

Chapter 10

Reinventing History

Let us move forward now in the mood of Origin, seeking an elusive sense of history, written and lived, and of functional history. These all, of course, are woven concretely together around the artistry of monuments and documents mentioned at the beginning of *The Sketch of Insight 17* that occupied us in the previous chapter. In the Introduction I noted that this chapter would be paradoxically short. It merely seeks to give a fresh twist to what I have already said on the topic in “Functional History.”¹ But it is paradoxically short too in that the topic is a massively complex contemporary problem. Frederick Crowe’s recent book, *Christ and History. The Christology of Bernard Lonergan from 1935 to 1982*,² begins with a Prologue titled “In Search of History” where he emphasizes openness, incompleteness. That is to be the emphasis here. But the emphasis is on a particular character of that openness, and the brevity with which I treat it now helps to keep it in focus: there is a clear **towering** challenge - no need to comment at this stage on the word *towering* - to initiate a massive heuristic shift in the ethos of historical studies and historical living.³ I wish here only to hover over the heart

¹The title of Cantower 38.

²Novalis, Saint Paul University Ottawa, 2005.

³My *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Press, Halifax, 2005) discusses the tower-emergence in analogy with “The Calculus of Variation” (the title of the relevant 4th chapter) in physics, indicating the hope of stages of sophistication that are to develop in the future. The conclusion of chapter 3 of *Lack* deals in a preliminary fashion with the problem of ‘transfer’ from *theoria* to common sense.

of that challenge, the heuristic heart of its ontic presence in the question, **What**⁴ is going on?

I do that in a curious fantasy-flexing focusing on two periods of 67 years by asking you to share with me the two questions, What was going on in doctrinal Christianity between 325 and 382 A.D.?, What was going on in Lonergan's Christology between 1925 and 1982?

You notice immediately that I have taken Crowe's dates for Lonergan and extended them. The extending is not merely for symmetry, though of course that was a factor. Nor is it a criticism of Crowe's limiting dates. His interest is in documentation. My interest is in ontic presence, in Lonergan, in historians, in future searchers. So I have no doubt but that Lonergan's Christology goes back even further than his formal Jesuit beginnings. In my own case, and in yours, it reaches thus back into cultural molecules, and certainly, long before I encountered Lonergan's texts, there was fermenting in me Christologies from Ignatius, From G.M.Hopkins, from Theresa of Liseaux, from Julian of Norwich. And now, for me, and I hope for you, there is the urgent need for a fuller heuristics of the spiral of Christologies within The Tower, in particular, of course, the spiral of ChrIStologies.⁵ That is the single existential question I wish to share with you, share with you indeed the better in so far as you are open to move with me down through that discomfiting page 250 of *Method in Theology*. But I would most of all wish

⁴I would have you connect the two bold-faced words here in a connection that holds my problem of reinventing history. The **What** of history in any of its askings (mesh *Method*, chapters 8 and 9 with *Topics in Education*, chapters 3, 4 and 10) is to be normatively laced, generalized empirical fashion (*A Third Collection*, 141, top three lines), with the best **tower**-heuristic of the time.

⁵See chapter 6 above as an introduction to the problem of conceiving luminously the relation of history to system, where the system is genetic system.

to share the question in the full pragmatic challenge of each of us homing in on our small Pauline corner of Satisfying collaboration.⁶

We have, I suppose, two heros of our two historical periods, Athanasius and Lonergan, and as I struggled with these two periods details attempted to take over. What was going on in the year '65? Athanasius was hiding in his family's funeral monument,⁷ and Lonergan - with functional specialization fresh in his molecules - brushed past his own funeral home.

The twist of the previous paragraph is relevant to our reflections. Do the details attempt to take over? Rather, each of our perspectives takes over, but if that perspective is humbly heuristic it is nudged ecstatically by this detail or that. Here I would have you, whether student of history or not, nudged ecstatically by the details of Lonergan's creative scribbles of February 1965.⁸

But the details and the muddling with them are the stuff of our human growth, opposing in our times the massive drift in our time to **the general**, to *haute vulgarization*.⁹ The first paragraph of Williams book, already mentioned, notes how searchings after the Christian meaning of the fourth century "mandate historically sensitive research"¹⁰ and he goes on to acknowledge his dependence on Barnes. "Dr

⁶Joistings 8, available on www.philipmcs Shane.ca, deals with this meshing of collaboration with the redemptive satisfaction of ChrISt.

⁷Timothy D.Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Harvard University Press, 1993, 11. I shall refer to this work simply as Barnes.

⁸The creative scribbles are reproduced in chapter 2 of Darlene O'Leary, *Lonergan's Practical View of History*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2006.

⁹I have referred, here and there, to Lonergan's comment on *haute vulgarization* in *Complete Works*, volume 6, 121,155. An alternative view of **general** has been offered in the book, but there remains a great deal of work to specify ex-plain-ing. See *Lack in the Beingstalk*, the conclusion of chapter 3.

¹⁰Williams, vii.

Barnes freely shared the proofs of his *Athanasius and Constantius*, which helped me avoid some serious errors in my own analysis of events in the 360s.”¹¹ I would hope that my muddling with the details of the 1960s, that transforming decade for theology, would rescue Lonergan studies from the serious errors that have plagued them in the four decades since.¹² What was going on in the 360s after the Council of Ariminum? What was going on in the 1960s prior to the February discovery? And what of the twenty years, the forty years, to follow?

In the case of the fourth century, we have Barnes and Williams and now a community of searchers rescuing Arius and Athanasius and Ambrose from hagiography and generalities.¹³ We could digress here to show how Barnes and Williams and their likes move solidly in the patterns that Lonergan sought to thematize in his two chapters on history in *Method*, but that is another task, for someone else. Our

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²The serious intellectual error is one that is associated with the drive towards popularization associated with Fontanelle (See Herbert Butterfield, *The Origins of Modern Science*, concluding chapter). That drive is meshed in our time with general bias’s desperation for commonsense reduction. Lonergan’s work flowed into that ethos, and it entrapped Lonergan himself in various ways. We shall touch on aspects of that mesh and mess below.

¹³The following passage helps the uninitiated towards generalities regarding Arius and the situation in the Empire. It is from p.244 of Michael Grant, *The Roman Emperors. A Biographical Guide to the Rulers of Imperial Rome*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London,1985. The book is obvious useful for keeping track of the complex of Emperors at the time. “Constantius II was profoundly interested in theological matters, and set the Christian Empire on a new religious course by supporting Arianism, a doctrine initiated by the Alexandrian priest Arius and propagated by apologists reflecting Greek philosophic attitudes. Arius (d.337) brought up on Origin’s doctrine of the singleness of God, regarded Christ as distinct from Him in essence and, although created before all time, nevertheless a creature and changeable like other creatures. This was a view which duly stressed his humanity - on which Christianity’s claim to a concrete place in history so strongly rested - but which invited criticism for seemingly deprecating his godhead. The result of Constantine the Great’s Council of Nicea had been the excommunication of Arius; but he was posthumously rehabilitated by Constantius II, whose consistent aim it remained, despite personal attacks on himself, to discover some compromise on which at least a large number of churchmen might agree.”

interest in this short chapter is in the central element missing in their work, as it is missing in cultural reflections of the twentieth century.¹⁴ Still, a bow to Barnes methodology is in order, and his first paragraph is a nice read in view of the parallel which I have made between Athanasius - and his biographies¹⁵ - and Lonergan biographied.

“The central purpose of this study is to use modern techniques of historical research to probe behind Athanasius’ misrepresentations, many of which have held sway for sixteen centuries, in order to discover the true nature of the ecclesiastical history and the ecclesiastical politics of the fourth century. If some readers feel that too much of what I have written resembles a detective story more than a work of history, that cannot be helped: where important facts have lain concealed for so long, such an investigation as I have undertaken constitutes an essential prerequisite for serious historical analysis. At the end, I have tried to show briefly how my sometimes speculative conclusions about Athanasius himself suggest a coherent and convincing general picture of the rule of the Christian church and its bishops in the Roman Empire of Constantine and his imperial successors.”¹⁶

There is a sense in which what I wish to say briefly in the next few pages can be astutely detected by a reader willing to push along the parallel between the two periods in history that I find lurking in that paragraph. And I might push the parallel by

¹⁴What is missing is the differentiated luminousness that would orient culture beyond axial muddles to “the second time of the temporal subject” (*De Deo Trino II, Pars Systematica*, Gregorian Press, 1964), *Quaestio XXI*. The central case of this book is that the Tower climb of the Ovalteam is identifiable as the efficient (see note XX below) human collaboration towards that luminousness global reality.

¹⁵Both Barnes and Williams return regularly to the theme of the unreliability of hagiographic sources and historical traditions. See, for instances, Barnes 1-9, Williams 106-113. “The hagiography of Athanasius appears to be virtually worthless as historical evidence of his career” (Barnes, 9). Lurking in this chapter, and this book, is the question, What was the real career of Lonergan?

¹⁶Barnes, ix.

adding a comment from Williams about the surge of scholarship surrounding fourth-century Arianism. "These new inquiries, despite the tenaciousness of the stylized portrait of Arianism as a monolithic system of belief, have shown that what writers in the patristic era collectively called 'Arianism' represents several distinctly different theological viewpoints. The result is that we are completely justified in designating the term *Arianism* a misnomer."¹⁷ Is *Loneranism* a misnomer? So, let me cut to the core pointing of this short chapter, indeed this short book.

There is something essential missing in the searchings of Crowe and of both the historians cited. It is missing, perhaps, because it is all too soon to expect it to be present.¹⁸ But to note its absence in some unclear yet operational way is to turn us towards both its source and its slow incarnation in humanity. That unclear but operational way was the topic of chapter 2 above: a pragmatic minimalism, a stumbling forward up a Calgary of satisfaction assisted by people from Cyrene and environs. There is the Christology of 335¹⁹ and there is "The Christology of 1935" that Crowe writes of in his second chapter under that title. The clues to Faith-filled hermeneutics are there, Whitsuntide expressions of the 30-year-old Lonergan.²⁰

¹⁷Williams, 1.

¹⁸See note 3 above for an enlightening parallel with the calculus of variation in physics. We seem, in theological collaboration's version of the calculus, to be back at the earliest stage of the activity and its thematization.

¹⁹I am thinking here of the exile of Athanasius because of his reaction to the Council of Jerusalem (335), which readmitted Arius to communion, a readmission repeated by Constantine at Constantinople the following year. (See Barnes, 24, 30, 56). I am thinking, too, in my odd way, of the inner exile of Lonergan accepted by him in his stand of 1935. In his copy of my little book, *Wealth of Self*, there is a sentence of the Epilogue, "Being and Loneliness", where "I recall Jung's remark that the truly contemporary man is alone - and the aloneness here is an aloneness of meaning": he marks this vigorously in the margin. The following pages relate to that exile.

²⁰I restrict myself here to a paragraph on the key topic. Crowe's book gives two pages of pointers (34-35) from the *Method Journal* article referred to in the next note.

There is the absolute *Geist* and there is the objective *Geist*. In a marginal note of Lonergan's **Restoration** text one finds: "N.B. The development of dogma is the developed absolute Geist turning back upon the content of revelation and seeing more than was seen before."²¹ The 'objective *Geist*' is 'the common mind of man.'²² But what is the absolute *Geist*? Is it not "the dogma of Christ,"²³ or should we not write ChrISt? "Christ as the new head of humanity ... is the originator of the absolute *Geist* of dogma ... that progress without ever falling back ... that selects the pure element of truth in the incomplete acts of the objective *Geist*."²⁴

What might be the meaning of this intellectual exile of Lonergan and its consequent journey towards to The Dark Tower?²⁵ That **What**, indeed, is quasi-defined²⁶

²¹*Method. Journal of Lonergan Studies* 9 (1991), note on p. 168. See Crowe, 34, and his note 6 on his page 230. Both Crowe and I use this published version of "Restoration of all things in Christ" for our references. I refer to that publication below as **Restoration**. The word *restoration*, of course, cannot survive explanatory analysis. It points to something that is not objectively a restoration: but that is an issue for later cyclic ChrIStology.

²²**Restoration**, 147.

²³*Ibid.*, 156.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 158. One can profitably connect the notion of a "pure element" with the challenge of reaching a "pure formulation" (*Insight*, 580[]) that we considered in the previous chapter. A further context for reflection on *Geist* and progress is Lonergan's comment on Hegel: "As the labor of introspection proceeds, one stumbles upon Hegel's insight that the full objectification of the human spirit is the history of the human race. It is in the sum of the products of common sense and common nonsense, of the sciences and the philosophies, of moralities and religions, of social orders and cultural achievements, that there is mediated, set before us in a mirror in which we can behold, the originating principle of human aspiration and human attainment and failure. Still, if that vast panorama is to be explored methodically, there is the prior need for method." I am quoting here from p. 14 of a Lonergan archival file labeled A697. It contains a typescript numbered pp. 6-23. Very plausibly it is a continuation of the sketch of a first chapter of *Method* contained in the File V.7 of February 1965 (available in ch.2 of the O'Leary work: see note XX: there is a scribbled 2-page sketch of the full chapter and nine pages of typescript that is a beginning of that chapter).

²⁵On "exile" see note 19 above. Cantower 4 reflects on the search of Roland for The Dark Tower in a primarily feminist context. Cantower 5 meshes that image and search with the task of

by the Tower. "The intellectual benefit of the absolute Geist is something that... fallen man ... easily overlooks."²⁷

But recall now the previous comments on Rahner and mystery.²⁸ The mystery, including the mystery of evil, is to be focused in humanity's "Genesis of Adequate Self-knowledge."²⁹ This was the exile of the Lonergan of the economics and the physics that carried him, in an absolute Geist embrace, "to embrace the universe in a single view."³⁰ There were the brutally lonely spiraling theoretic conversions that brought about his

building a lover's bower that is a future metaphysics. ".... upon the gilded tower in Echatan / Lay the God's bride for ever, waiting the golden rain" (Ezra Pound, *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*, Canto IV, 16). The images area relevant to the intussusception of the invitation to the inner exile of *theoria*.

²⁶I add here two further contexts. There is the reach intimated in the article in which 'quasi-operator' occurs: There is the reach and the helplessness of conceptualization expressed in that final magnificent problematic section on "The Problem of History" in *Topics in Education*. In reaction to the latter pre-*Method* seven pages, I would suggest a direction of solution to the problem of regional culture in thinking, affirming, cherishing, the Tower community, the Ovalteam, as a concrete universal regional culture. In this shift there can be found a solution to "the problem of general history, which is the real catch" (Topics, 256) My best analogue for this post-axial regional "hope of an adapted and specialized auxiliary" (Insight 726[747]) is, I fear, quite remote from normal readers. It is the manner in which advances in fibre bundle geometry make possible an envisagement of each space-time region in its particulated energy-possibilities. Useful here is chapter 8, "Forces, Connections and Gauge Fields" in Ian D.Lawrie, *A Unified Grand Tour of Theoretical Physics*, Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol and Philadelphia, 1998.

²⁷**Restoration**, 155.

²⁸See above, the beginning of chapter 3.

²⁹*Insight*, 535[558].

³⁰*Insight*, 417[442].

ontic come-about, turn around,³¹ so that when he had "come that far in *Insight*" he could type in ecstatic remoteness, thus:

"So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extensions and experiencing duration gives place to the subject oriented to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies."³²

Had he not, by then, intussuscepted his own climb sufficiently to take a fresh stand beside the Peter of Matthew 16:16, with a heart full of metaphysical equivalence³³ and mutual mediation,³⁴ in *Geist*-fully objectification of the inner word of truth, Truth?³⁵ Patterned Canadian Immortal chemicals³⁶ could be radiant before the Proustian memory of that flower of evolution, ChrISt, the organism³⁷ that IS God..³⁸

³¹I am thinking here of Vladimir Volkoff, *The Turn-Around*, Bodley Head, London, 1981. Pages 214-285 makes the topic narratively existential. The turn-around can be abrupt as with St. Paul, but more often is it treacle-slow, as with the future turn into the Oval and Tower project.

³²This, of course, draws attention to the Frontispiece challenge.

³³*Insight*, 502-20[526-33]. Here we arrive at the central existential challenge of this book, and of meeting the career-Lonergan. How does one arrive at a luminous sublating sharing of Peter's claim? It needs the lift of a luminous Augustinian turn (see *Verbum*, 6-8) carried slowly forward to the cultivation of inner words that give personal control and harmonious possession of chapter 16 of *Insight*. It is a high point of kataphatic theology that contextualizes the added luminousness of savoring the four absolutely supernatural realities that come with divine incarnation. It is to be the shared horizon of the Ovalteam.

³⁴A topic of Lonergan's essay, "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer".

³⁵Truth turns up as a precise topic on in the second section of chapter 17: something to be related both to the dynamics of doctrinal development and the deficiencies of contemporary debates. See, for example, the index of *Phenomenology and Logic*, under *Truth*.

³⁶I think here of the complex transposition and intussusception of Hopkin's existential perspective mad possible by the "comeabout" of my Frontispiece quotation. See Lonergan, *A Third Collection*, 132, on the layered self-taste involved.

³⁷It presume it will come as a surprise to most of my readers that this shift seems to me be key to the transition required of the Ovalteam. The challenge is there in that shocking page of

Now this is not the communicated tone or drive of Crowe's book. Certainly, he was aiming in another direction with his detailed survey of Lonergan's writings in Christology.³⁹ The full sweep of details should be welcome to generations who did not follow existentially the two dozen volumes of Lonergan's *Complete Works* in their genesis as such much less in their original genesis.

Yet, to press my odd parallel, is there not something homoian about Crowe's presentation of this Christologer?⁴⁰ Lonergan's young view, like a Nicea of the mind, was bent in 1925 on identifying, self-identifying, the heuristic *ousia* of history, of His, HIS, story. This was no scholasticism, but a *Geist*-driven loneliness.⁴¹ In his isolated typing-thinking of *Insight*, "the antecedent willingness of charity had to mount from an

Insight 464[489] where there occurs the phrase "study of the organism begins... ": what is said there and in the following pages is a missing link in coming to grips with modern genetic studies, the organism that is the daisy or the dog, ChrISt or the Mystical Body. Of course, the heart of the matter is adverting to the personal meaning of the phrase and getting going on the grim climb: "self-study of the organism begins..." Without that study one is liable to settle for the conventional illusion that one knows human forms without knowing science. It can be a useful and distressing exercise to ask, What is a dream?; What is a phantasm?; What is consciousness?; within this context. Of course, there is the deeper issue, what is the developmental system in the seventh functional specialty that does justice to the weave of *Geist* in history?

³⁸I wish to emphasize that my interest throughout here is in kataphatic theology, in Faith seeking understanding where understanding is ordinary hard-won understanding through prayerful thinking. One should, however, push personally towards the reality of inner harmony that is a topic springing from the text mentioned in the previous note, the conclusion of chapter 15 of *Insight*. I have nothing to say about mysticism. I do have things to say about the desperate need for kataphatic prayer: see, for instance, Cantower 21, "Epilodge".

³⁹His aim is modest. See *Christ and History*, 20-1.

⁴⁰This is not an offensive or simple question. But it may startle us towards a reviewing of the ethos of objectification that dominates our reading and writing. It relates to deep issues of the needed developments of linguistic meaning symbolized by Joyce's "Oxen of the Sun" episode in his *Ulysses*. See my "Features of Generalized Empirical Method", *Creativity and Method*, edited by M.Lamb, Marquette University press, Milwaukee, 1980, "The Bridge of Oxen".

⁴¹On Lonergan and scholasticism, see Crowe, *Christ and History*, the index under *Scholasticism*.

affective to an effective determination to discover and to implement in all things the intelligibility of universal order that is God's concept and choice."⁴² In the heat of his typing was that a graceful slip, the mention of God's concept, something he carefully avoided up till then in the book?

And here I cannot resist making a point about the orthodox view regarding the late and early Lonergan, shifts in his view of values and feelings and whatever. Yes, of course he had shifts, but not the stuff of present orthodoxy. In the Florida conference interview, when asked whether he discovered feelings by reading Scheler, he paused before he quipped "I've got feelings too!" Then he went on to make the very clear statement: "There is in *Insight* a footnote to the effect that we're not attempting to solve anything about such a thing as personal relations. I was dealing in *Insight* fundamentally with the intellectual side - a study of human understanding - in which I did my study of human understanding and got human intelligence in there, not just a sausage machine turning out abstract concepts. That was my fundamental thrust."⁴³

Certainly his view changed, indeed acceleratingly.⁴⁴ But it seems to me that we - and I include myself after precisely 49 year of struggle - have not caught up on the exile of 1935. So, useful as Crowe's survey is, I would note that the book lends itself to a naive reading, and this, oddly is a tribute to Crowe's talent as pedagogue and pastor. I think now of the lift in personal spirituality that his *Theology of the Christian Word* can be,

⁴²*Insight*, 726.

⁴³Lonergan, *A Second Collection*, edited by W.F.J.Ryan and B.J.Tyrrell, Darton Longman and Todd, London, 1974, 221-2.

⁴⁴Recall our reflection on growth and on the extract from his letter of 1954 which dominates the three sections (conclusions of chapters 2, 5, and 8) on **General** in this book. Add the context of the concluding pages of *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2005.

sweeping the reader towards a sense of the Cosmic Word.⁴⁵ Yet, for the Tower climb, the Oval team's effort, it is imperative that linguistic feedback tell us of the decades of dark climbing that result, with a tincture of most fruitful understanding, only in a more focused darkness of organic pilgrimage. Have you been reading along here, for instance, my print-steps comfortably flexing your neurochemicals towards spirited heart's desire, or have you been comfortable holding the book out there before you, print pointing towards a familiar Galilean?⁴⁶

In note 37 above I wrote of the challenge of conceiving ChrISt as divine organism. This is not a side-issue challenge in my hope for the emergence of the Tower, the spiraling of the Oval- team. Nor is it merely a conception. In my own struggle to "come about" I have found it essential to the harmony of my life to shift to a context of chemical imagery through a complex personal reaching of what I call *metaphysical words*, or metagrams, W_i .⁴⁷ From the beginning of that climb, in the early 1970, Fr.Crowe considered the strategy odd:⁴⁸ for me it is an essential step in rescuing theology from

⁴⁵F.E.Crowe S.J., *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study in History*, Paulist Press, New York, 1978.

⁴⁶The familiar Galilean, cuddled or crucified, is a legitimate symbol for commonsense consciousness, nor does the validity fade "when one emerges from the shadow and admits to oneself that the real is the intelligible, the true, being, the good". I quote here from the conclusion of Lonergan's powerful section on Existenz in *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, clearly a text for pondering in this context.

⁴⁷There are various lists: e.g. in Cantower 24.

⁴⁸The challenge you must face is the discovery of you own view of this, and its objectification. Crowe and I had quite different views of the need for symbolism, the complexity of categories, etc, and we were warmly - sometimes heatedly - blunt about it. I quote now at length from a letter of his, but primarily as an invitation to you to muse over a central challenge of theology. I had introduced my first metaphysical word in the essay "Being and Loneliness" (See *Wealth of Self*, 106: on the Website). I quote from a letter from Fred of May 13, 1972. "But what is wrong on page 4? [106]. It is your blessed mathematical notation, which I studied for 83 seconds and then went on. But I 've been working on my own insight as a consequence. The question: how to use symbolic notion for people to whom it is not as easy as the alphabet? I think what we need is to see it forming, element by element, with accompanying explanation.

common sense. The theology of the Tower and of the future Ovalteam is quite simply totally foreign to common sense. But this is a position I have been battling since the late 1950s. A paragraph here is just a possibility and a slim probability of your memory-work.⁴⁹

Perhaps a brief reflection on the meaning of *general* would help towards a glimpse of the danger that I talk about that lurks not only in Crowe's writing but indeed in the type of presentation that was regularly forced on Lonergan.

The problem has a context, could have a Kontext, from the two final chapters of *Topics in Education*. Indeed, there must be slowly generated a grouping of groups of Kontexts analogous to the grouping that constitute modern physics at its best if the objective Geist is to carry forward effectively⁵⁰ the hope within the absolute Geist.

Reflection on the groupings of Kontexts and of Ovalteam operations should give you a decent start on thinking out the problems of that other period of history that I selected, the period 335-382 A.D.⁵¹

But this means that you can never use it in a book where it is all there at one glance, but only viva voce, drawing it on a blackboard and talking at the same time. Oh I suppose you could put down one letter and explain, then put down two and explain the addition of the second, and us up twenty pages of a book in the process - but in general, are there signs you use in a static state and other signs to be used only in a moving process?" It seems to me that theology will remain breathless and very late if it does not face the challenge of the symbolic control of meaning, a control that would make entrapment in descriptive meanings painfully obvious.

⁴⁹See *Shaping of the Foundations*, (www.philipmcshane.ca) chapter 4, on enlivened memory.

⁵⁰The text of Lonergan that I regularly refer to in this context is *Topics in Education* 160, line 16. It raise the large issue of the unity, beauty and efficiency of metaphysics and makes plausible the view that, where Plato failed in seeking foundational monarchy, Lonergan points to the possibility of a hierarchy of local founders.

⁵¹The symmetry of dates would have been spoiled if I had noted that the important end-date for this first period is 387, not 382, so I cheated a little! Athanasius died in 373 but in Milan Ambrose battled on in his cunning way. **Williams**, 218, summarizes the key shift thus: "Two important events in 386/7 gave Ambrose the defenders he was looking for and completely reversed the political situation in north Italy. The first of these two events is well known and

The functional cycling is to bring historians into the Oval. The relatively-level plain, at any time of Tower work, makes demands on all the participants to "rise to the level of the times"⁵² that is expressed in the current TUV.⁵³ Initially there will be resentment, but then embarrassment should click in.⁵⁴ The shift is helped along initially especially by the second principle of the third canon of hermeneutics, which I immediately exercise now in regard to Williams and Barnes. As I noted already, from the perspective of Lonergan's treatment of history in *Method in Theology*, their work is first-class. But their education and background leaves them far from the TUV that I am advocating, and the operation of that TUV was not something that Lonergan was attending to when he wrote those chapters. What is missing from *Method*? Well, that is the topic of *Cantower 38*, the Cantower towards which this chapter has been leading.

celebrated, namely, the discovery of the relics of the martyrs Protasius and Gervasius. It is less recognized that the significance of this *inventio*, regardless of whether it was contrived or genuine, gave Ambrose and the Nicene Church divine ratification which strengthened their opposition to the authority of the court. But the actual demise of western Homoianism as an ecclesio-political force came about after the second event; the sudden invasion of Maximus in the summer of 387." Pages 218- 236 spell out the dynamic.

⁵²A regular refrain of Lonergan, picked up from his early reading of Ortega y Gasset. See *Method in Theology*, 350.

⁵³"The current TUV": that is a ticklish question, an embarrassing question, a question that is raised formally by the operators in implementing the second half of page 250 of *Method*: recall chapter 3 above. But note that current means current, now, here and now perhaps, where you can do an informal clashing with my current view and come up with a narrative projection of self and history's future. Note that the crisis in theology parallels normal paradigm shifting in science, but is much messier at present: there is a shocking spread of TUVs in theology.

⁵⁴"Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company" (*Method in Theology*, 299). One of the pragmatic marvels of the Tower expedition - or should I say exhibition, showing one's hand, "at pains not to conceal tracks" (*Method*, 193) - is what I might call the ordinary embarrassment of just being up to speed in one's field. Barnes and Williams are just not up to speed in their work, if luminous personal heuristic positioning is a common *ethos*, but it is not. The sad thing about the following of Lonergan is that such positioning has been a doctrine since *Insight*, made uncomfortably present by page 250 of *Method*: but there seems little embarrassment.

What is missing is the ethos of global functionality and of the necessity of the exile in *theoria*:⁵⁵ that is the crisis of the truth of interpretation and history.⁵⁶

Might we look forward effectively towards the emergence, in this century, of an ontic luminosity that grounds the relevant existential category? I am writing now of an existential category of the Ovalteam, of the Tower, but what Lonergan says of it in relation to popular culture holds also here, lending mystery to conferences and collaborations. "Popular tradition, whether it be poetry, fiction, or acceptable history, is something essential to human living. It is what the existentialists would call an existential category. It is a constitutive component of the group as human. It is an aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin. The aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin and story becomes operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides, or acts - especially in a crisis."⁵⁷ The present present crisis is perhaps your Christ-pause in the pointings of the thirty-year-old Lonergan of 1935 towards this homely exile.⁵⁸

So I come here to the promised abrupt halt, a halt pointing to that other chapter on "Functional History" that needs to be read before this one, in the context indeed of the chapters of struggle with the meaning of "functional" that followed on what is

⁵⁵Lonergan, In "Mission and Spirit" (*A Third Collection*, 27) reflects on *theoria* as the name for contemplative prayer in the Greek Patristic tradition and places his reflection in the context of Aristotle's "finest way". Perhaps it is evident now that I am placing this reflection in the larger context of a participation in Christ's satisfaction through a new collaborative prayerfulness? See **Joistings 8**: "Recycling Satisfaction".

⁵⁶It may be important for you to approach *Insight* freshly with regard to the question of truth. Track through the book and find that the key page is 549[572]. There the problem of "guarantees of truth" and "the real issue of truth" bubble up out of history's sin-stained mess of mystery and myth. This helps to place the specialties History and Doctrines in a richer context.

⁵⁷*Topics in Education*, 230.

⁵⁸The challenge of being at home in the "turn-about" of the Frontispiece. See *Method*, 14, 350-1.

chapter 1 above.⁵⁹ So I turn myself and you back, in a new twist of *Finnegans Wake*, to come forwards⁶⁰ to the last quotation in that chapter on functional history:

“Skin-within are molecules of cosmic all, cauled, calling. The rill of her mouth can become the thrill, the trill, of a life-time, the word made fresh. Might we inspire and expire with the lungs of history? But the hole story is you and I, with and within global humanity, upsetting *Love’s Sweet Mystery* into a new mouthing, an anastomotic spiral way of birthing better the buds of Mother.”⁶¹

⁵⁹The span, then, of the Cantowers dealing in a preliminary way with functionality, the neglected hidden drive of *Method in Theology*:

⁶⁰But I would note that your going forward might well be helped by sharing with me a previous grim Oxford climb of 1988-89, which concluded, through the lift of its fifth chapter, to a strange ChrISt-centred viewing of the foundational struggle: “Cosmogenetic gentleness pivots on a contemplative focus on ultimacy mediated by and mediating a world view that leaves the subject turned in the privacy of God in existential repentant gratitude. For the Christian that privacy is a real and psychological hiddenness with Christ in God seeding an appreciation of a radical intimacy of friendship, in time and in eternity, with an incarnate Divine Lover, so that the Cosmos glimpsed in art and science, in war and peace, becomes a personal resonance of eucharistic dimensions, twisting the words of the poet into a new meaning: “I see the rose within his blood, and in His eyes the glory of the stars”. The sapling of history and the sapling of His life entwine in a subtle lonely calling to creative and delicate displacement. The minder is located in the groaning finality of matter’s blossoming: the privacy of the place and time of life becomes a startling prescience”.(the conclusion of section 6.4 of *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*, available on www.philipmshane.ca)

⁶¹The final quotation is from the conclusion of chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, where the device of **anastomosis** is used, and that device meshes magnificently with the view of **General** that we reached for throughout this book.