

## Prehumous 3

### Procedural Analysis

#### 1. The Immediate Context of this Essay

The immediate context of this prehumous essay is twofold. First, it was originally meant to be the second appendix to the book, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*, which is now on the website with its sequel *Loneran's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*.<sup>1</sup> The second appendix was recommended by one of the University of Toronto Press readers, both of whom were enthusiastic about the book. The publishing project died, however, due to lack of funding from the Canada Council, and with it this second appendix as originally sketched. The first appendix, too, was omitted from the book, but appears above as Prehumous 2. That Prehumous 2, is simply a presentation of the various diagrams or metagrams that I use in the book MITRI. The second appendix would have dealt with pedagogy, the problem of illustrating, exemplifying, supplying phantasms etc. It is helpful to note here, elementarily, that the problem of pedagogy parallels that of chemistry, which is regularly taught "in the presence of " the standard metagram, the periodic table: what is needed is a sequence of concrete strategies that would carry the student into the world thus metagramed.

Secondly, there is the context provided by my essay on the dispute among three of my Loneran colleagues, Doran, Hefling, and Ormerod, regarding the grounding of systematic theology.<sup>2</sup> It is not important that you be, or become, familiar with the

---

<sup>1</sup>The first book can conveniently be referred to as *MITRI*, recalling the ancient Persian god of light and truth, Mitra. The second can, without loss, be referred to as *Standard Model*. The Standard Model is no more Loneran's than Maxwell's Equations are Maxwell's.

<sup>2</sup>*Theological Studies* 68 (2007): Charles Hefling, "On the (Economic) Trinity: An Argument in Conversation with Robert Doran", 642-660; Neil J. Ormerod, "Two Points or Four? - Rahner and Loneran on Trinity, Incarnation, Grace and Beatific Vision", 661-673; Robert M. Doran, "Addressing the Four-Point Hypothesis", 674-682.

dispute or the topic in order to share the present venture. It is enough to know that in that essay, and while writing that essay, I was pushed and pushing towards an effort to invite us all towards more precision regarding foundational reality and its objectification<sup>3</sup>, regarding then, us, in our deepest organic loneliness.<sup>4</sup>

The objectification has at present associated with it a cluster of names: transcendental analysis, self-appropriation, generalized empirical method, intentionality analysis, whatever. I myself have distinguished, had to distinguish, four strategies that can be related to the name *generalized empirical method*.<sup>5</sup> All very confusing to the beginner, or even to those on the road for decades.

Might there be a more helpful description, wafting us towards the explanatory?

So I was led back to the name that I myself used in the 1960s, *Procedural Analysis*. Hence the present title. But I would have you note that the issue here is not just a name but precisions about a strategy that is eventually - in a mature third stage of meaning - to be a dominant ethos of global culture. But that is a later topic.

---

<sup>3</sup>See *Method in Theology*, chapter 11, section 2.

<sup>4</sup>All great art images this loneliness, including “nature’s silent communing”(see *Topics in Education*, 225). As I look ahead to the naming problem of the final section, with reference to Pan or the Latin Faunus, there comes to me such images as Nijinski’s strange lonely dancing in *l’apremedi du faun*, or Emma Bovary’s lonely scratching on the tablecloth with her fork in front of the usual beef-stew and the usual Charles. But in a pananalytic culture (see section 4) art and nature become luminous invitations to carry the symphony of history forward. “Each member, each group, indeed our whole host, and its great pilgrimage, is only a wave in the eternal stream of human beings, of the eternal strivings of the human spirit towards the East, towards home” (Herman Hesse, *The Journey to the East*, London, 1970, 12).

<sup>5</sup>See my Joistings 21, “Research, Communications, Stages of Method” and Joistings 22, “Reviewing Mathew’s *Loneragan’s Quest*, and Ours”.

## 2. Procedural Analysis

As I settled in to this section now here, nowhere,<sup>6</sup> I sense the loneliness, perhaps even the futility, of what one might think of as yet another beginning. What is procedural analysis? Well, it is what you do when you read *Insight* properly for the first time in the mode of GEM2 and for the second time in the mode of GEM3. Properly? First, second? “Deshil Holles Eamus. Deshil Holles Eamus. Deshil Holles Eamus”<sup>7</sup> : going round all again and again and again, that is the human organism’s way, the way of the self-study of the spiritual-organism’s endless beginning.

Finitude proceeds. The Infinite Proceeds. The Sanskrit noise, *esati*, is the feeble ask, askance, askew, of one for the Other, Others. Procedural analysis is the askstance (about)<sup>3</sup> all.<sup>8</sup>

## 3. Procedural Practicalities

A teacher, a THEN mistress, is invaluable if you are to begin again. The first context of this essay was the context of a quest, a request, for illustrations. But in a proper doing of self-study, for the second or tenth time, and in a later culture, the

---

<sup>6</sup>The splicing above of here and now to nowhere neatly images the heart of the search for the meaning of the molecular search that is you and I and all of us. How spread out is and is to be the space-time of our loneliness? The *eschaton*, is it nowhere? Is it not rather to circumincess ever-refreshingly our empirical residence?

<sup>7</sup>James Joyce, *Ulysses*, Penguin, 1986, 314. I comment on this text at the end of Cantower XXXI, the end of my five chapter block mentioned below in note 14. From it there emerged the title of the full set of Cantowers: *Roun Doll, Home James*.

<sup>8</sup>This is certainly not the place to introduce you to the graduate topic of (about)<sup>3</sup>. It is dealt with briefly in section 2 of chapter 2 of *ChrISt in History*. It relates to Lonergan’s discussion of three orders of consciousness in his incomplete first chapter for *Method*, written in the spring of 1965, and available in the Lonergan Archives of Toronto in Batch V, section 7, which includes Lonergan’s “discovery pages” of functional specialization and a handwritten full sketch of that first chapter. Briefly, we go about our business spontaneously; ask about that business, any business of meaning, shifts us to another order, ordering, commanding, control, of consciousness. The third ordering is the reach from this reaching-discovery of local method to a pan-reach, to methodology. Such a methodology is to method as histozoology is to animals.

notion of illustration, becomes sidelined. Normatively, with statistical actuality in a billion years, a later culture pivots on the Childout Principle, **When teaching children geometry one is teaching children children.**

That is a policy I turned, returned, turned us, to, as I concluding my Cantower series with *Cantower XLI* on the sixth functional specialty, Doctrines or Policies. In a fully developed cyclic operation of the global system which is to be the Standard Model of increasingly beautiful<sup>9</sup> human procedure, that Policy takes on increasingly remote meaning in the towering saving of humanity. But the saving at present is a matter of you and I helping each other to rerereread *Insight* with freshened fantasy and panache, pan-ache.

I wrote the book *Process* at the tender age of 57, ending up on the first page of *Insight* and at the deathbed of Nadia Boulanger.<sup>10</sup> It could help. It is the third of five shots at an introductory book, the second of which is perhaps my recommended beginning.<sup>11</sup> *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations* invites in a tiptoe way the little exercises that paragraph one of *Insight* cherishes, and chapter six there is perhaps the beginning of the GEM3 beginning mentioned above.<sup>12</sup> And I fancy that some of you might be odd enough to move from there, and from that first paragraph of *Insight*, to a discomforting

---

<sup>9</sup>I point you here to a cherished line from Lonergan: line 16 of page 160 of *Topics in Education*: think of it in relation to Joyce's talk of art as he points to the basket in *A Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man*. Then enlarge your notion to a resonant molecular notion of the beauty of symphonic efficiency, both personal and phyletic.

<sup>10</sup>The sixth chapter ends with the beginning of *Insight*; the *Afterword* ends with Nadia's last words, spoken to Leonard Bernstein.

<sup>11</sup>The five efforts at introducing are, in order of emergence, *Towards Self-Meaning* (with Garrett Barden), Gill, Dublin, 1970; *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, 1974, now available on the website (all books etc there are free of charge); *Process: Introducing (Themselves) to Young Christian Thinkers*, available on the website; *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, 1998; *Introducing Critical Thinking*, Axial Publishing, 2006(written with Alessandra Drage and John Benton: a grade 12 textbook).

<sup>12</sup>See note 5.

effort to meet Archimedes at the bottom of that first page of *Insight*.

That is where my heavier introduction to *Insight* begins, in Cantower 27, where Archimedes' climb, presented by him in crazy deductive form, is centre-stage.<sup>13</sup> Some might meet me, risk coming with me there, in a fresh climb through the first five chapters of *Insight*?<sup>14</sup>

All can and should meet me as I greet Helen Keller in the first chapter of *A Brief History of Tongue*. This is a test case of seriousness. Helen, perforce, needed five weeks to blossom into a talking human. Do you wish to become a human that talks luminously (about)<sup>3</sup> talk, or do you wish to remain in the comfortably talking community of the current study of both linguistics and Lonergan?<sup>15</sup>

#### 4. Pananalysis

The Helen exercise is a pansophy, a panlinguistic heartlanding. Procedural analysis is the extending of the exercise so that it becomes internal to all proceedings of meaning. So, I am tempted to shift from the phrase *procedural analysis* to a single name, *pananalysis*. It may not an important shift. I think here of such little shifts as the shift from  $s$  with two dots over it to  $d^2s/dt^2$ , or the larger shift of my present effort to name metaphysics with metagrams. The first shift was a shift of calculus to a significant control of meaning; the second could lift the shared slogan, *conception of the integral heuristic structure*, into an effective global implementation. So pananalysis would be the

---

<sup>13</sup>The crazy deductive presentational method, of course, moves forward through Euclid, Newton, Weierstrass, and a vast present supporting cast, into all levels of today's classrooms.

<sup>14</sup>Those five Cantowers, 27 to 31, parallel *Insight*'s first chapters and the first five chapters of Richard Feynman's famous introductory text, *The Feynman Lectures in Physics*, many editions, Addison Wesley Publishing Co pb. Various other Cantowers are helpful parallels, most particularly *Insight* chapters 14- 20 and the Epilogue are paralleled by Cantowers 14-21.

<sup>15</sup>The little book *A Brief History of Tongue* is a lengthy musing (about)<sup>3</sup> the darkness at the heart of linguistics. But surely, you may say, such a darkness is not a presence in Lonergan studies? There are many sad darknesses in the hearts of present Lonergan students.

humble trans-Hellenic exercise internal to the cherishing of each and every meaning, the progressing pilgrims' *Praxisweltanschauung*.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Note **Praxis** orientation: human interest is normatively wholesome and practical. In conclusion, I recall the title of the first of my two papers delivered at the 1970 International Florida Conference, "Image and Emergence: Towards an Adequate *Weltanschauung*". Do I repeat myself? Only if you miss the meaning of the ontogenetic and phylogenetic growing of human meaning. Pananalysis has its deep root in the fact that each of us is a "Notion of Survival" (The title of Chapter 10 of *Wealth of Self*) and that notion reaches, not from a self to others but to a self with others, a reach that underpins e.g. the South-African reconciliation movement surrounding Ubuntu, short for the isiXhosa proverb, Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu, "a person is a person through their relationship to others." (I am indebted here to the work of the South African thinker, Dalene Swanson e.g. her doctorate thesis of 2005 at University of British Columbia, *Voices in the Silence: Narratives of disadvantage, social context and school mathematics in post-apartheid South Africa*).