

Chapter 8 Research

That the specialty of Communications follows on the specialty that reaches for a fullness of systematic meaning is pretty obvious. That Research, as a specialty, follows the functional specialty Communications is less obvious. Yet that is of a piece with the general thesis of recycling, with the meaning of the collaboration of the Ovalteam, the diagram and the dynamics of The Tower. It is not obvious, perhaps, but not too obscure. Perhaps we should go immediately to the analogy with successful science that begins *Method in Theology* but is ultimately not sufficiently exploited in the book. I really don't even need to develop the analogy. Experimental research in physics and in chemistry move forward from the most recent communications not only of up-to-date high theory but also of the most recent experimental successes, techniques, practical results. The zoologist, pushing forward toward a better grasp of the nature of the giraffe does not try for his sons-eye view¹: he gets up to date on the current literature, theory, research, applications.

Back then to the cyclic process, which of course is to include the positive sciences in its full development. The key image all along here is the Oval and the manner in which function focuses the attention of the collaborators. In chapter 6 we returned to that image in relation to the larger context of chapter 7, but there is no harm in recalling the central point. The cyclic functional focus cuts out what I call cross-track communication as a *per se* part of the process. But this holds only for the six "inner specialties" running from interpretation to systematics. The image of track-running breaks down, then, when we consider the other two specialties. Not only is there, in Communications, the question of practical application in the normal sense, but there is the complex of relatings to disciplines, cultures, media mentioned in *Method*. And there

¹*Method in Theology*, 82-3.

is the task of interaction with other viewpoints that somehow take a stand against the functional approach. This is merely a recalling of points made in chapter 6.

In Research we have a parallel complexity of receptivity. The research community is tuned to what is concretely going on, going forward, tuned then to all current reality in its global and local problems. Communications may well have solved to some extent current problems of global needs but there is always a remained, and there is always a fall-out from the implementation of human solutions to concrete situational needs. We live in the surd world.

But what I wish us to attend to here is the complexity of the reception from the point of view of subjectivity. Bluntly, I would like you to notice, and take the challenge to heart, that receptivity is tuned properly - recall the analogy with successful sciences - only if the researchers are up-to-date on present theory. Do I need to go on about this? Well, since it took me some decades to figure out this obviousness, I should say more. And I wish to do so in easy stages that yet open up various lines of inquiry.

First, then, I turn to a favorite piece of Lonergan which is becoming available shortly in English: it is the Scholion of the relation of scripture to the psychological analogy for the Trinity. I have to hand, thanks to Fr. Doran, the translation done by Michael Shiels that is in Lonergan's *Complete Works*, volume 11. Secondly, I wish to take you on what seems a quite different journey, into Neuroscience, its present findings and problems. In the third place we shall gather the results of our pedagogical and doctrinal trips into a reach for a view of research as being mediated by the best available opinions of the day. By now, I suppose, you are expecting this. Anyway, it was in the original diagram named W3. The common context of all of the specialties there was UV(V....)² - what I have written about in these recent years as TUV, tentative universal viewpoint.

But it is convenient to break up the rest of this chapter in three sections related to the three aspects of research with which wish us to deal here. Yet are they three aspects?

²See *A Brief History of Tongue*, 124.

Certainly , unless you are very up-to-date, they are not topics you spontaneously comment: scriptures, neurodynamics, metaphysics. What do you think? Seriously: I would have you assess your poise here. You may be comfortable only in one of these zones. It has been a matter of the direction of your life, a direction embedded in your accidental culture of school here, college there, etc etc. A matter of the direction of attention. And is not that perhaps a point to focus on in our consideration of research: for is not research a direction of attention? I have been asking you about the direction of your attention, and shortly we shall find Lonergan asking you to direct your attention, and going on to direct your attention to select groupings of scripture texts. Do you direct your attention? Advertisers would like to think not. What, then, directs your attention, be it everyday or academic?

It is as well to raise this question before we push forward toward some fresh reflections on research. We will not be raising them or asking you to raise yourself to the fullness of the push of chapter 2: still, what we do here may help you with the dialectic struggle pointed to in chapter 3. And what I say in these next three sections is part of my foundational stand on research, so it too feeds back round to your dialectic struggle. It all makes more acute your sensibility about your microautonomy, your ontic tuning to the field. So, as a final lead up to that tuning crisis I add in here a quotation from the book that is to occupy us in section 2 below. The large bold-faced print is in the text.

“How is Attention Directed?”

We have discussed the effects of attention on the responses of neurons in several cortical areas, and similar effects have been reported in other areas. But what is controlling attention? At present there is no clear answer to this question. Certainly, the specificity observed in the physiological studies puts considerable demand on the neural mechanisms guiding attention.

One structure that has been studied for its possible role in guiding attention is the *pulvinar nucleus* of the thalamus. Several properties of the pulvinar make it

interesting. For example, it has reciprocal connections with most visual cortical areas of the occipital, parietal, and temporal lobes, giving it the potential to modulate widespread cortical activity.”³

This seems very far away from Lonergan as directing research but it is troublesomely close to the interests of advertisers. Might it be of interest to philosophers who write and think about patterns of attention and even of a basic transcendental precept regarding attention? But let us plunge into our first section with whatever attention we can muster.

1. Scripture Research

After *Method* was published Lonergan at times spoke of his regret at not writing more about research, since he had spent a large part of his life doing it. The text I wish us to consider would not be normally classed with such research as went into *Gratia Operans* or *Verbum*, but it illustrates the mediation of research in a manner that carries us forward in our reach for an understanding of the future of functional collaboration. But perhaps it is best, before commenting further, to peruse a relevant part of the text. I keep the numbers of the sections as they appear in the Latin and English texts.

“2. Psychological reality has four manifestations. The first is purely private, since it consists in the immediate data of consciousness. The second is public and common; for in the daily use of nouns and verbs there are a great many things that proceed from one’s interior experience and express it well enough for it to be understood by others who usually have the same or similar experience. The third is a psychological technique: it consists in introspective descriptions the purpose of which is to enable one to attend to one’s own experience and discover there what the immediate data are. The fourth is systematic and philosophical which comprehends globally the

³Quoting from page 672 of **Neuroscience. Exploring the Brain**, by Mark F.Bear, Barry W.Connors and Michael A.Paradiso, Lippencott, Williams and Wilkins, Philadelphia, 2001. I shall refer to this text below as **Neuroscience**.

cognitive power and all that can be known, as well as the power to choose and the full range of choices.

With this in mind, no one surely supposes that any but the first two of these psychological manifestations were experienced by the evangelists and apostles. There is no reason to think that they ever did any psychological investigation or worked out a philosophical system. On the contrary, just as everyone manifests his or her interior experience, so there is no doubt that the NT authors could have done so and actually did so in the very same way. And since there is the same meaningful content in both the manifestation and what is manifested, when there is a public and common manifestation of a psychological fact the interior experience that is manifested must not be excluded.

But if it is impossible to think that the evangelists and apostles experienced any other than the first and second psychological manifestation, it does not immediately follow that the third and fourth can be ignored by an exegete. For there are a number of exegetes who talk about ‘the mind of the author,’ and a knowledge of the mind, both its nature and how it manifests itself, seems appropriate for them. No one can have this clear and exact knowledge of the mind except one who makes use of introspective descriptions and, it may be, introspective psychological experiments as well. Nor is it enough to attend solely to the immediate data of consciousness; the data themselves need to be understood, and this sort of understanding cannot be had without gnoseological, epistemological, and ontological consequences. That is why in these times there are many highly regarded exegetes who turn to philosophers in order to learn the fundamentals of hermeneutics.

3. Accordingly, to discover the immediate data of consciousness that have to do with the Trinitarian analogy, you will have to examine yourself. I should like you, then, to ask yourself whether in your life you have ever experienced the following: speaking what is true because of your grasp of the evidence for it. If you have had this experience and state that you have had it, you will have it once again when you speak the truth about your prior experience, for you will be saying so because of your grasp of the evidence. But if you never have had such an experience and deny that you have had it, you will immediately be able to say so, for if you truthfully deny it, you will be doing so because of your grasp of the evidence. And if you neither affirm nor deny but doubt, we shall still make our case, for you will doubt because you have not seen sufficient

evidence; if you had seen sufficient evidence, you would not have doubted but would have affirmed it. Everyone except children, dreamers, and the insane experience their own rationality when they sincerely affirm or deny or doubt.

Again, ask yourself whether you have ever in this life experienced the following: making a virtuous choice because of an acknowledged moral obligation. But—not to speak more generally—do you not acknowledge that veracity is obligatory? Have you not sometimes spoken truthfully because of this acknowledged moral obligation? If you are able to say so, you will have discovered the immediate datum of consciousness that we are seeking. But if you say no, will you not at least now be speaking truthfully? But someone may say that they at times speak truthfully not because of honesty but because of utility. If, however, one does this, their objection can be rejected; for the objection was not made honestly, but, as the objector says, because of some advantage that he expects will come to him as a result of his objection.

Moreover, just as the knowledge of contraries is the same knowledge, so in a somewhat similar way the consciousness of contraries is the same consciousness. Just as we experience our own rationality when we speak the truth on account of our grasp of the evidence for it, so we experience the same but violated rationality when we judge rashly either beyond or against the evidence. Just as we experience our own morality when we make a virtuous choice because of an acknowledged obligation, so do we experience the same but violated morality when we make a choice that is contrary to an acknowledged obligation.

Furthermore, as habits proceed from acts, so we conjecture the habitual state of our conscience from the immediate consciousness of our acts. The virtue of the mind, therefore, is to always judge because of and according to our grasp of evidence. Blindness of mind, on the other hand, is to regularly judge about all sorts of things beyond or against the evidence. Similarly, it is the mark of a good conscience to always choose because of an acknowledged obligation, but the mark of a hardened conscience to regularly choose contrary to clearly acknowledged obligations.

Lastly, it is most important to realize that even if now for the first time you are experiencing your own rational and moral reality *thematically*, or *conceptually*, you have all along been experiencing it as *exercised*. The exercise of rationality and morality begins with what is called the ‘age of reason’; but the abstract consideration of this exercise does not begin

until you so skillfully interrogate yourself about your state of mind so as to experience clearly and distinctly those constraints that reveal the nature and, as it were, the innate law of the mind.

4. In view of this, there are many diverse questions that can still be asked, either for developing an entire transcendental philosophy or for explaining how this psychology contributes to understanding up to a certain point the mystery of the Trinity, or to recount the many ways in which this psychological Trinitarian analogy has been explained. But all of these go far beyond our present intention. It was for this reason that we wanted the reader to attend to his or her own rationality and morality, so as to be able to understand the questions that are now to be asked concerning the NT. (1) Is the exercise of rationality and morality to be acknowledged in the NT authors? (2) Did these same writers speak about this exercise in a general way or in a symbolic way? (3) Is this way of speaking to be found in the context in which preaching and hearing the word of God is mentioned? (4) Is this way of speaking found also in the context in which the missions of the Son and of the Holy Spirit are mentioned? (5) Are statements about the missions such as to suggest that similar conclusions might be drawn concerning the eternal processions?"

It seemed worthwhile to quote Lonergan's invitation to the reader as he gave it, unabbreviated, even though most of my readers have been in this zone for some time. In the final section he comes down to his elementary intention which is in contrast with the pursuit of "many diverse questions" that could be addressed. But notice that the list of five questions to which he concludes is really a shocking change of pace. Recall your own introductory days of self-attention: would they have been adequate to tackle this exercise? Indeed, are you up to doing the exercise now, without having the other 9/10ths of Lonergan's text?

We have here, then, a very simple illustration of mediated research. You pick up the NT, but you have to know what you are looking for under each of the five headings. Moreover, "knowing what you are looking for" has degrees, and the better one knows, the better one is at homing in on the significant texts. "Knowing what": the what known is you, and the "better knowing" is a matter of a hierarchy of mediations. Indeed, it is

not a question of a simple hierarchy at all: there are to be expected overlapping and complementary contexts, a house of mezzanines, turrets, dumb waiters, air shafts.

Lonergeran began *The Incarnate Word* with a thesis in which he gathered strategic texts in order to bring the students to an appreciation of the plausibility of an incarnate divinity. Pause and think of this in the context of the four theses that follow there, theses that bring the student up through history in a somewhat messy way. Certainly the psychology of Christ was a topic in those centuries of debate about one or two wills in Christ, but we are far from issues regarding the full psychology of Christ, much less the curious imaging in Christ's psychology of the Trinitarian intimacy. Think now of this new run through the NT as a second cycle. Is it not evident that the second cycle benefits from those first five theses, especially if their content is reordered functionally in the manner that has been suggested by the previous seven chapters here? Well, perhaps not really evident, but it should become more so as we move through the next two chapters, where we shall find that the struggle with NT meanings leading up through those early centuries carries one up into the strange world of chapter 16 of *Insight*, with its major and minor real distinctions.

Then, in so far as the Oval team are ingesting discoveries adequately, such refinements are embraced existentially in the community's viewpoint, or should I say tonepoint? The refinements freshen the approach to Christ's psychology, and of course within that cycling there is no need, no place, for Lonergan's elementary nudges of section 3 within that long quotation. But there may be other nudges, new nudges, from the recycling, from the sloping that we attended to in chapter 2, from the oddities of the present three-part reflection. We saw in chapter 2 how different disciples come to nudge each other, leading to refinements of foundations that generally were crying out to be made in the previous generation.

There is no harm in identifying such nudging here, even if only broadly. In the first place, they give us a further illustration of the mediation of research. But secondly they open up, as such nudging should, new realms of questioning. So, the next section,

dealing with the present developments of neuroscience, nudges us positively to reach for new perspectives on the chemistry of literary composition and also on the neurodynamics of Christ. The section nudges us, as it were negatively, to notice obscurities and needs - and even horrors - in neurodynamic research, gaps and blind-spots in the field that are recycled steadily over generations, that warp our global attention to sweet conformity with the longer cycle of decline.

2. Neuroscientific Research

We must be brief here. I have to hand the convenient text already referred to as **Neuroscience**, but you may have another: it is not of serious consequence. We are back in the world of Candace Pert that we may have met in Cantower 2, where we recognized with her the need for a larger perspective on issues of neurodynamics. Whether or not you venture back to that key Cantower, a Christological Cantower⁴, I think that I give enough tidbits of the **Neuroscience** text here to stir your reflections to needs and problems in readiness for the reflections on philosophical and theological research that is our final section.

Why not start at the beginning? So I quote the two first paragraphs of the Introduction, spanning 24 centuries of axial mis-direction. The italics and in the text.

“Men ought to know that from nothing else but the brain come joys, delights, laughter and sports, and sorrows, griefs, despondency, and lamentations. And by this, in an especial manner, we acquire wisdom and knowledge, and see and hear and know what are foul and what are fair, what are bad and what are good, what are sweet and what are unsavory All these things we endure from the brain when it is not healthy In these ways I am of the opinion that the brain

⁴The Cantower, titled “Sunflowers Speak to Us of Growing” contains a verse that can be identified as expressing obscurely the full orientation of inquiry and yearning: “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 thrill / Annotaste of Throat.”

exercises the greatest power in the man.' [Hippocrates, *On the Sacred Disease*, (Fourth century B.C.)]

It is human nature to be curious about how we see and hear; why some things feel good and others hurt; how we move; how we reason, learn, remember, and forget; the nature of anger and madness. These mysteries are starting to be unraveled by basic neuroscience research, and the conclusions of this research are the subject of this textbook."

The Introduction continues in the same mis-direction of attention. Add "Galen(A.D.130-200), who embraced the Hippocratic view of brain function", for the Roman Empire, Vesalius (1514- 64) for the Renaissance, and so on up to the present. And the present has brought forth the ethos not just of present research but of popular culture and the destructive *haute vulgarization* of such magazines as Scientific American. So we have "**Cognitive Neuroscience**. Perhaps the greatest challenge of neuroscience is understanding the neural mechanisms responsible for the higher of human mental activity, such as self-awareness, mental imagery, and language. Research at this level, called cognitive neuroscience, studies how the activity of the brain creates the mind."⁵

Neuroscience describes the scientific process in a single page. There are, as one would expect, **Observation**, **Interpretation**, and **Verification**, the usual truncated version of the elements of knowing and a standard mis-direction of attention.⁶ But it is not to be thought that mis-direction is a major sweeping business. It is, rather, the more insidious warping of language, sentence by sentence, that infest our observations and symbolic imagings of our patterned immortal diamonds. We are led into the silly world of **information** shuffled around by macromolecules, away from forms layered

⁵**Neuroscience**, 14. I thus refer to the text by Mark F.Bear, Barry W.Connors and Michael A. Paradiso, *Neuroscience. Exploring the Mind*, Lippencott Williams and Wilkins, 2001.

⁶Appendix A of *Phenomenology and Logic* gives some re-direction. See also below at notes 9 and 10.

dynamically in the actuality of flexible recurrence-schemes. So, for example, one is invited to conduct one's research and thinking and life in the context of a macrochemical mythology that mocks Thomas Aquinas subtle hold on the real recurrence-schemes that ground *strategy*, *tactics* and *execution*.⁷ Thus does John write his Gospel of light and darkness and Jesus adjust his posture on the *via dolorosa*:

"The [read *His*] central motor system is arranged as a hierarchy of control levels with the forebrain at the top and the spinal chord at the bottom. It is useful to think of this motor control hierarchy as having three levels. The highest level, represented by the association areas of neocortex and basal ganglia of the forebrain, is concerned with *strategy*: the goal of the movement and the movement strategy that best achieves the goal. The middle level, represented by the motor cortex and cerebellum, is concerned with *tactics*: the sequences of muscle contractions, arranged in space and time, required to smoothly and accurately achieve the strategic goal. The lowest level, represented by the brain stem and spinal chord, is concerned with *execution*: activation of the motor neuron and inter-neuron pools that generate the goal-directed movements and make any necessary adjustments of posture."⁸

So the authors naively state at the conclusion of the chapter on language and attention - but of course do not follow up that statement: "it is easy to forget that the human brain is much more than a passive information processor."⁹ The authors make it quite easy to forget, and make no effort to attend to the "much more".

Perhaps we should pause over that chapter, chapter 20, on "Language and Attention". Indeed, we should: there is the shocking fact of a global neglect of research into that wondrous leap that grounds language, a fundamental contentment in darkness that allows one - are you one? - to read unmindingly a paragraph in *Method in*

⁷The subtle hold is expressed in the *Prima Secundae*, qq. 6-17.

⁸**Neuroscience**, 466.

⁹*Ibid.*, 673.

Theology about that evolutionary flash as it occurred in Helen Keller: “The moment of language in human development is most strikingly illustrated by the story of Helen Keller’s discovery”¹⁰

Such an unminding darkens the reading of the Scholion that we considered in the previous sections, darkens the reading of the New Testament writings on light and darkness. Thus does scripture live in the horrors of the axial period of history. But, on the smaller scale of our present considerations, one is mindlessly allied with the authors of **Neuroscience**. “To discover the immediate data of consciousness that have to do with the Trinitarian analogy, you will have to examine yourself.”¹¹ Helen’s discovery, the most common analogue of Trinitarian life, a preaching and teaching and reading gem, is darkly excluded from both neuroscientific and biblical research. What fools we mortals be!

So, yes, a pause is warranted, so that the word be made fresh and dwell among the zillion molecules of our global researching. “To communicate one must understand what one has to communicate. No repetition of formulas can take the place of understanding.”¹² How is one to communicate the Trinitarian heart of communication itself, if one does not search and research that heart? Read now, a read shaken in the winds of conventional reading, the dull love of darkness in **Neuroscience**’s research. “To determine whether animals other than humans use language, *one must be specific about what language is*. If it is to be defined simply as communication, then most animals certainly do use language. But this definition misses the point. Human language is a remarkably complex, flexible, and powerful system for communication that involves *the creative use of words* according to the rules of a systematic grammar. Do other animals

¹⁰*Method in Theology*, 70. Chapter 1 of *A Brief History of Tongue* gives details of how to tackle the relevant exercise.

¹¹Above, the beginning of 3 in the quotation from Lonergan’s Scholion.

¹²*Method in Theology*, 351.

have anything similar? Actually, there are two questions: Do animals naturally use language? Can animals be taught human language?"¹³

"Our use of language - the fact that we have a brain sophisticated enough for language - is one of the features that distinguishes humans from other animals. More than just sounds, language is a system by which sounds, symbols, and gestures *are used for communication.*"¹⁴

"All languages convey the subtleties of human experience and emotion. Consider the fact that no mute tribe of people has ever been found, not even in the remotest corner of the world. Many believe this is a consequence of the fact that the human brain *has evolved special language processing systems. These systems are present in newborn babes;* if a child grows up in a normal language environment, he or she inevitably learns and understands language. Consistent with this idea, it has been found that children acquire language in a similar way in all cultures."¹⁵

But the acquiring has not been found nor attended to: the whole world of psychology and linguistics and indeed methodology sits in darkness and the shadow of death to that most common vestige, image, of the trinity. And, closer to our ChrISt topic, that darkness invites us all to show no interest in how God had the nerves to become master of his Aramaic tongue-movements.¹⁶

¹³**Neuroscience**, 638. The italics in these quotations are in the original text.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 639.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 640.

¹⁶This line of research has obvious scriptural resonances. "For who has known the mind of the Lord ... we have the mind of Christ" (I Cor 2:16).; "Make your own the mind of Christ Jesus" (Philippians 2:5)

And what of the desire to know, an invariant content of any research?¹⁷ Well, we can take time with this or any other book of psychology, linguistics, education, to see whether, under *Q*, there is something brighter than *quantifiers, questionnaires*.

In **Neuroscience** we find the single entry, *quantal analysis*. What of *Questions*? The book is obviously expressive of neural bundles of questions, but there are even un-indexed sections titled 'Review Questions. At the end of each chapter we include a brief set of questions for review.'¹⁸ But the inclusion is really an occlusion. So, the third of the review questions to chapter 20 reads: "Pigeons can be trained to press one button when they want food and to press other buttons when they see particular visual stimuli. This means the bird can look around and 'name' things it sees. How would you determine whether or not the pigeon is using a new language - 'buttonese'?"¹⁹

Humans can be trained in the present, within and without the academy, so that truncated language can press their buttons and trap them, whether in scripture studies or in zoology, to dumb-assed research.

3. Methodological Research

What directs attention? What guides research? Lonergan rightly regretted not writing more about research, but he was one tired sick elder trying to re-direct history's attention so as to re-invent history in both senses of history. Not chapters but books are needed; not books but a new ethos. If I criticize neurochemical research I could also criticize broader considerations of research methods such as those associated with Lakatos and Kuhn and Feyerabend and Popper and Gould etc etc all the way up

¹⁷Obviously, the trick issue here is that it is not invariant, that the cycling process strives to rescue it from previous thematics.

¹⁸**Neuroscience**, xii.

¹⁹**Neuroscience**, 674.

through the sciences.²⁰ But my hope here is simply to encourage you to attend to a simple fact and to take seriously a fundamental challenge.

The simple fact is that our attention is directed a priori: we are not *voraussetzunglos*. But the direction, normally, is not luminous, not self-digested or self-digesting. So, in section 1, Lonergan has to nudge us to notice those realities in ourselves that are relevant to the selection, the ordering and the anticipation of the interpretation of the data of scripture. Section 2, on the other hand, is a directing of attention by me to texts from **Neuroscience**, a direction that is aimed at helping you to notice a pervasive directing of attention that goes quite unnoticed: the scientific text is just part of the global ethos of mis-directed attention.

So, there is the challenge. It is the challenge to be Queen in your own chemical castle, Lord of the manor of molecules, luminously micro autonomous.²¹

We are back, of course, to an invitation to brood over the longer cycle of decline and the evils of a general decay, but with the unusual focus on research and its direction. I regularly recall a remark of the sociologist Peter Berger: "we become what we are addressed as by others". The address takes possession of us, embraces our *pulvinar nucleus*, our Broca and Wernicke areas. Not the cat but the culture gets your tongue. You are led by the nose, by codings of receptor proteins of the olfactory epithelium. Reductionism rules the reading and the writing and the research.

There is no problem of going on in popular vein, either in my style or in the style of Lonergan. The problem is to lift that popular heartbreak to the level of a global efficiency that is one and beautiful. What is needed - are we not simply back to the same Ovalteam need in a new corner of our anxiety? - is a thalamus toning of luminous

²⁰A reader might find Cantowers 15 and 16 useful here, dealing with Gould and Kuhn. A more elementary treatment of scientific methos is in John Benton, Alessandra Drage and Philip McShane, *Introducing Critical Thinking*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2005.

²¹See McShane, *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, chapter 10 (available on the Website www.philipmcschane.ca).

metaphysics that makes it a basement home of our finality, not a neuro-fiddle of home-burning. Do we not reach here a new meaning of *implementation* in Lonergan's description of metaphysics? Metaphysics is the conception, affirmation and implementation of the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being. And the implementation that we are thinking of now is the implementation of the molecules of progress-directed and progress-directing attention.

Research is to be part of a global and genetic circuit of personal relations, swinging forward the signs of the times under the guidance of the best in all of us, that best mediated by Ovalteam sweat. It is to have its aesthetics, a melodious discerning listening for heart-reachings. But the heart reachings must be conceived and affirmed within that suggested full metaphysics. The Ovalteam can read Romans 5:5 on its knees, but the flooded heart must be lifted to the level of explanation both to make life integral for the team and to mediate the cycle through the specialties to street and church. Otherwise, the street's attention may be too easily directed away from the church and the church's attention directed to a mythic and fundamentalist glow. The flooded heart, properly conceived, is a molecular patterned supernaturally recurrence-schemed loneliness for the putting on of the minding of Christ.

But that last paragraph was a direction of your attention to mood, only a component, if an important component, of the fundamental re-orientation of research that this short chapter hints at. That fundamental reorientation requires the meshing of metaphysical metagrams with our thalamic bent so that we read the signs of the times with discerning and progressive selectiveness.

The topic of those signs and their cultivation goes way beyond our sketchings: elsewhere there are listings and suggestions.²² So it seems best to conclude here with a

²²I list what I call metaphysical words, Wi, in various places e.g. in Cantower 24. A key suggestion is that given in Quodlibet 3 regarding the heuristic re-conception of virtues in terms of Insight 464[489] and following: quite a challenge towards transforming the *Secunda Pars* of the *Summa*.

very practical pointing at some methodological research that pulls our curious mix of topics here together and forward, giving you the concrete challenge of participating in, or at least encouraging, the lift towards a more adequate context of research in all zones of human inquiry.

I mentioned Lonergan's regret that he did not give more space to research. But there is that other regret: that he was not given enough time to work on the last chapters of *Insight*. Would chapters 15 and following have been different? That question doesn't matter to us here. What matters is that we advert to, have our attention directed to, the methodological research that calls to us from the print of the *Verbum* articles, words dancing to the tune of that scriptural context that is identified by the Lonergan's research in the *Scholion* to which I appealed in section 1.

4. Once More, In General

We shall move in the next chapter towards reading a high point of Lonergan's climbing of the spring and summer of 1953. Hillary, with Tensing, was on the top of Everest that summer. Now, fifty year later, Everest is almost a regular climb, but Lonergan's climb remains a solitary achievement, map-expressed, calling out for the risk of fantasy, a spiral climbing into the mists of mountain theory. The cyclic searching is eventually to replace the subtle dogmatism that clings to "an inadequate method no matter what its deficiencies."²³ It is to lift the human genus into the second time of the temporal subject, now so remote from our muddled generalities. The lift has to be a mesh of two efforts, the phylogenetic effort at cyclic collaboration, but also the heroic effort of some few to face the ontogenetic climb, each week becoming a stranger to the self of last week in an exponential Proustian growth.

²³Where "even enormous and indefinitely prolonged labours may merely move around in an inconclusive circle."(*Insight*, 588[610-11]).

We are, of course, back at that remark of Lonergan in Spring of 1954 that is worth quoting now for the third time in this book:

“The Method in Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating $[1 + 1/n]^n$ 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.”²⁴

God does not speak **in general**: God speaks *in generatione Verbi*, a generation which is constitutive of the Persons of the Trinity.²⁵ The Word is the Word of all possible finitudes including eternally, in a special selectivity, the actual finitude: nor is that actual finitude spoken **in general**. The Word made flesh had a minding reach of that actual, thus obedient unto death in a peculiar non-comprehension that yet was comprehensive. Nor was the reach of the actual an **in general** reach for Him. The theologian’s obedience unto death is not to be an **in general** reach but a communally-shared Christ-shared satisfactory cross-pollination of the little flower of history. “Thou art the Christ” reaches to the 14 billion-year-old ground of His feet and His feat, reaching it as an incomplete pilgrimage preparing to pirouette in Divine Triplicity.

In General? In theology it must be in *In Generatione Verbi*, an orientation of *theoria* that seeks to lift all human talk of the “in general” to be an intending of the real.²⁶ To thus continually lift the global talk is a task of a cyclic labor which freshens our openness to the fundamental data of research. That fundamental data is “The Question

²⁴I quote again from a letter of Lonergan to Fr. Fred Crowe in May 1954, which he kindly made available to me.

²⁵One must return to Thomas or Lonergan here. One might technically refer to the constitution of Father and Son here, but the text above is correct.

²⁶There are issues here of economics and leisure that need to be faced with the full power of functional specialization and a fundamental transformation of economics. See *For A New Political Economy*, index under *leisure*. The context in economics is provided by Bruce Anderson and Philip McShane, *Beyond Establishment Economics. No Thank You, Mankiw*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2000.

of God,²⁷ but in each turn of the cycle it becomes more richly, as n strains towards infinity, the (question)³ of God.

²⁷The title of the first section in chapter 4 of *Method in Theology*.