was "clear memory" in another sense, ill-defined. Some of my reflections on the topic found their way into chapter four of *The Shaping of the Foundations*, originally a paper for a Boston Workshop in the mid-1970s, where I began to sense the need for fantasy and for the more fully molecularized philosophy that was touched on in *Cantower IV*. Twenty five years later, Proustwise, that search and that sense is a memory that has gone clear through some neuro-boundaries. What was at issue, as I already knew at that stage, was a membering, a boning in and up and round. So, I was led to write some years later of "The Bridge of Bones", one of seven bridges that were the topic of "A Bridge too Far: Feature of Generalized Empirical Method."<sup>204</sup> And what is the point of repeating myself? I recall having lunch with Lonergan after Matt Lamb invited me to write for this *Festschrift*. I mentioned to Lonergan that Matt had asked me to write on mathematics, but I had done that more than a decade before. Lonergan's remark was that I should pass the article on again. So I leave you with that reflection on too-far bridges, handily located on the present website. But I must note, for your encouragement and enlightenment, that the article has new meaning for me these days. "The Bridge of Size" takes on now far more significance as a "natural bridge over which we may advance from our examination of science to an examination of common sense."<sup>205</sup> This new meaning is one of the reasons for the direction of

---

<sup>203</sup>*Insight*, xxviii[25].

<sup>204</sup>Published in the *Festschrift* for Lonergan's 75<sup>th</sup> birthday, *Creativity and Method*, edited by M.Lamb, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 1983.

<sup>205</sup>The first paragraph of chapter 5 of *Insight*. The problem of Space and Time will be tackled afresh in *Cantower XII*.

the next twelve *Cantowers*.<sup>206</sup> And I must poise the question, Can I give you some notion of this shift? I recall the concluding Bacchus-page of *Lack in the Beingstalk* and note that I could not even give myself of last year such a notion. Proust's elder taste was quite beyond the tongue of his younger self.

I suppose I could start this section again by noting that it is all about a certain way of going down that first page of chapter 14 of *Insight*.<sup>207</sup> The reading obviously depends on what you bring to the page. As I noted in the previous section, it was years before I brought to it a serious self-taste of myself as organism, kin to the invisible and blind tree of chapter eight.<sup>208</sup> It is only in recent years, in my sixties, that I read now, but with you someway along for the ride, the challenge as a self-studying organism in the mood of that other key page.<sup>209</sup> You may well, even as a beginner, read the top of the first page of chapter 14 of *Insight* - what real metaphysics is all about, finding you way - with more agony than I or Lonergan did, but you arrive at the end in a way that is common to all of us. That way is a way that places a question mark at the end. Can one remain in this so-called intellectual pattern, like Anthony Quinn in spontaneous poise? Have you ever met a person not 'really out there', and this in a vibrant mysterious luminosity? Indeed, has there been a meeting of "Jack and Jill", both bright-eyed in this lightness of being, eyeing aside these obvious living bodies? "You never identify yourself with the shadow cast by your body, or with its reflection, or with the body you see in a dream or in your imagination. Therefore you should not identify yourself with this living body, either"<sup>210</sup>

---

<sup>206</sup>That direction was modified after I wrote this, but I leave the reminder. The aim, expressed in *Cantower IV*, of locating serious reflections on a new physics in next year's *Cantowers* would, I suspect, have lost me much of my readership. But the reflection will be twined forward and blossom in 2009 as we venture towards the heuristics of eschatology.

<sup>207</sup>*Insight*, 385[410-11]. The reader with the Latest edition has to finish out the paragraph with eight lines from the next page!

<sup>208</sup>*Insight*, 250[275].

<sup>209</sup>*Insight*, 464[489].

<sup>210</sup>**Phantoms**, 39. This is a quotation from Shankara (788-820), *Viveka Chudamani*, (Vedic Scriptures).

But you must find your own way to the mark, the dark, of the question, the molecular quest. Some I have known have been shocked into it by drugs. For others it tends “to make its force felt in the tranquillity of darkness, in the solitude of loneliness, in the shattering upheavals of personal and social disaster.”<sup>211</sup> And there are ways of contemplation, Zen ways, aboriginal ways. Here I simply offer another help-line, continuous with the molecular and dark tower searchings of *Cantower IV*. Might you profit from the oddities of phantom limbs as presented by someone of the Hindu tradition?

“In the first half of the next century, science will confront its greatest challenge in trying to answer a question that has been steeped in mysticism and metaphysics for millennia: What is the nature of the self? As someone who was born in India and raised in the Hindu tradition, I was taught that the concept of the self - the ‘I’ within me that is aloof from the universe and engages in lofty inspection of the world around me - is an illusion, a veil called *maya*. The search for enlightenment, I was told, consists in lifting this veil and realizing that you are really ‘one with the cosmos’. Ironically, after extensive training in Western medicine and more than fifteen years of research on neurological patients and visual illusions, I have come to realize that there is much truth to this view.”<sup>212</sup>

So, I invite you to brood regularly, but Proustwise, incensed, over the startling suggestion of The Position foisted or forced on you by chapters, 8, 12, 14, whatever of *Insight*. Perhaps my two chapter fives - in *Wealth of Self* and in *A Brief History of Tongue* - might help, have helped, to find the thumb or nipple sucked, the tingle of orange or orgasm? The brooding must be an eye-stressing - both because of binocularity and because of estimative sensibility - pulling-in and negating-of the solidity of Jack or Jill’s face and body as well as your own, creations of your neuro-dynamics that haunt you with the vigour of a phantom limb. Ramachandran’s work may help you here, and doubly so: there is the issue of phantom limbs, but there is also the issue, outcome, of reaching for the invisible, reaching for the beginnings of an explanation, indeed an

---

<sup>211</sup>*Insight*, 625[648].

<sup>212</sup>**Phantoms**, 227.

explanation of the explanation, of ‘describing’.<sup>213</sup> Have you a friend crazy enough to share with you this exercise of in-membering of eyes-not-seeing-eyes-out-there? Thus you two may reach a bridge to a protopossession.

It seems foolish to go beyond these few pointers towards reading the book and yourself in an essay. The effort required is decade-long: memorizing, in-boning, a one-act play where you are the stage and the play. The quotation above, about the task of this century, leads into a final chapter that will force you, within *The Position*, to grapple with the ‘position of’ the integral qualia of sensibility: especially since Ramachandra is deeply but eruditely confused, counter-positional. You will get a sense of the challenge he would present were he to write his book of page 250 *Method in Theology* so that you could read it self-critically!

But you need the whole book, especially if your methodological education did not expose you to the neuro-dynamics of phantasm or of the *vis cogitativa*, (which I call here estimative sensibility). Then you can ask yourself (or a friend), in regular revisits to the crime of the seen, What am looking at when I look at diagrams of my brain?<sup>214</sup> The diagrams - of course, or off course? - are simply further neuro-dynamic products, organic crutches in our clumbering wormwise quest towards an in-being universe. It is a universe that is no more ‘in’ than ‘out’, but one-sided no-sided, a Moebius strip with no side, a trans-Klein Being-bottle.<sup>215</sup> You must find your own metaphoric crutches that conflict with conative sensibility. Indeed, you may find metaphors in his chapter-titles as you read, with a tentative molecularwised generalized empiricity, about the large and strange variety of phantoms. Rather than “Chasing the

---

<sup>213</sup>This is a central and massively complex topic, but it can be made solidly personal by a self-questioning about just what one knows when one describes - richly, poetically, whatever. I add the discomfiting suggestion here that the standard conviction even of purportedly serious thinkers is that an understanding of the lower conjugates and their aggregated acts *really* adds little to the *essence grasped in description*. We will confront it seriously in *Cantower XXIV*.

<sup>214</sup>See **Phantoms**, 9, 16, 26, 32, 71, 74, 163, 174. You have, no doubt, seen such diagrams before. The problem is, to take a new shocked look.

<sup>215</sup>You can quite easily make a Moebius strip by taking a length of paper that is not too broad, giving it a single twist and gluing it. A fly can walk all over it without taking flight. The Klein bottle is a three dimensional version of this. I have found it a useful counter-image for false objectivities and subjectivities.

Phantom”<sup>216</sup> we are chasing the phantasm. It does not offer “The Unbearable Likeness of Being”<sup>217</sup> but a total unlikeness, for likeness-seeking is like looking “Through the Looking Glass”<sup>218</sup>, with Plato or Kant as guide. Have I been a help? This is a matter of you in your there-then here-now, having heard directions for a journey. I have been a help if I have given you a life-line, pointed to a road not travelled by many but somehow welcome. You may welcome but find that it is not for you to travel it: that is all right. But if you deny the road’s existence, you are some form of naive realist, even if you profess The Position.

So it seems appropriate to end my guiding words where Ramachandran begins his book, quoting John Archibald Wheeler: “In any field, find the strangest thing and then explore it”. The field for me is the field of Lonergan’s *Phenomenology and Logic*,<sup>219</sup> and the strangest thing is the topic of the last note of this *Cantower*: the sensibility and the sensability of the nervy Galilean God. If you find exploring the position and the poosition beyond you, know that it was not explored by the organic Word. But it is the burden of some hodic minority to so explore, making up what was lacking in His pilgrim way. For the majority, Wheeler’s quotation can take on another meaning, for Jesus is the strangest thing.

## 9. Interpreting

“Walk into a photograph  
The waiter took so well”<sup>220</sup>

When I was a teacher of the first year of university philosophy a favorite exercise with the

---

<sup>216</sup>**Phantoms**, title of chapter 3.

<sup>217</sup>**Phantoms**, title of chapter 8.

<sup>218</sup>**Phantoms**, title of chapter 6.

<sup>219</sup>See the index, under *Field*.

<sup>220</sup>From the ninth song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

class, mainly of young women between the ages of 18 and 85, was reviewing, remembering, old group photographs. What did we mean then? What do we mean now? What do we mean now about the meaning then? What might we mean tomorrow as we move on from then? So, here, I invite you to check my waiting take, 2005, of Lonergan's take on interpretation of fifty years ago.

## Lecture 9: Interpretation

By now we are used to the operations of the Ovalteam, and the manner in which the cycling moves towards cumulative and progressive results. In so far as the operations are highly successful, there is better than a Bell curve distribution of successes in work undertaken. One might indeed suspect that with cunning selection of tasks, almost all tasks are progressively completed. That would mean, in the present case, that a task of interpretation suspected and selected would be pretty sure to be a positive addition to the next specialty: in its own modest way, then, reinvent history. In what sense? We leave that question to the final lecture.

The task of interpretation was the topic of volume 4(2005) of *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*.<sup>221</sup> There, certainly, is a place to start if one wishes to lift Lonergan's treatment of interpretation in *Method in Theology* to a new precise functional level. The poise of the volume, however, seems quite different from the mood of that chapter 7 of Lonergan's book. Indeed, there are various problems that come with Lonergan's effort in that chapter that would distract us here from the main drive. So it seems best to stay in the perspective that we have been generating all along here, a perspective much more related to the achievement of the book *Insight*. That means that we are pushing for some follow-up on Lonergan's footnote at the beginning of chapter 7 of *Method*, which points to a distribution of the task of interpretation, as it is defined or described in *Insight*, across the functional specialties.

We shall return in the conclusion to broader problems due to the *Method* treatment of interpretation, reaching thus towards our reflection on history.. Here we proceed in the style of that volume 4(2005). And it seems most enlightening and simpler to proceed roughly in the

---

<sup>221</sup><http://mun.ca/jmda> , a Memorial University, Newfoundland, Website.

manner in which I myself undertook the task there. I sought an interpretation of a single word in the canons of empirical method of chapter 3 of *Insight*, the word ‘complete’ in the title of the fifth canon, ‘The Canon of Complete Explanation’. What I eventually reached, in that article, was a hypothetical expression of my interpretation, one indeed which I put in the mouth of Lonergan. No need now to rush back to that article, but its eventual reading will help to shift the heuristic of the cyclic operations, the community’s TUV.

My effort here is strategic: it is, I might say, luminous towards the cyclic lift. All our interpretative effort should be thus operated, or quasi-operated, to use suggestively that odd word that Lonergan has in his article ‘Mission and Spirit’.<sup>222</sup> A pause to think concretely over this is worthwhile. The doctorate student searches out a respected director. I think here of Lonergan with Boyer, or Feynman with Wheeler. But you and I can think of less fortune ventures, perhaps in our very own cases. There is the luck of finding someone who knows the scene, who can point you to a gap or a glimpse that might just seed a change of pace or mood in the entire science.

In the present case I am my own director, happily untrammelled by institutional demands in the bad sense expressed to me by Lonergan regarding my own struggle of the 1960s in Oxford, when he advised me to ‘give the fellow what he wants’. What I am able to aim at here is not giving what is wanted, but sniffing out some need of the cycle, filling that need, and giving expression to it that may well annoy generally but find acceptance to the potential Ovalteam who are alert to such lifts. I am writing here, I would recall for you, of an existential category, an incarnation of crisis mood in this present deep crisis of method. ‘.... an existential category. It is a constitutive component of the group as human. It is an aesthetic apprehension of the group’s origin. The aesthetic apprehension of the group’s origin and story becomes operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides and acts - and especially in a crisis.’<sup>223</sup>

I am aiming here, as we will gradually grasp, at a very central problem and a very basic lift to the cycle. But the orientation is, or is to be, a common thing. I think now of the history of patristic scholarship and lifts along the road, and of the Why of certain selections and the mood

---

<sup>222</sup>*A Third Collection*, 29.

<sup>223</sup>Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 230.

and mode of their undertaking and their achievement, but that is a topic for our final lecture on re-inventing history. However, it is an advantage to have some illustrations of detailed interpretation in mind as we venture into this tighter topic. So I appeal to one book that relates to a surge of interpretation at the end of the twentieth century. The book is *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts*.<sup>224</sup> It is one of many such works that are emerging in recent decades, and I do not select it for any more profound reason than it being to hand at the moment.

“The book is the revised product of a Ph.D dissertation at the University of Toronto. The conflict between Christian Confessional groups in the fourth century presents quite a number of historical, theological and prosopographical challenges which the current renewal in fourth-century studies has only begun to address.”<sup>225</sup>

The questions I would wish you to nurse regarding this book, or an equivalent work that might interest you - for example, the Fiorenza work mentioned in the previous chapter that nudges forward biblical studies and the Preface - are questions that enliven the inquiry of *Insight*, chapter 17, section 3. But lift them existentially into the context that we struggle towards. In particular, envisage them as lifted into the context of the challenge of the second half of page 250 of *Method*, about which we hovered in the third chapter. Think, perhaps, of a graduate student of patristics reading *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts*. In parallel fashion, you might think of the undergraduate students listening to and reading Lonergan’s *De Verbo Incarnato* in Rome in the early 1960s, or now in translation. Think, as I do now, of your own undergraduate days, and ask such questions as the key one I pose at the end of this chapter, What was and is this minor real distinction all about? For me, then; for me now; for us now, for all of us that are (about)<sup>3</sup>. Does it have a luminous place in “the current renewal of fourth-century studies”<sup>226</sup>? The question asks implicitly about viewpoint: viewpoint of author, teacher, reader, viewpoint of interpreter in all the meanings of that word.

---

<sup>224</sup> Authored by Daniel H. Williams, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995. I shall refer to this work below as Williams.

<sup>225</sup> Williams, vii.

<sup>226</sup> Williams, vii.

Back now to my present selection for the task of musing over interpretation together. Like the choice of a next note in a sonata, the selection takes on an inevitability when it is made and followed, chorded, carried forward. The note that I wish to strike here, or write here, or right here, seems to me to anticipate that inevitability. What might one select in order to bring forward Lonergan's functional view of the second specialty? Can one get any closer to the center, and to the crisis, than the interpretation of the canons of interpretation that he provided at the end of that elusive chapter 17 of *Insight*? That last footnote points to their remoteness from present interest, something Lonergan anticipated in that heave forward of solitary meaning of 1953. Why not, then, tackle this heart of the matter, pushing for a hypothetical interpretation of these canons of interpretation that would shift the statistics of their operability, their future operating in the cycle.

I would point out here, though I would hope that the pointing become more and more superfluous as the decades pass, that my writing here is doctrinal. In the lecture associated with this written effort there is a shift to foundational pedagogy, indeed to commonsense illustration. Doctrinal writing is programmatic, and sometimes brutally so: "be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect". Or, to take some more homely examples "you'll have to spend a few days acclimatizing at Camp 4 before tackling the last 200 meters of the push for the top"; "you'll have to spend some months controlling your cello-bowing technique to be able to reach the proper tones for that sonata". Importing this orientation of mountaineering or music-making into the challenge of the verbal meaning-climb is a massive present cultural challenge.

I must, I feel, continue a little on this topic, recalling chapter 5. I raised it in 1971, when I was editing the second volume of the Lonergan Florida conference: my introduction focused in the question of how we stand on the shoulders of the past.<sup>227</sup> I wrote there about studies of animal thirst: it remains a massive complex problem of zoology. But the ethos of zoology recognizes that: their seems little of an equivalent ethos in the case of the thirst for understanding.

My work of the past decade leaves me more inclined now to talk about physics, with which I regularly draw parallels. There is the relevant parallel that I use between TUV and TUT, tentative unification theories in physics that reach for those elusive GUTs, grand unification

---

<sup>227</sup>See Philip McShane (ed), *Language, Truth and Meaning*, Introduction, Gill Macmillan and Notre Dame, 1972.

theories. The present Tentative Universal Viewpoints that we, and I mean you and I, possess, are, frankly, pretty feeble realities, and that will appear as we struggle towards a hypothetical expression of the canons here. Struggle towards? Am I forgetting that this essay is doctrinal? No: but you see how easy it is to think that, really, we can in fact do some serious climbing, even though we are just reading a map?

And, to console the philosopher or the theologian, I would recall that the cultural ethos is such that even that apparently mature zone of higher mathematics suffers from the bias. Learned articles and books there can throw in the translation into German or Japanese of the silly claim, ‘it is easy to see from this’. So, it may not be so difficult for my sympathetic reader to accept my comment about the canons of hermeneutics, ‘it is not easy to see from this’, from this reading or many discussions around the reading, what Lonergan meant by the canons, what Lonergan would mean by the canons within the larger context of functionality. I recall now Lonergan writing about the problem of presenting his economic theory ‘To discover such terms is a lengthy and painful process of trial and error. *Experto crede*,’<sup>228</sup> and can claim something similar about my struggle with these canons. Only similar, and indeed more closely similar to my experience with the reading of that economic theory in its 1944 version. Lonergan sent me that typescript of 130 pages in 1968: by 1998 I understood it enough to edit that volume 21 of his *Complete Works*. My *experto crede* then is not that of one who struggled to create a theory but of a struggle to understand what had been expressed.

The canons, like the economics, are expressed densely, doctrinally. What else could the man do? Let us pause over this issue. It is the issue of paradigm shift, but it is best thought of as a massive metatheoretic shift. And to help us on, I call in a parallel from physics, but a parallel theoretic and metatheoretic shift that is not some shift in higher geometry, but the simple shift that is appealed to on the first page of chapter 1 of *Insight*. This is convenient for me pedagogically since I have dealt in detail with the relevant shift, that of Archimedes, elsewhere.<sup>229</sup> All I shall do here is quote, with tongue in cheek and the memory of my own struggle with the first sentence of

---

<sup>228</sup>*For a New Political Economy*, University of Toronto Press, 1998, 112.

<sup>229</sup>In *Cantower XXVII*.

*On Floating Bodies*, the first paragraph of Archimedes famous book: ‘Let us suppose that a fluid is of such a character that, its parts lying evenly and being continuous, that part which is thrust the less is driven along by that part which is thrust the more; and that each of its parts is thrust by the fluid which is above it in a perpendicular direction if the fluid be sunk in anything and compressed by anything’. We are a long way here from ‘weighing the crown in water,’ indeed we only get to that in Proposition 7 of the book *On Floating Bodies*. Archimedes had mused over his discoveries for such a sufficient length of time, that he could comfortably pitch them all into wonderous axiomatic form. So we have, as we do in Euclid, an unteachable format, expression.<sup>230</sup>

Might we say the same about the musings of Lonergan that led him to these canons? It seems a plausible parallel. Might there be another, more helpful way of getting at the methodology that he is suggesting? Might we reach a hypothetical expression of his meaning that would jive with these canons but be accessible to us mortals?

Quite easily: and here I jest, of course. I have been grappling with these canons since 1958. It was only after about 25 years that I tackled the task of bringing this set into some type of comparison with the set to be found in chapter 3 of *Insight*. I never published that effort of the early 1980s, but the article I wrote then appears as the first part of Cantower 14, ‘Communications and Ever-ready Founders’. The Cantower, in fact, is written to parallel *Insight* chapter 14, and to twine round chapter 14 of *Method* on ‘Communications’, shifting that *Insight* chapter’s axiomatics of implementation into a heuristics of local foundational operations. So, the effort there is cousin to the push here, and is a relevant diversion now for the serious reader.

Here I dodge repeating myself, and simply point to two displays that I gave in Cantower 14. The first display is in section 14.1.1, The point of that display is to draw a parallel between the shift to thing-to-thing in physics and the shift to that relates interpretations to each other, not to the interpreter. The second display is a paralleling of the two sets of canons, a good exercise for you now. There are two columns, with the first column giving the Canons of Empirical Method in the right order. Corresponding to Canons 3, 4, 5, 6, in that column are Canons 1, 4, 2, 5 of the hermeneutics list. Let us call the first column E, empirical and the second H, Hermeneutic.

---

<sup>230</sup>The problem of such expression is discussed in elementary ways in *Introducing Critical Thinking*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2005 (John Benton, Alessandra Drage, Philip McShane).

Nothing very surprising in the pieces of the listing mentioned already: both E3 and H1 are named canons of relevance. E4 and H4 and Parsimony. E5 is titled Complete Explanation and H2 is titled 'Explanation', and we know from the previous exercise that we can drop the word 'complete' from the first to give precise symmetry.<sup>231</sup> Finally E6 deals with 'Statistical' Residues and H5 deals simply with 'Residues': there is no serious problem in making them parallel.

So, we turn to the top of the list, to E1 and E2. There is only one canon of hermeneutics left to put into correspondence with these two canons, 'The Canon of Selection' and 'The Canon of Operations': it is H3, 'The Canon of Successive Approximations'. What might we make of this? What I made of it in the list can be seen there: roughly, the canon of selection coincides with the first two principles of criticism and the canon of operations coincides with the third and fourth principles of criticism. We skip repeating detailed comments. What is important to ponder immediately is the disordering of the canons of hermeneutics. H1 comes third in the list in the new order, and it is useful to think of this in relation to Archimedes' first principle in his work on hydrostatics, quoted above. Lonergan's first canon 'demands that the interpreter begin from the universal viewpoint'; Archimedes first principle demands, as you find in those first pages of the text, that the reader get a grip on the floating apple or the flowing stream from the viewpoint of someone who sees the surface of the water as coincident with a great circle of the earth. How many of us are comfortably, luminously, at home with the notion that the surface of our local lake lies on a patch of a sphere?

"Weigh the crown in water"; would it not be better to start with Archimedes in the bath, with his ecstatic selecting and operating? Would this not be 'eminently relevant, sane and solid,'<sup>232</sup> as Lonergan remarks about his account of interpretation in *Method*, which he ties in with Bishop Descamps nudge away from the broader viewpoint of the divine plan.

What Lonergan adds immediately here in *Method* requires our serious consideration in the context of our problem here and of our suggestions regarding the ethos of the Ovalteam. So I had

---

<sup>231</sup>See my reflection on "The Meaning of 'Complete' in the Fifth Canon of Empirical Method", *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* 4(2005): <http://mun.ca/jmda>

<sup>232</sup>*Method in Theology*, 172.

best quote it in full.

“Many perhaps will hesitate to agree with the rejection of general presentations of the divine plan running through scriptural history. But they too will come around, I think, when a distinction is drawn; such general expositions are highly important in the functional specialty, communications; but they are not the vehicle by which the exegete communicates his results to the theological community.

It remains, however, that the basic mode of expression, just described, has to be supplemented.”<sup>233</sup>

How is it to be supplemented? Again, it is better to quote directly from later in the same page. The rambling, believe it or not, carries us forwards towards the hypothetical expression of the canons that is our objective: but only if you have time to muse and digest all this!

“What is needed is not mere description but explanation. If people were shown how to find in their own experience elements of meaning, how these elements can be assembled into ancient modes of meaning, why in antiquity the elements were assembled in that manner, then they would know it in all its suppositions and implications, they could form for themselves an exact notion and they could check just how well it accounted for the foreign, strange, archaic things presented by exegetes.”<sup>234</sup>

I recall now conversing with a frustrated Lonergan around 1966, at the time when he was envisaging those early chapters of *Method*, pacing his room asking ‘what’ll I do? I can’t put all of *Insight* into chapter one of *Method!*’

Might I suggest that “weigh the crown in water” has a parallel in those “sane and solid”<sup>235</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup>*Ibid.*, 172.

<sup>234</sup>*Ibid.*, 172-3.

<sup>235</sup>*Method in Theology*, 172.

suggestions about understanding object<sup>236</sup>, words<sup>237</sup>, author<sup>238</sup>, self<sup>239</sup>, and following up with some refined judgment<sup>240</sup>? What of the supplement? Well, that should emerge, if only with massive slowness. Indeed, with the slowness of the functional cycle's early stages, treacle-twirled against clinging conventions.

Pause again over those quotations from page 172 of *Method*. All of *Insight* was not to be tossed into chapter one of *Method*, an indigestible meal for present exegetes. Indeed, even the functional business was not brought to the fore. But a respectable beginning of half-decent exegesis is described - not explained. That respectable style of exegesis makes possible a communication with the present theological community, such as readers of Williams or Fiorenza. But where does such a respectable performance stand in the challenge faced by the Ovalteam? I would claim that it stands in that zone that I usually name C<sub>9</sub>, the zone that goes out into common sense and common nonsense, a going out that is 'concerned with theology in its external relations.'<sup>241</sup> In my fundamental diagram of the cycle W3, in its flat or Tower form<sup>242</sup>, it is one of the two zones of external exchange, of non-baton exchange, in the cycle. The guidelines of chapter 7 of *Method*, indeed, are not only reasonable for discussions with exegetes of all types; they are a quite decent set of pointers for a church-group bible study.

And they are a quite decent start for a move forward towards determining canons of hermeneutics. But we must think of that decent start in terms of the gap between Greek physics and the physics of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, if we wish to get to grips with the place of the canons in history. This is not easy for those unfamiliar with serious physics, but perhaps we can make do

---

<sup>236</sup>*Ibid.*, 156-58.

<sup>237</sup>*Ibid.*, 158-60.

<sup>238</sup>*Ibid.*, 160-61.

<sup>239</sup>*Ibid.*, 161-62.

<sup>240</sup>*Ibid.*, 162-65.

<sup>241</sup>*Method in Theology*, 132.

<sup>242</sup>See **Joistings 8** for both.

with the general tone of popular physics, however misleading. We have presently left behind, on the serious front of physics, not only Greek but Newtonian physics. Leading physicists are grappling with particle relations and variations in terms of complex fibre-bundle geometries and Lie algebras. At present two Ovalteams can be detected in physics, standard model and string theory proponents. But they ‘layer down’ to a unity of empiricity despite their frontline differences.

In hermeneutics one might say that one can detect two teams: the standard model of exegetes and the ‘string theory’ or Ovalteam formula. But there is this difference. The Ovalteam has its parallel in either of the contemporary pushes in physics. While both these teams in physics suffer from popularization distortions, neither team converses, when seriously working, with popular consciousness. The split in hermeneutics is between a serious scientific collaboration that is struggling to emerge, and a standard model that is conservative in regard to communicability in a manner that weighs heavily on their success: “even indefinitely prolonged labours may merely move around in an inconclusive circle.”<sup>243</sup>

Now it happens that I am quoting here from the first paragraph of the third canon of hermeneutics, the canon that I moved up the comparative column to place it parallel to the first and second canons of empirical method. “There is a canon of selection, for the empirical inquirer is confined to insights into the data of sensible experience. There is a canon of operations, for he aims at an accumulation of such insights, and the accumulation is reached, not in the mathematical circuit through insights, formulations, and symbolic images, but in the fuller circuit that adds observation, experiment, and practical application.”<sup>244</sup>

In Lonergan’s later functional context, that fuller circuit becomes the eightfold way and it is important to leap into that context for the moment to get a grip on the contrast between Ovalteam work and standard interpretative work. The demand for Ovalteam work is gradually emerging in physics. As it emerges, it illustrates the clear gap between seriousness and common sense or popularization. The first principle of criticism of the 3<sup>rd</sup> canon of hermeneutics “is

---

<sup>243</sup>*Insight*, 588[610-1].

<sup>244</sup>*Ibid.*, 70[93].

supplied by the demand for a universal viewpoint". In the emerging functional physics, that demand has its parallel in the demand for a GUT - or more realistically of course, a TUT - operating in each and every specialty. So, cyclotronic observational results are best read through the spyglass of the most up-to-date theoretic, and new equipment is molded by that same theoretic, indeed is generally at the front edge of the theoretic. Similarly with functional hermeneutics: and so you can grasp better now the recurrence of UV across or round that W3 diagram. The tower image helps here: the tower climbs with a relatively horizontal roof. This image counters the terrible tendency to imagine that somehow one climbs into theory up through the first three specialties and then climbs down to commonsense in the last three. Research involves high theory, and so does Communications.

This is a very necessary perspective and imaging in all this matter. And we might enrich it by merging in, with slow seriousness, the comment that concludes *Insight's* first discussion of interpretation and the possibility of revision.<sup>245</sup> How does the Tower climb? A revision, even 'a basic revision'<sup>246</sup> can bubble up in any specialty: some researcher finds a strange scroll; an eighth-type specialist exploits a novel nano-process of communicative intimation-potential.

Back now to E1 and E2 and to the parallel with H3. Can we detect significant pieces of the parallel? Well for starters, to the various subtle layers of sensible data one can parallel equivalent data in manuscripts, though Lonergan amazingly makes no mention of manuscripts till the word *documents* turns up in H5.<sup>247</sup> Might it not be better to get these in earlier in our hypothetical expression? Next, we could detect - an illuminating exercise that would be a separate chapter - the parallels between the canon of operations and the principles of criticism. The demand for the universal viewpoint is simply, in physics, that hidden thing that drove early Egyptians and Greeks and Chinese to formulating and re-forming nature's ways in the

---

<sup>245</sup>*Insight*, 162-4[186-8].

<sup>246</sup>*Insight*, 166[190].

<sup>247</sup>*Insight*, 590[612].

cumulative<sup>248</sup>, constructive<sup>249</sup>, verifiable<sup>250</sup>, impartial<sup>251</sup>, systematic<sup>252</sup> dynamic that blossoms into higher viewpoints.<sup>253</sup> One can sniff out the parallel drive in relation to the data of documents, and the weave towards higher viewpoints.<sup>254</sup> But the weave here raises more explicitly the issue of the dynamics of the weavers. The sources of cumulative meaning are in there in the data, as Annie Sullivan **told** Helen in those famous five weeks of 1887. So, the second principle of criticism throws in a wild subjectivity into the data: what the primitive Helen means now by water is a far cry from Annie's meaning, which of course includes Helen, the five weeks, and a Proustian lifetime of tea and water. Could Annie "form for herself an exact notion and check just how well it accounted for the strange"<sup>255</sup> that was the old Helen, that is the new Helen?

At all events, the parallel to E2 has a discouraging complexity that is intimated well by the distinction between W1 and W2 in my list of metaphysical words.<sup>256</sup> And that is only a beginning of the required, demanded, control of meaning.

Are we getting closer to a useful attempt at a hypothetical expression of Lonergan's canons, one that would be perhaps not only 'a simple interpretation'<sup>257</sup> but a reach for a reflective interpretation?<sup>258</sup>

---

<sup>248</sup>*Insight*, 74[98].

<sup>249</sup>*Insight*, 75[98].

<sup>250</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>251</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>252</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>253</sup>*Insight*, 76[99].

<sup>254</sup>The structural pattern of the 'higherness' shift us into genetic and dialectic searchings.

<sup>255</sup>*Method in Theology*, 173, with a few twists.

<sup>256</sup>See Cantower 24.

<sup>257</sup>*Insight*, 562[586]

<sup>258</sup>*Ibid.*, 563[586].

Yes, I think we could have a shot at a better expression of the task, role, institution, of later hermeneutics. But, before taking that shot, note its presuppositions of luminosity. Are we clear and luminous on what we are doing, what is going on, going forward?<sup>259</sup> Is my control of meaning such that I could switch to another audience different from you early 21<sup>st</sup> century people? If I had such a control, it would somehow hover over all possible hypothetical expressions, like a master inner word but meshed with a masterful supra-linguistic expression, a pure meaning that a latter-day Plotinus might savour. Best refrain here from that necessary digression on that.<sup>260</sup> Why not have an initial shot at a hypothetical expression, helped along by those canons of empirical method?

Then we make our pedagogic start with types of manuscripts, the parallel of data.

Next, we must do some justice to the complexification that is added to water and *water* by Helen's new meaning of both and the vast history of analogous complexifications. The canon of operations is enriched by the presence of immanent sources of meaning.

Thirdly, we need the flowering of that enrichment that somehow is to give the Plotinian purity to the whole operation, or to the canon of operation for the new hermeneutics. But that flowering is not one that can be shared with any given audience: like a summary presentation of Lie Algebras or ultra-modern geometries, it is a meaningful word only to the wise.

Yet, fourthly, it is that flowering, or the reach for it, that can ground a decent hypothetical expression to stand out there as obviously equivalent to some original expressed suggestion: in our illustrative case, to Lonergan's account of canons of hermeneutics.

Fifthly, this strange complex of operations does not get out of control: the hypothetical expression has to fit, in our case-study, into Lonergan's *opera omnia* documents, into the genetics and the dialectics - if any - of his growing perspective.

I have leaped along in those previous paragraphs. They could well become a book, not a

---

<sup>259</sup>We are back to the meaning of (about)<sup>3</sup>, but also within the problem raised by Lonergan in his discussion of the obscurity of the evolution of doctrine, *De Deo Trino, Pars Dogmatica*, Gregorian Press, Rome, 1964, 17-29.

<sup>260</sup>One might enter the topic through P.McShane, "Obstacles to the Control of Meaning", *Method. Journal of Lonergan Studies*, 2006.

few hundred words, if I were to shift from doctrinal statements to a pedagogy of a climbing-companion style. But have you as yet got my little, but deeply significant, joke? What was I doing in those five paragraphs? I was suggesting, as a decent hypothetical expression, a summary of Lonergan's actual expression that is the middle of *The Sketch*! My five-point paragraphs echo with relative accuracy the five points of that deeply obscure sketch. My full hypothetical expression would indeed coincide with Lonergan's actual five-point expression in *The Sketch*.

Before going on, let me illustrate that obscurity and the slow pedagogy of the climb to luminosity. Take, then, the unhelpful introduction to "pure formulations" in the third point. What are they? Well, we are told that they are a type of gnostic business: they are spoken by the pure of mind only to the pure of mind.<sup>261</sup>

It is important to brood over this illustration, for from such brooding can emerge an appreciation of the complex of problems that are associated with Lonergan's teaching of Christology in Rome and with our struggle to re-structure the layers of ChrISt-appreciation that are to become a dynamic intrinsic to history. The basic image here is that which dominates the Cantowers: the Ovalteam **can tower** over commonsense in its TUV appreciation of ChrISt: they read Peter's confession of ChrISt in Mathew 16:16 in incarnate luminosity that is still doubly focal mystery.<sup>262</sup> The commonsense faithful share that double darkness, and paradoxically the tower top is no nearer Vision than the plain.

But let us now pause over pure formulations: they are shared properly only by the community of TUV.<sup>263</sup> We need illustrations of that problem of sharing, and fortunately Lonergan provides them in his treatise on *The Incarnate Word*, and this in a way that opens up our topic considerably.

What was the real issue of the Council of Ephesus, of the debate and vote on June 10, 431, that centered on the two letters of Cyril and Nestorius? The real issue was the reality of, and the

---

<sup>261</sup>I am being positive here, in the manner of Origen as quoted in the Preface to *ChrISt in History*.

<sup>262</sup>Recall the reflection on Rahner at the beginning of chapter 3 of *ChrISt in History*.

<sup>263</sup>Note that they are only verbal to those outside that community. So, there can develop a scholasticism that is only verbally beyond the struggles of pre-Nicaean Christianity.

comprehension of, an inadequate minor real distinction.<sup>264</sup> What was the real issue at the second Council of Constantinople? The real issue is a subtly ‘analogically-drawn’<sup>265</sup> minor real distinction. But what is the real issue here, in this context of the problem of interpretation, in this context of the meaning of ‘pure formulation’?

What is the real issue in telling someone that  $E = mc^2$ ? The real issue, in our context, is that neither the speaker nor the listener may have any serious grasp of the meaning of the formula. The formula may be merely a formula, the outer skin of a formulation.  $E = mc^2$  is (points to: think of Helen and Annie Sullivan and the formula *water*) a relatively pure formulation if speaker and listener share the best TUV. What of Lonergan’s students in the Gregorian University? What of his present readers of the translation from the Latin of *De Verbo Incarnato*? What of the readers of Williams’ book? What of you? Are you genuinely comfortable with the subtleties of that first section of chapter 16 of *Insight*, dealing so briefly, doctrinally, with distinctions? And if you are comfortable only to a certain measure, are you sufficiently luminous about that measure? Without that sufficient luminosity there will be illusions about teaching and preaching, or even ‘the arrogance of omnicompetent common sense.’<sup>266</sup> ‘The New Testament emphasis on the function of priests is that they are to be leaders, teachers, preachers. In the measure that a diocese or a religious order wishes to provide the church with leaders, teachers, preachers, it will do all it can to make the leaders far-seeing, the teachers profound, the preachers wise. The formula for that is simple: they will themselves live the Christian life that is the sublation of the whole of human living, and they will know a theology that thematizes the sublation of the whole of human living.’<sup>267</sup>

We are back at our basic image: there must be a kataphatically contemplative community tuned to the times and its differentiated meanings, reaching out gently, profoundly and wisely, to

---

<sup>264</sup>Thesis 3, preliminary note 1.

<sup>265</sup> Thesis 4, part 2, which contains several pages relevant to our topic.

<sup>266</sup>B.Lonergan, *Collected Works: vol. 17*, ‘Questionnaire on Philosophy: Response’. 370.

<sup>267</sup>*Ibid.*, 360-61.

the global pilgrims. That community, living in “the sublation of the whole of human living” that is the Satisfaction of ChrISt,<sup>268</sup> is perhaps to be a reality before the end of this millennium: but only if we listen now to all pondering pilgrims. Then we bring to our interpretations of life and scripture a fresh version of Origin’s ‘despoiling of the Egyptians’ of which he wrote to Gregory.<sup>269</sup> ‘We need great application when we are reading divine things, so that we may not be precipitous in saying or understanding anything concerning them .... As you apply yourself to divine reading, seek correctly and with unshakable faith in God the sense of the divine Scriptures hidden from the many.’<sup>270</sup> Such application makes us distinctly strange participants in the Triune dynamic. ‘May you be such a participant, and may you always grow in such participation, so that you may not only say, ‘We have become participants with Christ’ (Heb. 3:14), but, ‘We have become participants with God.’”<sup>271</sup>

I halt abruptly with that bow to Origin’s place in the history of the quest for the Dark Tower. At the beginning of this chapter I touched on problems associated with how that quest flowed on in ups and downs through those early centuries, and now perhaps we have a larger map of how our times must wind that quest into the cycling of a viewpoint that would generate in this millennium an integral scientific consciousness. The Egyptians are no longer outside the walls. But we had best leave this doctrinal grappling with the third order of consciousness to our final chapter on ‘Reinventing History’.

---

<sup>268</sup>See **Joistings 8**, “Cycling Satisfaction” the a discussion of the creative minority’s participation in Christ’s Satisfaction.

<sup>269</sup>The ‘Letter to Gregory’ is available in English translation in Joseph W.Trigg, *Origen*, Routledge, 2004, 210-13.

<sup>270</sup>*Ibid.*, 212.

<sup>271</sup>*Ibid.*, 213.

## 10. Phenomenology Again and A Gain

“Out of history we have come  
With great hatred and little room”<sup>272</sup>

That final chapter of *ChrISt in History* is certainly a natural follow-up to the previous section. But there are others, some written, some unwritten, some beyond me but bubbling up in you of this new millennium. There is the earlier written push of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, with its central attention on Husserl’s contribution to the Calculus of Variation as related to a marvelous analogue to the deeper calculus of variation that, in spite of local hates, is to springtime its Way into a Global sisterhood and fellowship of history, into a larger *Lebensraum*, a healing room.<sup>273</sup>

## 11. The Fundamental Incompleteness Theorem

“Made my heart so sore  
I just couldn’t think any more”<sup>274</sup>

---

<sup>272</sup>From the tenth song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

<sup>273</sup>So ends the first of four quite evidently incomplete reflections, symbolic of the incompleteness of this book, yet with hopefilled symbolism. That, indeed is the meaning of the fuller parallel work “of conclusion” to which these four short reflections also belong, *Joistings* 27, “In the twenty seventh place”, referring to both chapters 19 and 20 of *Insight*. And the hopefilled symbolism is the incomplete list of seven metagrams,  $W_i$ , distributed throughout this book, metagrams that control our slippings into rich description below the demands of the two canons of explanation. Perhaps the best of my analogies regarding the history and future of the healing *Raum* of hedics, is the paralleling of “The Calculus of Variation” in physics with “The Calculus of Variation” of hedics, done in chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. Neither Husserl scholars nor Lonergan students pay much attention to Husserl’s push forward, described there, in the company of the great Berlin mathematicians: that locates my analogy as quite futuristic as well as fantastic. So perhaps you might at first nudge your fantasy more gently with a comparison of Plato’s planning of the running of a city with my take on Lonergan’s planning of the running of the globe. The issue is the same as that of the frontispiece. And this ends the first of four footnotes to our four end-sections. (The other three notes are notes 276, 279, and 282 below)

<sup>274</sup>From the eleventh song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

I have had this problem before, of course, and a previous answer might will be meshed in here, the answer of the final chapter of *Process: Introducing themselves to Young (Christain) Minders*, a book written in peculiar isolation in Oxford 1988-89. There, the answer was to wind together an italicized climb beyond present dreams and screams with a discomforting “advance” back through the early chapters of *Insight* that asked for a return to, a re-turning of, the first page of the first chapter of *Insight*.<sup>275</sup>

But if I was to push forward freshly here towards an Incompleteness Theorem, one that would sublimate the achievements of Goedel and Fermat-Wiles, a sublimation that would make hearts sore and soar, it would pivot on what I might consider a final theorem of *Insight*, contextualizing the effort of that book, a theorem presented by Lonergan in the summer of 1954.

"The Method in theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating  $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$  as  $n$  approaches infinity. For the rest: ordo universi. From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God."<sup>276</sup>

---

<sup>275</sup>This re-turning is related to the project of *Cantowers 27-31*, which we have considered at various levels previously. The 5 Cantowers parallel the first 5 chapters of *Insight* but also the first 5 chapters of Feynman's 3-volume *Lectures on Physics*, so that the emphasis is on the shift from doctrinal reading - like reading about mountain climbing - to climbing reading. This is a key challenge of these next generations, a challenging of descriptive contentment. I would recall here another page turning, from the word *assembly* of page 249 of *Method* to the word *includes* at the top of page 250. (On that precise turning, see SOFDAWARE 4, “Care: from Name to *Nomos*”). On *include* see in particular the quotation from Le Carre in note 279 below, with its reference to chapter 6 above, on economics. Page 250 is the crisis page for the future of theology and philosophy and the particular pointing here is to the fact that the foundational person without a thematic economic position is a fraud. For fuller reflections on the crisis one needs the mountain climbing of the 200 pages regarding that single page 250 that is SOFAWARE 1-8 and *Quodlibets* 1-12.

<sup>276</sup>Letter of Lonergan to Fr. Crowe, May 1954. I doubt if Crowe had much idea what Lonergan was talking about. Do you? So, we are at our second note in our third-last end section`. Back then, or forward, to the come-about text of the frontispiece, repeated more than once. Keep it, and the quotation above, as best you can “in your intellectual paws”(PL, 357) and consider that only in this context is a serious thinker in a **position** ( take the word seriously!) to push on to ask in what way is the human spirit spirit? That is where Lonergan places the question of **the**

## 12. Divergent Convergence on Encouraging Tolerance

“But the great goddess  
Has us blessed”<sup>277</sup>

“A manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God," a development blossoming in luminous spiralling foundational tolerance, a Gaia blessing that would remove from global “action the widespread impression of complacent irrelevance and futility.”<sup>278</sup> “Song becomes a more personal lyric .... and the cosmic whole summons philosophy

---

**spiritual.** In *Lack in the Beingstalk*, (see note 105 of chapter 4, notes 87 and 94 of chapter 3), I have noted the difficulty of that question. One does not skip through *Insight* to find a short proof for the immortality of the soul; the human group climbs towards that self-explanation with massive slowness, ontogenetically and phylogenetically. *Insight* must be read in later millennia with all the climbing subtlety of the third and fourth definitions of generalized empirical method (see sections 2 and 3 of this chapter). This throws (when done!) magnificent light both on the significance of the lift of global supernaturalism and on the stumblings and rumblings of both Aquinas and Lonergan in the area of the goings-on [literally] of the genetic reaching of the posthumous spirit. But perhaps it would be easier to contemplate an earlier central difficulty, one manifested by the muddles on truth of the views of phenomenology and logic presented in the book of that name (**PL**). Lonergan’s stand is The Position, but like scholasticism in its use of axioms, he does not push for an axiomatics. This is a topic I have dealt with occasionally, noting the incompleteness of Lonergan’s statement in *Insight* 388[413]. There are missing axioms I have noted previously: of intentionality, of infinity. But there are also deeper axioms of incompleteness: an axiom of slow genetic achievement both ontogenetic and phylogenetic; an axiom of posthumous beatific incompleteness; an axiom of eternal incompleteness. It is the first of these that is to gradually incarnate, in the Tower and in plane meaning, the street mystery of tolerance. The other two have to do with “infinite surprise”, and that leads us to the final section and the final of the four footnotes, note 282 below. But first, note 279 and the second last section, and the quest for global tolerance.

<sup>277</sup>From the twelfth song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

<sup>278</sup>Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 367. The blessing, unjust-steward-wise, has to ferment out of “the far more arduous task (1) of effecting an advance in scientific knowledge, (2) of persuading eminent and influential people to consider the advance both thoroughly and fairly, and (3) ....” (ibid., 366-7)

to venture on its speculative way.”<sup>279</sup>

“The last time I saw you / I fought with you / I fought  
with you / I didn’t mean to ‘ I didn’t mean to / Oh say  
you’ll see me / Let me say sorry / The next time I see  
you / I’ll love you / I’ll be sweet to you / I’ll take you to  
my healing room.”<sup>280</sup>

### 13. Entrophy

“Lord have mercy”<sup>281</sup>

13.7 billion entropic years on its knees of finality, with 4 million years of dedicated souls posing as angels within a cosmic unity that escaped Aquinas and his predecessors, that escaped the tired attention of Lonergan: this indeed would be an entrophy, swinging it all into a larger actual unity of layered improbabilities, the rest oration of “infinite surprize”.<sup>282</sup> “It”? “Swinging

---

<sup>279</sup>*Insight*, 536[560]. So we venture on the way of the third note in this our second-last section. That note centres on the long-term incarnation of the axiom of genetic and phylogenetic incompleteness that is to be the possession and the possessing of the Standard Modelers, the Tower People, a possession mediating global life, religious living certainly but obviously including its macro-, micro- and meso- economic relating. “Where to begin? Everywhere! Which path to follow? All of them” (see the first and last notes of chapter 6 above, taken from John Le Carré’s novel, *The Constant Gardiner*). By what fantasy might we envisage such tolerance and care, such non-harvesting in the blooming of goodwill, a mystery of lamb and lion together?

<sup>280</sup>From the twelfth song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD.

<sup>281</sup>From the thirteenth and final song of Sinead O’Connor’s *Faith and Courage* CD. There is background talk to this singing, to which I add the foreground of *Finnegans Wake*: “Lord, heap miseries upon us yet entwine our arts with laughters low!” (FW 259); the subtle wounders of the Divine Comedy that loft us to our knees; “Sandhyas! Sandhyas! Sandhyas!” (FW 593)

<sup>282</sup>These words end the book *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, written thirty five years ago. A great part of the challenge, in this present culture, is to lift Proust’s view of growth from aesthetic apprehension to the full zone of explanatory living, kataphatic contemplation that meshes with road living. The paragraph above is just a dense invitation, a bit of a Philmac last theorem, something that might have been said thirty five years - or forty years - later. Wile’s

into”?

“Not an isolated atom detached from all context, but precisely as part of a context, loaded with the relations that belong to it in virtue of a source which is equally the source of other concepts.”<sup>283</sup>

---

proof of Fermat’s last theorem ( “Modular Elliptic Curves and Fermat’s Last Theorem”, *The Annals of Mathematics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ser., Vol. 141, no. 3 (May, 1995), pp. 443-551) runs 109 pages, 102 months thinking, starting with what for non-specialists is an incomprehensible sentence: “An elliptic curve over  $\mathbf{Q}$  is said to be modular if it has a finite covering by a modular curve of form  $\mathbf{X}_0(\mathbf{N})$ .” What incomprehensible sentence about an infinite covering of the human  $\mathbf{Q}$  might I begin with, matching and sublating Joyce’s “riverrun past Eve and Adam ...” of *Finnegans Wake*? It would have to twist into energy’s finality Aquinas’ suggestion of a divine boost of separated spirits’ knowledge, Eve’s and Adam’s (see *Summa Theologica*, Ia, q. 89, a.1, ad 3m), and lift that reflection into a context that improves both his struggle with angel’s living and his Aristotle-trapped reach for cosmic integrity and circumincessionality. His suspicions regarding natural resultance (see *Verbum*, 143-48) would then rise towards convictions regarding supernatural open achievements: something of an eternal exigence (see **PL**, index under *exigence*) paradoxically fulfilling. Something on the explanatory level that would echo in full grandeur the poem (see *Cantower2*: “Sunflowers Speak to us of Growing”) of the *Cantowers*: “Sun flowers, Son-flowered, / Speak to us of growth / Seed cauled, cribbed, / Kabod yet confined, / Crossed with dark earth, / Light-refined, / Rill open-ends a trill / Annotaste of Throat.”

<sup>283</sup>Lonergan, *Verbum*, 238. A next place to bring to the fore the issue of the book: working after 2111 A.D. in the context of The Standard Model. But have you figured out sufficiently what I am pointing to by that name? Our journey remains incomplete, perhaps, even in its elementary heuristic identification? The *Eldorede* series, completed in the Summer of 2007, should help a bit!