

Q. 29 (Frank Braio. February 28th). In what way does the study of neuro-science replace or remove the necessity of the study of the 'psyche'? Is the study of the psyche in the individual and even, perhaps, the search for the 'archetypes' of the 'collective unconscious' still a worthwhile enterprise in light of the progress of contemporary neuro-scientific studies? And could you intimate in some way the relationship between the latter and the former types of studies?

A. 29 This is a colossally complex question about the **way**, “in what **way**” to be intimated “in some **way**” that would define “a worthwhile enterprise”. You have, as you know, dropped us right into the mess of Lonergan’s inadequate expression of problems of expression in *Insight* 17.3, with the transitional solution sketched and canonized. We are back with Q. 28, where we faced the **way**-faring in an elementary fashion: how might we talk effectively to undergraduates of 60910? There I began with the possibility of starting with Linnaean description, perhaps of a flower. As I puzzled over this central problem of a luminous **way** of inviting luminous wayfaring, I thought of returning to scripture: not then the sunflower but the mustard tree. And indeed this could help the undergraduate, while letting the teacher dodge the “contrast between mythic expression and developed expression” (*Insight*, 568), playing out in the classroom the fact that “metaphor is revised and contracted myth” (*Insight*, 569). But Frank’s question ranges way beyond an undergraduate classroom, looking perhaps for a larger meshing of *Insight* 15’s push on development – recall the quotation at the end of A. 28 about the lift to the psychology of Freud and Jung – and the whole dense impossibility of *Insight* 17. The expression of that dense impossibility was something I had tried to “intimate” (Frank’s word) before in *FuSe* 2, but as I reread it now I sensed that it fails to intimate unless, so to speak, I am writing to an intimate, a mate of the set of assertions underpinning *Insight* 17 and *CWL* 12 (See *Posthumous* 16, “Spiralling Assertions as Psychic Skin”). But here, at all events, is that previous flight of fancy, from page four of *FuSe* 2, “Pedagogical Struggling with the Second Canon of Hermeneutics.”:

“But let me invite you to muse over the genetic sequence in humans, either as ontic or as phyletic. Can you push towards a control of this musing that holds to an explanatory

differentiation? I am thinking of the suggestive first metaword, $f(p_i; c_j; b_k; z_l; u_m; r_n)$. One might begin with the infant, “mewling and puking in the nurse’s arms,”¹ or with Helen shifting to language, or with the primitive hunter who has a cluster of words. One is, then, dealing with, in, within, an explanation of a performance in bare description, the fringe of a psychozoology of the prowling cat, the leaping cougar, the mastery of the descending hawk. One simply adds a Helenistic name.

Can you go on to envisage a beginning of explanation on some level? Is it to be on the level of physics or chemistry: the primitive control of time 20,000 years ago by sticks and moon-shapes, or the measuring of space by the early Egyptians, or the Chinese genesis of linguistic patterns, or the musings about atoms in Greece? Or is it to be Greek dramas’ initial correlations that, although only initial, held sway, as serious ventures in explanation, in Capital letters,² through much of the twentieth century? Whatever way you go, up or down, ontic or phyletic, you need the control of an elaborated first metaword, if you are to hold the sequencing in explanatory control. Furthermore, your heuristic needs the anticipatory fullness of a relatively³ terminal state of the genesis. Without that heuristic - and now I thinking of the full theoretic culture - the canon of complete explanation will be conveniently dodged or warped. At a “top” level, one stays with the Capital discussions of an old-style psychology. One is content to talk in philosophy of elements of meaning like questions, judgments, plans, as if they were free-floating forms, or perhaps zooming round a pineal gland. One theologizes about spirit as if we gorillas in the myst were angels in this-skies. Or one can muddle in the middle sciences, going up and down between “well-informed”⁴ chemicals and the anthropomorphic wonders of pet-behaviour. Or one can reduce chemistry to physics and learnedly brutalize progress in the simplest of sciences, physics, with persistent needs to blithely describe.”

¹Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, II, 6, 144.

²I recall being with Lonergan as he was bedded down the night before an operation in a Boston hospital, when he waxed eloquent and wittily about the way the capital letters of German were carried into English to give solemnity to words like Ego, Id, Shadow.

³A full eschatological heuristic is another matter.

⁴Texts in botany and zoology tend to talk in terms borrow from the distortions of information theory, so information is carried along by macromolecules etc.

This flight of fancy does add a mood, so that *haute vulgarization* become positive for the mate in the mate's inner words that are toned with a hard-won heuristic tonality of mystery – the central topic of that first section of *Insight* 17.⁵ But the positivity of the mood needs the kernel of a long-mustered seeded cherishing of the five semi-colons binding self-identification, character, into a “Meaning and Ontology” that is a Towering presence radiating to “Common meaning and Ontology” the invitation towards being one in linked bodies.

Which eloquence translates into *Insight's* plain talk of beginning by grappling with aggreformic thinking and living, an achievement that eludes our axial culture.

Am I answering your question on “the relationship between the latter and the former types of studies”? The to-be-cherished five semi-colons is to reveal to all types of culture that explanation is a layered business, an inner-worthwhiled control of the fragments that are neurochemistry and the stumbling descriptions of the followers of Freud and Jung. The distant goal – innerly, word and linked molecular whisperings, represented only in a later culture than ours - is to be an expression of the incarnate integrality of the subject named darkly by **W₁** and - move from ontic to phyletic - by **W₃**. And the luminous naming of course, sits there between: **W₂**. So, as in the simpler science of botany's two semi-colons, explanation will fill out the five semi-colons with defined – add the trickiness of secondary determinations - aggregates of acts that take the fogginess out of namings and descriptions of archetypes and collectivities by Plato, Damascene, Jung, Yeats, Durand, Duran Duran, etc etc. A genetics of that progress would not be linear, but geohistorical and of a complexity that goes beyond, in imaging, the 60910 paragraph of *Insight* or the talk in *Method* of ongoing, overlapping, merging contexts.

But what do I intimate by these rambles? Perhaps that “we are not there yet lifting our eyes more and ever more to the more general and more difficult fields of speculation Nor will it suffice to have some highest common factor of culture.... ” (*For a New Political Economy*, 20-21), and that full two paragraphs of 1942 can be easily modified to apply to the present question's reach. Lonergan offered a way, and his disciples, in the main, have dodged it. How

⁵ I would consider my two essays on “Liberal Arts: the Core of Future Science” (*Bridgepoise* 3 and 10) to be an existential context-nudging towards this inner mating, one that would be needed to transform the expression, say, of Aquinas in the *Summa* or Lonergan in *Insight*.

do we begin the journey? Yes, individuals like Frank must struggle solitarily to break forward foundationally: they do so by random dialectic and fantasy. But they remain ineffective, unrecycled, in need of the first broad lift of Cosmopolis, functional collaboration. That cyclic dynamic – and I have spelled this out all too often with little effect - is to generate a significant statistical shift in the global metaphysic, giving fresh effective meaning to the failed pre-cyclic suggestion of *Insight*, “the meaning of metaphysics primarily is pedagogical: it is heading towards an end that is unknown and cannot be disclosed; from the viewpoint of the pupil, it proceeds by cajoling or forcing attention” (*Insight*,423). The systematic cyclic apex, agony and ecstasy of the attention-forcing is *The 1833 Overture*, but in these times of a sick shabby following of Lonergan, the solitary authentic searcher may, like Luther, have to take a more public noisy stand against complacent decay.