

Prehumous 11

Fostering Functional Specialization

1. A Game without a Plan

Taking page 250 of *Method in Theology* seriously would seem to be a key to the initial fostering of this cyclic collaboration. But the move has to be gentle, minimalist. It seems to me plausible that if Lonergan were taking the stand that he requires of dialecticians, he would take a stand on the implementation that he suggests in the second half of the page. “This is how I see the future”. That future, he would optimistically claim, is to include a slow emergence of the doing of the tasks sketched on the first half of the page.

An obvious beginning of that emergence is making the emergence a pragmatic topic, which at present is not the case. The beginning of that beginning would seem to be: each of us who are interested in Lonergan’s suggestions about ourselves taking a stand on this particular page of suggestions. You think? You understand? You stand?

I am clearly not talking just about dialecticians here: I am talking about you, even if your interest is restricted, say, to applications of Lonergan’s self-attentive strategies in a grade six classroom. Do you support this “making a topic”?¹ The general support is like the supporting of a game, soccer or tennis: a support of attention, of enthusiasm.

The fostering? Well, that is a different type of support. Within the general population of supporters and admirers, there is to be a subgroup who would involve themselves in the next decade, according to their ability, in getting the show on the road. That subgroup need to be articulate about its stand: aligning itself with Lonergan - or with me now, as I putter forward. I have been talking about Lonergan’s stand for forty years now: isn’t it time that I did something practical about it?! Join me, as I make a move; improve on my suggestions and my moves.

¹ “ ... and therefore promote”; the reference is to *Method in Theology*, 253.

To what degree might you join me? Many, certainly, are busy with other projects. But might you not join me then minimally by becoming a genuine supporter of the great game of Cosmopolis? ²

2. A Game Plan, Step One.

Here, oddly, the genuine supporter-population may be skewed towards the young enthusiasts rather than the old experts. Lonergan spent a dozen years coming up with the broad game-plan and with the brilliant sub-plan that is page 250 of *Method in Theology*. The brilliance of the plan and sub-plan seems to have escaped many of the older experts. A first piece of my game plan, then, is to invite the older folk to bring a fresh eye to the page, where I mean not just their eyes but the eyes of their students. Again, “making it a topic.” Since I am one of those older folk, that is what I am doing here, but I add the suggestion that the younger folk need to push the topic, cautiously. So, a teacher may be talking of a dialectic enterprize: what, a student might ask, has this got to do with the structure of dialectic as presented on that page, with startling precision, by Lonergan?

3. The Game-Plan: a Step Up.

The last question is a neat step-up, a step up towards a stand up, clasped. The teacher’s stand is called for, so that the student knows where the teacher stands. The teacher’s real stand may be in some old style of dialectic: some vague comparative business.³ It is best to know this, to have this up front. Indeed, that is the whole point of the second half of page 250. In an energetic classroom exchange there would be a shabby but useful shadow of the subtle goings-on describe in those last lines.

²The characteristics of Cosmopolis are shown to be verified in functional collaboration in Joistings 22, “Reviewing Mathews’ Quest and Ours”.

³This is a dominant ethos of present writing, including thesis-writing. On the remedy, see section 6 below.

But the core of the step-up that I envisage here is your step-up consequent to this reading. And I plead here for an honest minimalism. If you are young, you certainly do not share Lonergan's foundational stand as expressed by him later in the book. Having some little grip on this is part of the honesty, but let us not fuss over that now. The focus is on functional collaboration. Might you come to seriously think that such collaboration is the way of the future, the answer to the massive global problem raised in the concluding section of *Insight* chapter 7?

Here I would note a happy part of this minimalism, summed up in my claim that "Lonergan is the foster-father of functional collaboration, but history is its mother."⁴ What do I mean by that? I have spent forty years nudging people to notice how, in every zone of inquiry, there has emerged a mess groaning for the division of labour. Oddly, one does not need a theory of levels of consciousness to get this sense of history's mothering.⁵

But this happy minimalism does require attention to the groaning in some area or areas that are familiar: for many of my readers these are the areas of philosophy and theology. And here I must return to the point made at the end of *Prehumous 8*: I have to rely on your good will to lead you into some of the accounts of the need and the relevance of functional specialization.

Still, we can have a step-up here in that some of us can, in an amateurish fashion, tackle the issue of the history of method in philosophy and theology, maybe even method's history elsewhere. But we shall get back to that later.

⁴This is the central message of the first chapter of the Website book, *Method in Theology. Revisions and Implementations*.

⁵This is an important perspective on a operable minimalism expressed in detail in chapter 3 of McShane, *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism*, Axial Publishing, 2002.

4. Pointers from Successful Elementary Sciences

We need fantasy to encourage us, especially fantasy based on other successes in the long search for explanation. Let us think of the simpler areas: physics, chemistry, the calculus of variation. But I focus here on physics, the simplest of sciences. And I focus us, in a manner that can help us forward significantly, on research. You will recall perhaps that Lonergan remarked to colleagues, after the publication of *Method in Theology*, that he had spent too little space on research in the book. A pause over the orientation of a physicist in good research, even just the imaginative pause of *haute vulgarization*,⁶ can bring forward in us as oh so obvious, like Columbus' answer to the problem of standing the egg on its end, the character of the poise required for good research.

But first, think of research in the broad sense that includes questions like, What could go wrong at my dinner party?, What do we have to watch for in protecting the President?, What might I do my thesis on?, What is wrong with my tennis serve?, What is wrong with my molar or my mind or my mutt?

The poise that poses such questions is an informed poise, or a poise that is open to being better informed. One checks with veterans in the area. One seeks to do so because the good veteran is so "up" with the zone that they can home in on the locus of answering the question. Against the background of such musing we can turn to physics, even if it is not a zone familiar to us. At least we have heard of cyclotrons and the output of experiments in them. And all we seek, at this stage, is some sense of what being "up" means. We get at that sense simply by attending to the reach of the question, Who reads the data on the question adequately? Someone sufficiently expert, not only on contemporary theories but on what is "going forward" in you, in your interests, in history.

⁶See Lonergan, *Collected Works*, vol. 6, 121, 155. Chapter 3 of McShane, *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, Axial Publishing, 2007, is titled "*Haute Vulgarisation*" and points towards the Tower Community's later control of popularization.

Our topic explodes here for you, but let us focus on physics. The data-reader is expected - even examined on this matter - to be at least “up” with the standard model, with where it came from, with where it is weak or suggestive. The Standard Model has a technical meaning, but not to worry about this. The standard model is a complex of theoretic relations that fits current data pretty well; and don’t let the word current fool you here. It includes the goings-on of 13⁺ billion years ago. And it anticipates further findings. Indeed, it is informedness about this anticipation that haunts the research question.

But my objective here is popular plausibility. You notice, then, a certain genetic element in the “being up”? The standard model fits into a genetic perspective, a genetic system that includes it as **the present best system**. If I use the symbol **GS** here, it should not frighten. GS simply stands for **Genetic System**, and the Standard Model is the “front end” (operator and integrator, in you recall the analysis of development in *Insight*) of the GS.

But, patience, there is more to be added: the past and the future are messier, laced into the fractal global geometry. Things and theories and experiments have gone wrong and they may go wrong in the future. There is need, in physics, in any zone, to handle this by adding a context to the **GS**. Might I use the symbol **UV** for this addition? Yes, the reader of *Insight* notices that UV might refer to universal viewpoint. But let us not fuss about that for the moment. Let us pause over the plausibility that the researcher in physics is best prepared by having a perspective summed up symbolically as **UV + GS**.⁷

5. Stumbling Beginnings

To some it comes a surprise that researchers need the full present perspective if they are to operate successfully. Yet it is pretty evident, when you advert concretely to

⁷See note 14 below.

successful scientific practice, or medical or tennis practice in consulting, advising, etc. In this short section we turn for help first to chemistry and then to the (no doubt unfamiliar to you yet) Calculus of Variation to find our way into what Lonegan invites when he writes of “a normative pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results.”⁸

You may have little idea of what is meant by The Standard Model in present physics, but you certainly have come across the Periodic Table of chemistry. It is regularly built into the covers of school texts in chemistry and I’m sure it flashes upon your imagination as you read. PT is to some extent the SM of Chemistry. Only to some extent: PT has changed over the past 150 years, and indeed it has changed genetically. So thinking about it helps us to glimpse better the genetic place of **the present best system**. The present PT, with refinements on the version of the 19th century that need not bother you, is th parallel to the SM in physics.⁹

And perhaps I can leave it to you to envisage how and why the PT_{now} requires operationally to be in a similar context as its physics’ little sister: chemistry has its UV + GS, the heuristic context of its concrete *anamnesis* and *prolepsis*. One is educated into it by a culture of teaching and learning at the later levels in schooling. No one graduates in chemistry without having a decent grip on the PT_{now} : well, maybe not ‘now’ but of the past decade. No one does serious research without climbing up to the ‘now’, at least in their small corner of interest. And no one gets into industrial chemistry’s inventive zone without thinking concretely about the future possibilities of that PT_{now} .

Now this is all pretty strange to the contemporary philosopher or theologian. But think of it in terms of present schools of philosophy and traditions of theology: in a philosophy graduate program in Oxford, and I’m sure something similar holds in other schools, there is a sort-of taken-for-granted perspective. What I am talking about here,

⁸*Method in Theology*, 4.

⁹A context for all this is, of course, the work of Kuhn and his school. See *Cantower XVI*.

and what Lonergan was suggesting for theology, is a future taken-for-granted perspective. But we shall get on to that in the next section. Let us stay with simpler topics: so I move from contemporary chemistry to ancient calculations of variation. I do so because it gives an interesting set of helps to our envisaging our present problem of stumbling.

So, we find ourselves back with a problem of Virgil's *Aeneid*, which can be posed thus: given a length of rope, what is the best shape it can be laid out in, end-to-end in order to have it contain the most area? You can, of course, reenact the required messing with a small loop of string on a table. You can make it square, rectangular, elliptical, circular, or just messy. For each shape that you form, you have to be able to calculate the area. How are you on the area of the ellipse? - a nice side-exercise! But I suspect that you have guessed the best shape?

Now the Calculus of Variation has come a long way since then: something symbolized by the capital letters of the title. But we won't go there, except to note again that its "long way" is a series of CV_i , with the recent taught version - close then to CV_{now} - being in such a text as *Calculus of Variation*.¹⁰ What more can I say here that might help, beyond what I put in the footnote? The text that I just mentioned is pretty-well incomprehensible, even for graduates in mathematics. It requires the normal slow climb of understanding, as does any text that expresses a serious climb to explanation. And I suppose that there is a general point to be made here, relating to climbing to serious understanding. But it is, fortunately, one made by Lonergan in his brief but biting comments on *haute vulgarization*¹¹ as opposed to the serious control of meaning

¹⁰ I.M. Gelfand, *The Calculus of Variation*, translated and edited by Richard A. Silverman, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1993. I used this text in the prolonged analogy developed in chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, Axial Publishing, 2007. Section 2 of the chapter deals with Husserl's work in that field, which yielded his thesis done under Weierstrass in 1882.

¹¹ See the references at note 6 above. Add *Topics in Education*, 145.

that depends on building complex images.¹² His comments invite honest brooding, honest explanatory reaching that parallels the climb from the Aenead's efforts to CV_{now}. A learned *haute vulgarization* takes a subtly viscous stand against the climbing, especially in the more difficult human sciences.

So, for instance, page 250 of *Method in Theology* is like the table of contents of an unwritten text such as *The Calculus of Variation*. Taking the stand of a real assent to that claim, that is the present stumbling block to our stumbling beginning. UV + GS, in the case of philosophy and theology, is the larger issue of this stand, in so far as that real assent sees and seizes that Standard Model, but only in heuristic hope, as what binds together the full community of collaborators in global care in the cyclic dynamic that I have called *The Tower of Able*.

6. Tracking and Avoiding Distracktions

To make serious sense of my concluding sentence of the previous section requires some parallel to the climb represented by the contemporary text in the Calculus of Variation. The Calculus of Variation invented by Lonergan and so gently expressed by him is eventually to be a towering global care, incomprehensible to common sense but yet having THEN¹³ an acceptability in common sense analogous to present commonsense bowing to science. So what I am writing about here is, so to speak, far out. Yet it seems to me that there are hints of a few strategic moves that we could identify descriptively and implement stumblingly.

¹²The complex of images are presented in *Prehumous 2*. The Web book, *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, has as frontispiece the controlling image that is the two central quotations from Lonergan on the issue: *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, University of Toronto Press, 2002, 151 and *Insight*, 514[537]. The first quotation regards the "comeabout" which is a regularly referred to topic and the second is on the need for a controlling image in difficult matters.

¹³**Cantower V**, "Metaphysics THEN", introduced the notion of a sublation of Zen and Ken thinking into a THEN or **Ven** heuristic.

I have focused above on the presuppositions of research that are to be a norm of the future: probably a surprise to many of you. In physics such research leads to an identification of anomalies which are passed forward to theoreticians, who share the (UV + GS)_{now}.¹⁴ In a later development of physics the passing on will continue to historians who will grapple with larger problems of what is going on, and sometimes¹⁵ come up with genetic shiftings from the present “now” view. And so on round the cyclic structure to ground loving modifications in the common sense of searchings and streets and sales and cellphones, whatever. So, quantum leaps lift the possibilities within human loneliness.

Questions abound here, not just about the physics of the future, but about our search for leads in our struggle to improve the global care of human meaning. They are questions that are to be answered by a communal effort to rewrite *Method in Theology* in these next generations. What seems best here is for me to draw attention to some broad strategies that could be implemented in these next years, strategies that would nonetheless be permanent characteristics of the Tower in the third stage of meaning.

Back to physics, then, for a key clue-in. It is not part of present front-line physics to converse, say, with those who cling to a Newtonian past or to old nuclear models. Physics tracks along with the Standard Model.¹⁶ Implementing that parallel in new-

¹⁴I am referring here regularly to the central image of our topic, presented in various places e.g. Prehumous 2. In that image, however, there is only marked the common UV. Only in recent years have I come to grips with the more complex cycling heuristic of the best available fruit of the efforts of the seventh specialty. It gives the community a much more powerful common heuristic.

¹⁵One must beware of exaggerating large-scale creativities. Recall the context mentioned in note 9. This is tremendously important in the present context of backward theology, where the primary drive must be one of learning.

¹⁶There is little point in adding comments here on cogent and colourful but unverified String Theories. Later in this page I mention attention to odd-balls, eccentrics. String theory is certainly an instance. In 1977, when I was assisting Lonergan in preparing for his first teaching of his economics (Spring, 1978) we kept an eye out for the eccentrics who did not fit the Standard

style Lonergan studies would be amazingly helpful. I have written about the norms of theological tracking in various places, and presented a key “relay race” diagram. The cycle resembles a relay race with 8 participants on each team. The baton is exchanged by the Indigo¹⁷ group with all possible finesse. What about other teams? One should envisage here, realistically, other styles of organizing the running: even to think of an opposition of a single runner: a lone ranger type. One may find it worthwhile to think of what would parallel a flat-earth society. But my main point here is that conversation with such opposing views or styles has to be precisely controlled. This gives a quite effective edge to serious implementation of Lonergan’s suggestion, eventually grounding respect for its collaborative achievement and even promoting the wider implementation that is eventually to be global and omni-disciplinary.

What is that control of conversation? Conversation with opposed or dated views is to be limited to two zones of the cyclic operation. First, there is the zone of research to which we have been attending. Research must be open to the goings-on of all oddballs in the general area. This is a listening poise, a one-sided sort of conversation. Now there is the other end of the cycle that is related to the specialty Communications: again, a sort-of one-sided conversation, but now predominantly a speaking.

Is that it for conversation? Per se, yes.¹⁸ But what, you may ask, about dialectic? This needs a refining pause. Stuff picked up as relevant or anomalous in Research finds its transformed way to the specialty Dialectics. The Dialectic team, with its relatively uniform perspective of (UV+ GS)_{now}, separately but eventually collaboratively go

Model in economics, a model which of course still holds sway.

¹⁷The relevant diagram or metagram is in *Prehumous* 2: I use a parallel set of teams rainbow-named, stopping at the outside, the sophisticated best, at the usual 2nd last colour indigo, with its horrible pun, “In They Go”!

¹⁸The *per accidens* includes the reality of random sharings of enlightenment. For a complex imaging of the heuristics of inner conversations of functional collaboration, see McShane, *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, 1998, 108.

through the six operations. Are they in conversation with opposed views, non-positional views? Only mediatedly, through the cycle from Research.

This feature of the work, which probably seems strange, helps towards envisaging concretely the progress that occurs in a relatively mature collaborative dynamic. As stumbling beginners, we find it hard to envisage what might be meant by shaking off counterpositional stuff. The beginners' tendency is to think in gross terms: all or nothing conversions. In the mature Tower (UV + GS) is the perspective of what I might call the converted. What is cycled up, as relevant or anomalous, is an aggregate of possible, indeed probable, refinements. The shift from probable to plausibly actual refinements is the task of the dialectic community feelingfully complimenting and opposing one another. So, Foundations may be improved in a given cycle, a given generation. But the improvement comes from the inner community, not from conversation with those with views that are just not in the ballpark of present achievement.

Finally, something should be said about conversation within any specialty, but it can best be dealt with in the next section.

7. "You in Your Small Corner, and I in Mine"¹⁹

I was tempted, indeed, to postpone the remaining topics of this *Prehumous* for a later *Prehumous*, but it seems better to add the three final sections, but with the brevity of the first three sections of this essay. For, my hope is that this *Prehumous* would set the tone of the Halifax effort of 2008. So, while I am overwhelmed with the much that could be said here, I cut back from it with an eye on its emergence as we get together for mutual self-help.²⁰ We must put the charity of *I Cor 13* back into the context of different

¹⁹The phrase concludes each verse of Susan Warner's lyrics (1968) of the hymn, "Jesus Bids Us Shine". The usual music is that of Edwin O. Excell.

²⁰I recall the slogan on the edge of the metagram W3: "Normative mutual-self-mediating of Periodic Cycles of the Being of Controlling Meaning".

gifts, of *I Cor 12* and *14*. “Jesus bids us shine” in a manner that lifts the cosmic zeal and its love for God into a global interpersonal wonderland. There are reasons to suspect that we are at the beginning of the longer cycle of incline, with two billion years to go. Within that panoramic fantasy, kindled by ineffable but kindly light,²¹ we each must struggle to identify our little yet glorious corner, cornering, being cornered by God, in our spot in history.

The identification is humdrum. It brings to mind Naaman’s leprosy and Elisha’s inviting him to paddle and splash in the Jordan. “But Naaman went away angry, ‘I thought that he would surely come out to me and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, wave his hand over the spot and cure me of my leprosy. Are not Abana and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, better than any of the waters of Israel? Couldn’t I wash in them and be cleansed?’ ”²² Are we not back at the first paragraph of the first chapter of *Insight*? Are we looking towards the waters of some Abana rather than the waterlift of Archimedes?

So the identification begins in each of our little corners.²³ Could I have a shot at writing a paragraph about my own present interest or work that is functionally specialized, that is not all over the place theologically, that could help the tracking of

²¹The evident reference is to Newman’s Hymn, “Lead, Kindly Light” which talks of one step being enough in the gloom. In spite of the gloom, as I recall, he was having a cheerful Bloomsday (June 16, 1933) when he wrote the words. Note the identification of the light of minding as ineffable: very central element in the paradox of humans being that is central to the theorem of the natural desire of human mind. On this there is, of course, Lonergan’s long Latin work, *De Ente Supernaturale*, of which there is a translation in the Lonergan Archives in Toronto. I repeat the quotation from *The Incarnate Word* - not yet available - given in *Prehumous 8* at note 5: “What is ineffable in us, what our life is the expression of, is the light in which all knowledge is imparted to us, the light by which we naturally desire to know being, and therefore to know God by his essence.”

²²*2 Kings 5* : 11-12.

²³A helpful pointing to the self-identification is Quodlibet 8: “The Dialectic of My Town, *Ma Vlast*”.

history's groanings and yearnings? Fr.Fred Crowe used to ask, "What specialty are you in?" and I amused him, chatting in the 1970s, with my slogan, "If something is worth doing it is worth doing badly". Probably you do not even have too many clues about how to begin to do it badly? Certainly, I do not. Should we not, then, try to learn together, learning by intussuscepting Lonergan's talk of self and of collaboration in order to leave him behind in a glorious mustard mustering surge?

So, we can begin, amateurishly, to tiptoe round page 250 of *Method in Theology*, assemble and self-criticize our poor efforts at a *scienza nuova*, aiming towards a global sharing that is to blossom from a coming convergence of world legations²⁴ within that new science, aiming always at the aesthetic transformation of our present struggles and streets, our hidden human lonelineses and longings. "What then is needed is a qualitative change in me, a shift in the centre of my existing from the concerns manifested in the *bavardage quotidien* towards the participated yet never in this life established eternity that is tasted in aesthetic apprehension."²⁵

²⁴To the echoed title of R.E.Whitson's *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*, I add the foundational fantasy of the Tower of Able mediating effectively a transformation of organisations such as the U.N., The World Bank, etc.

²⁵I quote from a review by Lonergan in *Gregorianum* (36) 1956, 138, of Jules Chaise-Ruy, *Les dimensions de l'être et du temps*. The review appears now in the *Collected Works*, volume 20, pp.209-10. In a later review there, pp. 222-3, of books on the possibility of philosophy, he mentions the need for a *scienza nuova*.

8.. Footsteps in the Sans, Speaks, Stands, Clasps²⁶

My appeal here, pretty obviously, is to those people interested in Lonergan because of their interest in the Christian God. But our first step, or perhaps another first step, is related to *Insight* chapter 17, section 1: the sense of mystery, the sands of time, the *sans* of our “Lonerganesque” times.

I would wish us all to prayer serious over that powerfilled paragraph 2 of section 1.2 of that chapter. *Sans* resonates better in the French of Pierrot Lambert, leading up to that final sentence, sentencing, “Et avant tout, ce qui fait défaut, c’est une connaissance de ce qui fait défaut”²⁷ No one who has a serious sense of history, of what happened to Aristotle and Aquinas, can be happy with the past fifty years of Lonergan studies.

The issue, it seems to me, is that contemplative prayer that would ask, self-attentively, who are our lovers? That is the issue in Lonergan’s brilliant digestion of Aquinas’s self-searching, of which I recall his comment: “five years work for anyone who disagrees with me”. To that I add my own comment “fifty years work for anyone

²⁶My naming of the Trinity as *Speak, Spoke, Clasp*, emerged in increasingly richer ways from various preaching efforts since the 1960s. Here I both agree and disagree with Meister Eckhart. “But I say yet more (do not be afraid for this joy is close to you and is in you): there is not one of you who is so cross-grained, so feeble in understanding or so remote but he may find this joy within himself, in truth, as it is, with joy and understanding, before you leave this church today, indeed before I have finished preaching” (*Meister Eckhart, Sermons and Treatises*, translated and edited by M.O’C. Walsh, 3 vols (London, Watkins, 1981), Vol. 2, 91. One must pick up the pointers, leaving the church with a freshened gentle quest. The pointing and strategy are expressed in McShane, *Music That Is Soundless. A Fine Tuning for the Lonely Bud A*, Axial Publishing, 2007. I am touching here, however, on a massively complex and central issue, that raised in the first section of chapter 17 of *Insight*., but also by the work of Derrida. See, on Derrida and Eckhart, Amy Hollywood, “Preaching as Social Practice in Meister Eckhart”, *Mysticism and Social Transformation*, edited by Janet K. Ruffing, Syracuse University Press, 2001. I may not get back to this topic - indeed, see the concluding paragraph of the series, in *Prehumous 12* - but it can be so simply expressed as the issue of reaching, in the third stage of meaning, to a new *praxis* of gentle contemplative thinking, of bringing forth feminist Anteus of earthy muscular minding.

²⁷Lonergan, *L’Insight*, Bellarmin, 1996, 552. Excuse, please, missing accents.

who agrees with him.”²⁸ Need I recall his appeal in the Epilogue to the last article there? I have a solid suspicion that much Lonerganesque talk is not grounded in scanning the psychic skin of minding. What, for instance, is a judgment of value? The question falls within the reach of the final *Verbum* article, for our judgment of value is a pale thin shimmer-shadow of the Word,²⁹ the Eternal Judgment of Value of All, that nonetheless cherishes you and me in the intimate privacy of our scanned or unscanned skins.³⁰

But scanning those skins, that is the road to speaking and to Speak. The Eternal Word is the Stand of God, Clapsed in Proceeding Love. Within that Word, a non-describing non-descriptive Word that we must comeabout towards, the home-call eats up a loving cosmos’ zeal and asks for gentle repentance. The Lonerganesqueing repentance is to be from *haute vulgarization*, so easily meshed with rich descriptiveness.³¹ That descriptiveness makes shabby, even if mysteriously acceptable, the Song of the Adorable.³² It delays the chording, the cor-ding, of the cosmopolitan climb.

9. Minnesinging

I speak of a kataphatic reorientation and climb, one that is to effect the dynamics of anaphatic reaching. The present title relates to that challenge. It should bring to mind medieval German poets, but I am thinking here of that contemporary of Thomas

²⁸Lurking here is the issue of slow but accelerating adult growth. See *Lack in the Beingstalk: a Giants Causeway*, Axial Publications, 2007, 191-63, and also *Joistings* 3.

²⁹A classic context is worth recalling: *Contra Gentiles* Bk. IV, Chapter 11.

³⁰“A new name written, which no man knoweth, saving he that receiveth it” (*Revelations*, 2: 17).

³¹The problem of description is discussed in *Cantower XXIII*, “Redoubt Describing”, a Cantower that forms the undertow of the Website book, *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*.

³²The reference is to the *Bhagavad Ghita*. See my Website book, *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*, chapter 5.

Aquinas, Hadewijch of Antwerp, and her attention to love, “De Minne es al” (Minne [love] is everything).³³ But that tradition, and its study, is lacking the lift of the serious foundational prayer that has been our topic all along. I have touched on this topic in *Prehumous* 8 and only add a few concluding sentences now.

It seems to me that there is to be a lifting forward of the mystic tradition into the mainstream by prayerfully merging Insight 19, section 9, in the 5th and 6th places, with the contemplation³⁴ of the divine persons as³⁵ notional acts heuristically suggested in *De Deo Trino Systematica*.³⁶ That merging could, perhaps, be better seen as effected by another expansive deductive system beginning with “In the 27th place”³⁷ and, on the

³³Hadewijch’s 25th Letter, quoted in Vol 3 of Bernard McGinn, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, Crossroads/Herder, New York, 1998,201. The context there is an account of three contemporaries of Thomas: Chapter 5: “Three Great Beguine Mystics: Hadewijch, Mechthild, and Marguerite”.

³⁴Contemplation is now, in normative foundationality, in the third mode of generalized empirical method (see *Joistings* 21). So, one might think here of *The Spiritual Exercises* of Ignatius lifted into a new world. Or, in the present context, of what are considered his mystical reaches. Where would the suggested merging leave us in our reading of his *Spiritual Diary*: “I was knowing, or experiencing, or contemplating - the Lord knows - that to speak to the Father was to recognize that he was one Person of that Holy Trinity. This brought me to love that Person’s whole self; and that all the more because the other two Persons were by their very essence present in that One.”

³⁵Useful here is to associate this *as* with the *as* of self as self of *Phenomenology and Logic* (see the index under *Self*). It does not have, in either case, the usual mood of a negative abstractiveness.

³⁶The work from the Gregorian Press in 1964, is available in English and Latin in *The Triune God: Systematics*, University of Toronto Press, 2007. I was fortunate to get a signed copy from Lonergan that year. It is now a very battered fragmented prayer book. The present reference is to pages 368-75, and the key to the climb is the ineffably-luminous darkness expressed in the final sentence of the essay.

³⁷I have puzzled over the years about how much Lonergan adverted to, or indeed created, coincidences. One could envisage his smile at halting at the 26th place, thinking of Thomas’ next move in the *Summa*. That next move was the topic of my first theological article, still a useful introduction: “The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God,” *Theological Studies*, 1962: available now on the Website, in *Archives*.

way, the new Tao, relocating the third part of the *Summa*. But one must develop and keep, be kept by, a grip, a *minne* clasp, of the common model on which our searching and Lonergan's suggestion of collaboration pivots. This lesser³⁸ revision of the *Summa* takes its place in the genetic sequence of geo-historical systems.³⁹ The foundational (UV + GS)_{now} is to include that⁴⁰ sub-system shift in our loving search, our inner birthing of the Word,⁴¹ for attunement with and within the cosmic song of zeal.

³⁸Lonergan's functional cycling perspective is the major revision of the *Summa*. In his unpublished notes on that creative surge of February 1965 there is inserted the beginning of the *Prima Pars*, for me a sign that he was astonished at implications of his shift from Thomas' axiomatics to cyclic anti-foundationalism. See *Method in Theology*, chapter 11, section 2.

³⁹A help here is P.McShane, "Systematic, Communications, Actual Contexts", *Lonergan Workshop*, vol. 7, edited by Frederick Lawrence, Scholars Press, 1985. It is reproduced, on the Website, in chapter 7 of *ChrISt in History*. The geohistorical perspective and imaging is an addition, involving a significant complexification of the heuristics through attention to local systems over time e.g. the systems of Antioch and Alexandria, their merging, overlapping, etc etc.

⁴⁰The sub-system to which Fr.Doran has been drawing attention in recent works (see *Prehumous 9*) find its place in a subsystem - a "now" genetic systematics in the geo-historical heuristic - of the larger cyclic system through something like an inclusion in the sequence following the parallel of "the nineteenth place" of the new deductive expansion. But that is a topic for another day. Add the context of *Prehumous 9* and the detail of note 9 there.

⁴¹One can think here of the sublation of the tradition associated with Meister Eckhard regarding the birthing in us of the Word (see note 14 of *Prehumous 8*) into Lonergan's suggested perspective on "our inner word of the divine Word", *The Triune God: Systematics*, 513. Thus, anaphatic, kataphatic and mystic traditions can mustard-mesh the billion-year circumincession that shadows the *Eschaton*.