

*Cantower I***Function and History**

Easter Monday: April 1st, 2002

**1. Remembering the Future**

I make a fresh pragmatic beginning at seventy.

There is a sense in which I can echo Voegelin's last puzzling, Where does the beginning begin?<sup>1</sup> But I have been lucky in life to get beyond his fundamental puzzling about the type of organism that he and I are.<sup>2</sup> Or at least I have got beyond it in core but not yet in *cor*, not yet heartheld, heartHeld, Heartheld.<sup>3</sup> To become heartHeld is to become enlightened in the fullsome sense pointed to in note 2 or in *Cantower IX*: the Position becomes a harmonious Poisition and one merges Zen and Ken in a new Then bushelling enlightenment.

---

<sup>1</sup>"Where does the Beginning Begin? As I am putting down these words on an empty page I have begun to write a sentence that, when it is finished, will be the beginning of a chapter on certain problems of beginning." (Eric Voegelin, *In Search of Order*, Vol. 5, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1987, 13)

<sup>2</sup>For the advanced Lonergan student an immediate context might be the incarnate merging of four contexts: the bottom of the first page of chapter fourteen of *Insight*; the page there beginning "study of the organism begins" (*Insight*, 464[489]); the page stating "the position" (*Insight*, 388[413]); the statement of the problem of a memory of startling strangeness (*Insight*, xxviii[22]). The remote goal is a **poise** that would carry one psychically beyond the problem of the end of that first page of chapter fourteen to a pilgrim's being-at-home in skinned molecular intelligence's universe as habitat. Such would be the mature positional character, sublational of the oriental poise of enlightenment. This note, however, represents another beginning. Its doctrinal brevity here will be expanded into foundational conversation in *Cantower IX* under the title "Position, Poisition, Protopossession".

<sup>3</sup>There are two readings that would help here: chapter three of *Lack in the Beingstalk* and my earlier struggle with the same topic in "Systematics: A Language of the Heart", chapter five of *The Redress of Poise*.

This has already toned into the obscurity of a Then Master, sublating both Dogen and his contemporary Thomas Aquinas, so I must turn round to another beginning.

That other beginning is, of course, you. And I have to presume that you are not totally a beginner. How much can I presume? How much have you to bring? Where and how are you being invited to climb?

At worst, let us consider that this is a Master/Mistress class into which you have stumbled. This is a good and helpful fresh beginning for both of us. For you, it may be a case of not really belonging but staying to enjoy all the same. A friend brought you here and there is no pressure on you to climb anywhere. I call to mind such an event that is doubly relevant, in which Quincy Jones is the friend, Nadia Boulanger the Mistress.

What sort of a pupil was Quincy? Bobby Tucker (arranger, conductor) recalls of Nadia “that she said two of the most influential musicians she ever knew were Quincy and Stravinsky”.<sup>4</sup>

Tucker tells of walking with Quincy to a Master-class the latter was attending. Tucker remained outside but Nadia coaxed him into the house and brought him up to her rooms. Tucker’s report is worth quoting fully.

“Inside her class, the students had the score to Stravinsky’s *Firebird Suite* open on their desks. I took a seat in the back next to Quincy.

Nadia sat down at the piano and played a few bars of the *Firebird*. She was sharp as a razor. She played energetic, like a teenager, just zipped through the piece. The she turned to the class and said, ‘Now, clap the rhythms of the second violin.’ We started clapping the part and she stopped us right away. She said, ‘No, no. *No retard!* Stravinsky told me himself!’

That just flipped me out. I’m just a little raggedy-ass motherfucker from Morristown,

---

<sup>4</sup>*Q. The Autobiography of Quincey Jones*, Doubleday, New York, 2001, 123. Tucker is the writer of this chapter.

New Jersey, ain't I? What am I doing here?

I peeked at Quincy and I saw that he got it too. He was thinking the same thing that I was thinking. I leaned over to him and whispered, 'Stravinsky told me so himself!' And Quincy whispered back, 'Damn right, mademoiselle.'"<sup>5</sup>

So, you may not be even up to the standard of Bobby Tucker, conductor, arranger: you may be a mothertucker with no particular background in music or metaphysics. But you are the conductor and arranger of your own life. What has that life been; what is that life to be?

Perhaps you are a mothertucker that has been misled by bogus master-classes into aspiring to be a composer. As Tucker or Von Karajan might tell, composers are a rare breed. And this is a key to what my *Cantower* series is all about.

Meaning is not a democracy. There are giants of meaning scattered through history, but there are the present axial institutions of education that would suck us into an illusion about sharing their meaning. Writing of the place of great books in education Leo Strauss remarked: "The facile delusions which conceal from us our true situation all amount to this: that we are, or can be, wiser than the wisest men of the past. We are thus induced to play the part, not of attentive and docile listeners, but of impresario and lion-tamers."<sup>6</sup> He goes on to write of teachers, and the rare teachers who may pass from being also pupils that are "extraordinarily rare. We are not likely to meet any of them in any classroom. We are not likely to meet any of them anywhere. It is a piece of luck if there is a single one alive in one's time".

It was with that quotation that I ended my little book, *Loneragan's Challenge to the*

---

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>6</sup>Leo Strauss, *Liberalism: Ancient and Modern*, Basic Books, New York, 3. One must, of course, soak this up imaginatively, molecularly. Envisage a history teacher dealing with early nineteenth German history, getting Schiller, Goethe, Beethoven over a barrel.

*University and the Economy*,<sup>7</sup> ending a stage in my own climb, and this brings me to a further key point. My books represent my climb; they may help in your climb. But they may not.<sup>8</sup> You have to make and find your own luck. I ended a previous book, *The Shaping of the Foundations* on my 45th birthday; I published my recent effort, *Lack in the Beingsstalk: A Giants Causeway* on my 70th birthday. I remain a pupil of Lonergan, as I do of Chopin whom I met much earlier, and continue my search for the meaning of music and the music of meaning. As I type I listen to Brahms's C-minor symphony, his first, called Beethoven's tenth, weaving forward to the last movement's melody, a birthday gift to Clara Schumann. You share, I hope, some of my lunacy about, aboutshipped by, music? Music "that breaks the heart: it is a Monteverdi lament, the oboes in a Bach Cantata, a Chopin Ballade"<sup>9</sup> Our best speaking, "our poetry is haunted by the

---

<sup>7</sup>The book was originally published in 1980, from University Press of America. I have now made it available on the present Website: indeed, I was fortunate in being able to make available a copy of Lonergan's own copy of the book, with his interesting markings.

<sup>8</sup>Since I wrote this sentence, I had occasion to re-read *The Redress of Poise* as I prepared that book for this Website. It represent my struggle in the 1990s, as I moved through my sixties. It was a double struggle: in the context of titles and topics supplied by the Boston Lonergan Workshop I struggled both to refine my own foundational perspective and to intimate the need for that struggle to others. More about that below in the Introduction to section B. I think that the chapters of that book are valuable for what I may call advanced climbers, but in these *Cantowers* I take a different tack, the fresh pragmatism described in the third chapter of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*. In these years I sometimes wonder about conversations I had with Lonergan in 1966 when he puzzled over what he might do about *Insight* as he tackled *Method*. "I cant put all of *Insight* into chapter one!" was an expression of his frustration. When I came to indexing *Method* in December of 1971 I was thrilled to find *Insight* "included" on pages 286-7. But now I surmise that the listing there should have been more modest and especially that it should have included the set of categories regarding the division of labour, the central foundational shift of the book. *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway* contextualizes the problem of a rewrite of *Method*. See also note 32 below.

<sup>9</sup>George Steiner, *Errata*, Weidenfel and Nicholson, London, 1997, 73.

music it has left behind”.<sup>10</sup>

I wrote in the first paragraph about “the type of organism” that we are. This questmood haunts my present prose, meshed with two separate single page pointings. There is the page I have been referring to for decades that I have tried and still try to play, “study of the organism begins....”<sup>11</sup>, molecular-wise, seeking molecular wisdom.<sup>12</sup> And there is that other page, the first page of Chopin’s C-minor Nocturne, lifting to integral densification the first-page elements in the following five pages.<sup>13</sup>

Indeed, might not those six pages of that Nocturne be a fitting ideogram of the first six of my *Cantowers*?! But let us leave this flight of fantasy aside for the moment and return to the elements that I have in mind in initiating this series.

My concern, then, is “not only with knowing history, but also with directing it”.<sup>14</sup> My concern is with “implementation”, mentioned many times in *Insight* but not as yet indexed. The *Why* of this and of the axial failure of philosophy and culture is the largest issue in the book *Lack in the Beingstalk* and I do not wish here to repeat myself. However, I’m afraid the book is relevant: you need the text of this firebird, this gosh-hawk, to hand, even if you are only to clap

---

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>11</sup>*Insight*, 1957, p. 464; 1992, p. 489. Page references in future will be thus: 464[489].

<sup>12</sup>This search for molecular wisdom, hopefully, will tighten, boa-wise, vortexwise, round Lonerganism. What is phantasm? What are feelings? One might begin by reading Candace B. Pert, *Molecules of Emotion*, Scribner, New York, 1997: the principle topic of *Cantower IV*: “Molecules of Describing and Explaining”. What is at stake is taking seriously the challenge to “go on” of the relevant paragraph of page 287 in *Method in Theology*, reaching out of the sadness of being “breathless and late” (*Insight*, 733[755]) that is the dominant reality of present Lonergan scholarship.

<sup>13</sup>My copy is from Schirmer’s Library of Classical Music, vol. 1550: *Chopin: Book IV. Nocturnes*. The page I refer to is page 62.

<sup>14</sup>*Insight*, 227[253].

retardedly your dissent. Most elementarily, the book offers you two views of Lonergan's efforts. In it is presented my own complex view of Lonergan's struggles, entrapments, limitations; there is a view of an anonymous reader, to whom I gave a sex-neutral name Joey, critical of my work and holding that whereas Lonergan had "a few clear things to say,"<sup>15</sup> I muddy the meaning with my own eccentric agenda. People commenting on my few remarks in the book regarding Joey seemed to wish more dialogue, comparison, whatever. I see no point in that: first, *Comparison* in the new context is sublated into Dialectic - one of the "clear things" Lonergan has to say<sup>16</sup>; secondly, and consequently, let the vortex of *hodic method* settle the disagreement. But let there be no doubt about my view of Joey's perspective, or the prevalent perspective in Lonerganism. I recall a neat summing up by Schumpeter of a precursor of Marshall and Keynes: "so lucid and so wingless".<sup>17</sup>

Lonerganism in the main is wingless, ineffective, effete. Lonergan's achievement, on the other hand, is a wind over the academy and culture, a falcon: Lonergan, "the sparrow hawk, offers birds to the spirit,"<sup>18</sup> sublates obscurely the vorticism of Wyndam Lewis into a geohistorical solution to the problem of general bias.

But I wish to be practical, to offer practical help. Back then to you and your friend, to

---

<sup>15</sup>Section 4 of Chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway* presents Joey's "Publisher's Critique" of my initial version of *Phenomenology and Logic*, in particular a substantial Appendix A, which I removed from the volume. It is available in section 4.3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

<sup>16</sup>*Method in Theology*, 250.

<sup>17</sup>The person in question is Henry Sidgwick(1838-1900). His significance for Keynes and Marshall is discussed in D.E.Moggridge, *Maynard Keynes. An Economist's Biography*, Routledge, 1992, pp. 56ff. The quotation from J. Schumpeter, *History of Economic Analysis*, 1954, 408, is given there on p. 57..

<sup>18</sup>I quote from Canto LII, *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*, A New Directions Book, N.Y. one volume edition, 1970, 260. All my references to the Cantos will be to this edition.

Tucker and Quincy.

You have the challenge of finding where you are at regarding this master-class stuff, regarding life lived or to be lived. Some of my readers are young. If you are one of them, then you may find that, luckily, you have found Lonergan inspiring, useful in orchestrating your life, your teaching, your business, whatever. But you may be like Quincy, with talent and ambition. Where to, then? Let Quincy Jones's own story, twisting around Nadia Boulanger, inspire you.

"I loved talking about music with her. We'd sit in the warm living room of Fontainebleau, her summer residence at the American School of Music, and she'd talk for hours about music. No pencil. No paper. No lesson. Just knowledge. She admired jazz. I wanted to learn to write symphonies, but Nadia wouldn't hear of it. She said, 'learn your skills but forget about great American symphonies. You already have something unique and important. Go mine the ore you already have'."<sup>19</sup>

"Go mine the ore you already have": Note now that I am accepting this for both you and I, and indeed, for history, in a profound ontogenetic and phylogenetic sense. There is no question, then, for economics or anything else, of "going back to the beginning and starting again" as Joan Robinson and John Eatwell suggested.<sup>20</sup> The beginning begins by accepting the past, ontogenetically and phylogenetically, as obscurely "something better than was the reality".<sup>21</sup> What a strange phrase that is, and what a strange hopefilled twist it is to thus **accept: *wo es war, so ich werden.***<sup>22</sup> The acceptance at its relative best is a massive molecular leap of faith regarding

---

<sup>19</sup>Q: *The Autobiography*, 133.

<sup>20</sup>Joan Robinson and John Eatwell, *An Introduction to Modern Economics*, McGraw Hill, London, 1973, 51.

<sup>21</sup>B.Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 251.

<sup>22</sup>Lonergan, "Method: Trends and Variations", *A Third Collection*, Edited by F.E.Crowe, Paulist Press, 1985, 18. I am citing here Lonergan's rendition, without capitals, of Freud's

a “friendly universe”.<sup>23</sup> And here I come to my centre-piece: my imaging of the acceptance is the vortex, a friendly gentle twist. We must pause here and gently twist.

Ezra Pound asserted that the first job of a critic was to present his “ideograph of the good”<sup>24</sup>. Now it would be quite foolish of me to expect many of my readers to see what I am pushing for with this ideograph, this central character-eye-sing of the lifting of the id of history towards some luminosity of the mystical organism. Perhaps those who have worked through chapter three of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism* and chapter four of

---

“where the id is the ego is to be”. In the same context he refers to Gerhard Adler’s *The Living Symbol, A Case Study in the Process of Individuation*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1961. This is a rich ontogenetic direction to pursue, personally and thematically, under the dominance of the vortex, the twist, image, but I must hold in the text to my central concern, phylogeny.

<sup>23</sup>*Method in Theology*, 117.

<sup>24</sup>*Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*, edited with an introduction by T.S.Eliot, New Directions, Norfolk, 1968, 37. Of interest, perhaps, is the source of Pound’s focus e.g. his dependence on Fenollosa essay, “The Chinese Written Character as a Medium of Poetry”, viewed by Pound in 1915 as a “whole basis of aesthetics”. References to these works and to other relevant discussion of the topic are available in Ronald Bush, *The Genesis of Ezra Pound’s Cantos*, Princeton University Press, 1976; my immediate reference is to page 10. See also Peter Mankin, *Pound’s Cantos*, especially the first four chapters on “The Beginning”, “Preparation”, “Ur-Cantos” and “Structures”. On Pound criticism in the last century see Mankin, 310-16. I must note here that I am not setting up Pound as some front-runner in the search for the “tale of the tribe”. I happen to find the Canto notion suggestive, tied in with Lewis’ notion of vorticism and Upward’s image of ‘whirl-swirl’ (Bush, pp. 92-3), and Pound’s interest in economic reality. And the image of his long struggle echos with my own. “For forty years I have schooled myself to write an epic poem” (Ezra Pound, *Selected Prose, 1909-1965*, ed. William Cookson, New York, New Directions, 1875, 167). Some other image may suit you in sharing or criticising my monthly flight of fantasy, your daily climb, the human tidings. We desperately need post-Dantesque imagery, “To make a church / or an altar to Zagreus.../ Without jealousy/ like the double arch of a window/ or some great colonnade”. (“Notes for Canto CXVII et seq.”, that concludes Pound’s efforts). My imaging of molecular spirit’s Cantower and Whirlwind (see the Bacchuspage at the end of *Lack in the Beginstalk*) is simply one searching beyond Constantian and Dantesque layerings.

*Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway* will be with me. Indeed, it was only through my struggle with the latter chapter that the image of whirlpool, sea-well, sea-wall, began to infest my psyche. I was grappling with Lonergan's solution to the challenge of general bias. That solution is an ongoing global spiralling of functional specialization, sweeping up a creative minority, gracefully making conversions beyond general bias a topic and an embarrassment, seeding over millennia a global lift of communal meaning. The previous footnote would give leads to the literary sources of the imaging, but there are wider and deeper sources, meshed with the imaging of recurrence-schemes that dominate the emergence of the cosmos.

The image began its infostering through my work in musicology in the late 1960s, and now it is quietly pointed to by the word *Cantower*, which perhaps is my version of Joyce's *Deshil Holles Eamus*<sup>25</sup> that may have seeded *Finnegans Wake*. My selected word is not important, but you having some equivalent image is. What is the plain, plane, ex-plane<sup>26</sup>, meaning? It is the manner in which an efficient<sup>27</sup> communal "turn to the idea" promises and hopes to generate a self-generating self-critical tower or well<sup>28</sup> of meaning generating not axioms

---

<sup>25</sup>The incantation begins the Section of Ulysses, Chapter 14, that is called Oxen of the Sun, a sweep through previous styles and a birth in Holles St.Hospital. *Deshil* is Gaelic for "turn to he right". "Eamus" is Latin for "Let us go". But you get my extra twist if you shift the "s": "Deshil Holle Seamus": "twist everything round right, James".

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, the concluding section of chapter 3. Ex-plane is in general a process of popularization recognized normatively as such, at least in the communicator, but in a compact or a sophisticated culture the 'recognition' can be in both speaker and listener. There will be more on this topic in : *Cantower IV* "Molecules of Description and Explanation".

<sup>27</sup>My key reference here is to *Topics in Education*, 160, where the unity of a science in relation to its efficiency is discussed. Clearly, this centres on the problem of implementation.

<sup>28</sup>There is an issue here of sexual preference in imagery which would turn one into the zones of searching associated with Pert and Durand and Betcherev. In *Cantower IV* I will make reference to an image in Shakespeare and Browning, of the Tower searched for. More homely, more sexually balanced, is the image focused on in *Cantower V*: "I will build my love a bower".

but characters, a cosmopolis “to //witness to the possibility of ideas”<sup>29</sup>, and for the theist, the possibilities of Idea.

## 2 Strategic Occupations

I have indicated briefly the central image. Now I recall my basic Irish analogue. My image is of another Easter Monday, but the year is 1916, and a small group of Irish people occupy various buildings in Dublin - the most famous being the General Post Office on Dublin’s main street - and challenged an empire that had held colonial sway for almost seven centuries.<sup>30</sup> There are lots of parallels to our task, the most evident being a parallel with the colonization of English by Scotism.<sup>31</sup> But here I wish to get straight to the pointing, and so I point first generically, secondly with peculiar particularity. If you like, you may think of the focus of my two sub-sections as being on the two words of my sub-title. Strategic? The focus is organic functionality on all its levels. Occupations? Where, literally, should these organically-twisted characters hazard

---

<sup>29</sup>*Insight*, 239[264].

<sup>30</sup>Your analogue or memory of oppression and resistance will undoubtedly be different. Some may think, for instance, of another Easter, that of 1943, and ZOB, the Jewish resistance in the Warsaw Ghetto. What matters is the coming to grips with the horror, the brutal reality, of general bias as a colonization, a jackbooting of human yearnings. An illustration from another context may be helpful here. I think of “the standard of unliving that is present academic economics, butchering young minds and old nations, ‘a cavalry riding on, dust-stained, sweating, red-faced, no trace of excrement after their butcher’s work, professionals, its all done perfectly calmly - that’s what makes them special, their self-assurance, hard work, nurses on horseback’”. *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, p. 161. The inner quotation is from Isaac Babel, who died in the Gulag on St. Patrick’s Day 1941.

<sup>31</sup>On the subject of linguistic colonization I am indebted to Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland. The Literature of the Modern Nation*, Harvard University Press, 1997. See the index there under *Colonialism*.

to occupy themselves most efficiently? And it is important for you and me herenowtherethen to note that section 2.1 is the practical heart of this Cantower: the rest, if you like, is visionary, but in that section I try to give an initial answer to the interested practical question, ‘What might I do, here now?’

## 2.1 Functional identification

This is an old problem which I try to put in a fuller context in *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*. Fr. Fred Crowe’s regular question is, “What functional specialty are you working in?” and he enjoyed my comment on that challenge, “if a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing badly”. This is what I wish us, alone and communally, to envisage with a fresh pragmatism.<sup>32</sup>

So, you, I, can carry on life as scholar or teacher, but push a little towards the addition of a twist, a turn towards functional thinking.<sup>33</sup> That turn would help towards a more differentiated perspective. For instance, you have specialized in some philosopher or theologian. Has the specialization been a specialization of interpretation? Then Lonergan’s few descriptive pages on the matter give you food for thought about what you might be at, food for pragmatic thought

---

<sup>32</sup>This obviously echoes the subtitle of the book *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics*. The key pragmatism there is to push for an honest statement of one’s own categories: perhaps a vague grasp of Lonergan’s list in *Method* pp. 286-7, but with the focus now on the missing categorial division of labour. Recall note 8 above. My ‘proverb’ for Crowe in the early eighties took almost twenty years to ferment into the present thematic. That thematic is related to a more precise role of foundational thinking, particularly that thinking which I have been calling *fantasy* since the mid-1970s.

<sup>33</sup>I am thinking here of people who are beyond the sufferings of thesis’ work: to the latter I can only give the advice that Lonergan wrote to me when I was having trouble in Oxford, “give the fellow what he wants... its only a union card”.

about deficiencies. Do I understand the object about which the author writes? That question pushes one to see where one stands categorially so that one can be more luminous - not *voraussetzungslos* - regarding the author's contribution, the author's positive function in history. And one grows more luminous in regard to one's own function in the community. One is simply an interpreter. One does not go on to the story of either the fate of or the impact of the author's view; one does not criticise the author or compare the author to other writers: these activities belong to other tasks. And this, of course, is true, when the author in question is Lonergan.

I ramble briefly round this one point, though what is needed is a re-write of the corresponding section of *Method*, indeed various rewrites of *Method*, that would build into our ethos of interpreting an operative presence of a transposed "first principle of criticism".<sup>34</sup> It may be simply a private effort to re-view your own work, a thesis, an essay, to glimpse that you have wandered e.g. into *comparison*<sup>35</sup> which belongs in dialectic, or you wandered back into research or forward into doctrinal assertions. You thus begin to suspect that hanging in, sentence by sentence, with specialized interpretation, is beyond our present communal talent. In fact it, and any other specialization, in its full realization, involves precise differentiations of consciousness that would and eventually will give rise to a new functional control of meaning and expression.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>*Insight*, 588[611]. See below at note 50.

<sup>35</sup>*Method in Theology*, 250.

<sup>36</sup>A worthwhile exercise here would be to take such a work as Fr.F.E.Crowe's *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study in History*, Paulist Press, New York, 1978, and struggle with Crowe's "spadeful of earth in the moving of a mountain"(p.149) both in its general structure and in its details. Such reflection may be illustrated by considering a single page, p. 3. Crowe is on the edge here of the distinction between history and systematics, a distinction which preoccupied Lonergan in the late 1950s. He write of "ideas ordered genetically and not just temporally". But lower in the page he remarks that "the organization is not systematic but genetic, and the ideas are not theoretical but historical. That is, there is no theory of the word of God that unfolds etc...." The page ends with the suggestion, "there will surely be no objection to the notion of a path through history, or even to calling it an organization of history when this is understood as

You can recognize, I hope, that final sentence of mine as a piece of foundational fantasy. But also as an operable fantasy: otherwise it would not be foundational fantasy. I express, popularly, a methodological doctrine. “Let’s try it ... however badly we succeed”. Let’s try it on Lonergan articles in e.g. *Method* or *Theological Studies* or Lonerganesque reflections anywhere. If you wish, you may think of this as a popular sublation of a watered-down cosmopolis into the present context, a push for self-critical operative witnessing to the seeding of an idea.<sup>37</sup> And to see it in its full discomfiting reality would require a sentence by sentence consideration of our various efforts to either interpret or apply Lonergan’s work.

But the purpose of the discomfort is to help us recognize, badly, our bad functioning. Then we might have a shot at twisting our present work into a functional mode.

Have you the beginnings of a suspicion of some personally-helpful image here? Does my image of **twisting** help, put in the context of my images of vortex, whirlwind, spiral?<sup>38</sup> Think, perhaps, of the way a magnet slipped under a table covered with iron filings can line up those filings.<sup>39</sup> The line up, or round, here is the line up in collaboration, a relay race in which there is a

---

the discovery of an intelligible sequence”. But can the suggestion not be sublated by denying the opposition between **systematic** and **genetic**, and so moving on to more precision regarding the relations and distinctions between a genetic systematics and history? We will ponder over this question in *Cantower VII*: “Systematics and General Systems Theory”.

<sup>37</sup>The relevant section in *Insight* is section 7.8.6. The nature of cosmopolis and of efficient implementation were the single central problem left dangling in *Insight*.

<sup>38</sup>The image was originally the centrepiece of the book *The Shaping of the Foundations*: it is reproduced at the end, the Bacchuspage, of *Lack in the Beginstalk: A Giants Causeway*.

<sup>39</sup>Pound wrote “if you clap a strong magnet beneath a plateful of iron filings, the energies of the magnet will proceed to organize form... the design in the magnetized iron filings expresses a confluence of energy”. (“Affirmations, Vorticism”, *The New Age*, xvi, 11, Jan 14, 1915, 277). One could sublimate Pounds various reflections on “vorticist man”. Even here, does it not give you a new notion of filing systems?!

handing over from research to interpretation etc; the handing is increasingly done *self-luminously*. You anticipate that your piece of work on Paul or Augustine or Thomas or Lonergan will find its way round - cleansed, criticized, supplemented, integrated - to a relevance in streets and hearts. Just as a contemporary chemist might fit work into a zone in the periodic table, so you fit your effort into a zone of specialized function in hodic method.

This is a tough topic: can you identify in the Lonergan literature efforts to do this with any precision, any success? Might you have a shot at cleansing, criticizing, etc a particular effort; you as alone or as a group, in a seminar or class? The *Cantowers* will try to reach forward in such ways. But at least here we have the beginning of “making conversion a topic”<sup>40</sup>, where the conversion is to the primary categorial shift invented by Lonergan.<sup>41</sup>

## 2.2 Strategic Occupational Hazards

I have been writing about a revolutionary view, but now we come to grips with the ambiguity of the word ‘revolution’. Yes, there is the evident simple meaning: the defiant occupation, Easter Monday 1916, of strategic buildings like the G.P.O. in Dublin. But there is the key meaning here of a view of revolving, twisting, which points to the possibility of a quieter revolution. Elsewhere I have indicated that the ferment and fragmentation of the past centuries edge us towards that turning. Can we gently go with the flow, speed it up: can towers emerge, people who tow gently the massive confused cultural reflection towards a functional circulation so that a vortex movement begins to stir in the turn to the idea?

My *Cantower* work is my effort to tow culture to a better dance in the round. How about

---

<sup>40</sup>*Method in Theology*, 253.

<sup>41</sup>Recall notes 8 and 32 above: I am talking here about a missing set (10) on page 287 of *Method in Theology*.

you? Again here there is ambiguity: hazard can mean genuine risk, but it can also mean taking a gentle chance. That chance can be as gentle and private as just carrying the reflections of the previous section into your own research or interest, but mainly in a reflective fashion or in a non-obtrusive way. I have given some leads to such reflection and action in section 5 of chapter 1 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, “Your Fitting Survival”, and there is no point in repeating them here. A further pragmatic reflection on patterns and opportunities of operation is the final chapter of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, “Proximate Pragmatics”. *Cantower III*, “Round One Willing Gathering”, will push forward the reflection in a communal manner: it represents the program for the annual West Dublin Conference of August 12-16, 2002, “Implementing Functional Specialization”.

Part of the project of that conference is a tentative personal identification in or outside functional specialization: Might I shuffle and sift my work, with dialogue and help, into a specialty, in a communally helpful manner? Or might I identify my work as outside that collaboration, popularizing self-attention or even ‘functionality’ or more directly meeting the desperate needs of our times?<sup>42</sup> The conference will focus especially on the challenge of education at all levels. Twenty years ago I wrote ineffectually, “If there is to be a massive shift in public minding and kindness in the next century, there must be a proportionate shift in the mind and heart of the academy and the arts at the end of this century, with consequent changes in operating schemes of recurrence from government to kindergarden”.<sup>43</sup> We will attempt in August to envisage in an effective, affective and collaborative manner, like the revolutionary group of 1916, what each of us might do, with our limited talents, to efficiently initiate strategic shifts. Might

---

<sup>42</sup>This is a topic I deal with in one fashion in the appendix to both *Economics for Everyone* and *A Brief History of Tongue*.

<sup>43</sup>Philip McShane, *Lonergan’s Challenge to the University and the Economy*, University Pres of America, 1980, p. 1.

you initiate a little shift? And who knows: your little shift might be the chaos-theory beat of butterfly-wings in Japan causing a flutter in Harvard! But what I am asking you to do now is, not shift, but just think about, contemplate, a possible shift. The shift indeed may be the seed of an effective shift of perspective. If you wish to share that thinking, well and good. We surely must begin to talk about it in humble practical terms. The humility will increase with honest talk.

These specializations, in their maturity, are difficult differentiations of consciousness that we can fantasize forward to by analogy.<sup>44</sup> It is quite evident to me, and I hope to you, that we do not share, as a community, the massively remote differentiations and categories of Lonergan.<sup>45</sup> Our topic there and here is this one set of his categories that needs airing and tentative implementation, and I am emphasizing that an airing is itself a beginning and that a tentative implementation is possible within a commonsense perspective. We are back at Crowe's question, What functional specialty, if any, are you attempting? And perhaps you can share better now Crowe's grin at my invented proverb "if a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing badly"?

A global ferment screams for what Lonergan discovered, named, described. It is his central doctrine. Is that not an embarrassment to his disciples, thirty five years after he began to share his discovery? "Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company".<sup>46</sup> In *Lack in the Beginstalk*, I noted a key part of my present orientation at seventy: I can risk being

---

<sup>44</sup>As well as the differentiation that make possible and probable secure luminous operation within a specialty, there is the broader differentiation of scientific fantasy, already touched on, that will constitute a discomforting redistribution of scholarly energy to futurology.

<sup>45</sup>Most of us were just not educated in a way that would bring us to share the list (1) to (9) of categories on pp. 286-7 of *Method in Theology*. Further, Lonergan did not share with us there, as he might have, a tenth set of categories - see the end of note 8 above. Finally, he did not invite the climb in his writing of *Method in Theology* and so he had to recall the relevant aspect of the climb beyond breathlessness by adding "on can go on" to his list.

<sup>46</sup>*Method in Theology*, 299.

impolite, even offensive, indeed perhaps “I’ll so offend to make offense a skill”.<sup>47</sup> But your status in life in all likelihood is not like mine. You have perhaps the hazardous occupation of doing a thesis, getting a job. Then, keep your reflections on functional specialization, and especially its being dodged in respectable Lonergan circles, to yourself. Sadly, it may be true, even if your thesis director or class instructor is a Lonergan disciple, that you have to follow the advice of Lonergan to me, mentioned in note 33, “give the guy what he wants”.

The key occupation of the Easter rebellion of 1916 was the occupation of the G.P.O. in O’Connell Street, named after that strange pacifist liberator of the 1820s.<sup>48</sup> What is my GPO? It is a quiet revolutionary self-attention in the context of Lonergan’s central doctrine, his solution to the problem that haunted and underpinned his struggle with history in the thirties, his searchings for cosmopolis in the fifties, his discovery in the sixties of recycling as the key.<sup>49</sup> The General Procedural Operation that I minimally ask for, a GPO occupation, preoccupation, embarrassment, is gentle contemplative talk, with self, with others. It can, for instance, - as I suggested earlier - be a private or a conversational or even a written reaching for the twisting of an essay, a lecture, a thesis, a life, that is pointed to by Lonergan’s first principle of criticism. The dominant notion in that principle, as Lonergan formulates it, is the universal viewpoint. The notion here is simply a descriptive but operative sense of the significance of functional specialization in any zone of inquiry. “A critic can proceed from that notion to a determination of the contributor’s particular viewpoint, he can indicate how the particularism probably would not invalidate the contributor’s work and, on the other hand, he can suggest to those working in

---

<sup>47</sup>Shakespeare, *King Henry IV, Part One*, I, ii, 209.

<sup>48</sup>Daniel O’Connell (1775-1847) achieved Irish Catholic emancipation in 1829.

<sup>49</sup>The discovery texts of February 1965 are presented in chapter 2 of Darlene O’Leary, *Lonergan’s Practical View of History*, Axial Press, 2002.

the contributor's special field the points on which his work may need revision".<sup>50</sup> But be cautious about hazarding this with your professor!

I had best conclude here with a return to the suggestions of helpful imagery, imagery you may already have begun to hazard after your reading of section 2.1. There is the problem of general bias, a sort of global flattening of meaning. The fact is that meaning is infinite and remote, even the meaning of the windhover, the daffodil, the sunflower. History has multiplied words, externalized them: how might that long decline be reversed? You recognize here another descriptive hint of the conclusion of chapter seven of *Insight*?

The vortext movement of functional specialization is part of the answer. The relevant image is the Twister, or some such turning at sea, which lifts - positively in mutual self-mediation, negatively in communal embarrassment (we tow and push each other round) - a creative minority to a higher plane of meaning. There emerges (oh so slowly: think in terms of centuries) a tower of meaning and a sea-wall, see-well. Common meaning is to be enriched by an ex-planing (integral and symbolic, even in classes in mathematics) which is not just *haute vulgarization*.

Does this help you contemplatively tow words imaging **implementation** and the eighth functional specialty?<sup>51</sup> And the image can be supplemented by the imaging of the axial period

---

<sup>50</sup>*Insight*, 588[611].

<sup>51</sup>We will be following this challenge through the *Cantowers*. *Cantower III*, section 3, "Identification", places it in the context of sublating the meaning of *identification* (*Insight* 17.2.5) into a functional specialist context. But it is worth your while to pause here over the puzzle of the nine precise generic meanings that *implemmentation* and *identification* take on in the new context. On the eighth functional speciality you might find useful McShane "Systematic, Communications, Actual Contexts", *Lonergan Workshop (7)*, 1987, edited by Frederick Lawrence, 143-174.

and the Trinitarian involvement in the stages of meaning.<sup>52</sup> But that's stuff for the next and later *Cantowers*. Here what I am concerned with is involving you in slow contemplative imaging of this partial solution to the massive problem of human progress and decline. It is an imaging that eventually reaches for an imaging of our destiny, your destiny and mine within the destiny of the billions of yearning human organisms.

Perhaps I have surprized you at moving thus to a core identification of the hazard? - contemplative living, the central hazardous occupation.<sup>53</sup> So I can conclude meaningfully and abruptly here by noting that the vortex image is a seed to be sucked daily, slowly, if one is to find what one's biographic way is in history tow-wards everlastingness.<sup>54</sup> Nothing succeeds like suck seeds: that is the ultimate harazardous occupation, Aristotle's finest way, the call to "towering on giant stilts".<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>Such an imaging is presented on page 124 of P.McShane, *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Band to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Press, 1998. Note 27 there comments on the problem of complexifying images.

<sup>53</sup>Note that here you may take my request or appeal to be simply an appeal to contemplate the division of labour of functional specialization with some level of seriousness: a musing about our present mess in Theology, in Lonergan studies, in the different arts and sciences, and on your present possibilities. But my appeal reaches deeper, into the function of leisure in the West, into the search for enlightenment in the East. In *Cantower II*, section 3, "The Organism That Is God", I shall invite you to some musing on a Christian contemplative focus. In *Cantower XXI* the question will be tackled more adequately. See note 55 below.

<sup>54</sup>I wish to gradually indicate that the vortex image has deep eschatological significance, liberating us from conventional Christian and non-Christian cosmic imaging, from the restrictive visioning of, for example, Dante and Milton.

<sup>55</sup>The reference is to the final page of Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past*. The next section will invite some reflection on the defect of this orientation, caught neatly in the phrase "Remembering the Future", the title of a relevant chapter on J.L.Synge in *Inventing Ireland. The Literature of the Modern Nation* by Declan Kibbert. I shall have more to say about the absence of and the need for a sublated kataphatic contemplative tradition in *Cantower XXI* (December

### 3. Lonergan and Then Enlightenment

In one of the meetings of the writers of *Searching for Cultural Foundations* - it was the meeting in which I presented stuff related to forwards foundational thinking - I recall Fred Lawrence making the astute point that Lonergan did not have the opportunity to fantasize.<sup>56</sup> Two decades later I am beginning to come to grips with the point.

Much could and will be written about this, and here I must be brief. Was it a matter of opportunity or bent, dynetype, as Lonergan himself would say? Regarding bent I would suggest that Lonergan's temperament led him to be primarily a rescuer of the past, a dialectician then. I made the point, in the Introduction to *For a New Political Economy* that, in his last years, while he seemed primarily interested in heading towards a primer in economics, he was in fact sifting dialectically through Schumpeter's *History*. Regarding opportunity there is much more to say but I will note one sad feature of his life: his entrapment in *haute vulgarization*. I do not wish to enter into this topic here: I suspect that my suggestion will be give rise to controversy that would not

---

1st, 2003). It might be of interest meantime to note a curious sublation here of Dionysius' circular motion of contemplation reflected on by Thomas in q. 180, a. 6 of *Summa Theologiae IIa IIae*. And now, perhaps, you can read the beginning of the second paragraph of this section 2.2 with a fresh eye? I would regard my *Cantower* work as primarily contemplative in a sublation of Thomas' tradition that makes luminous and operative the cyclic curling convenient, necessary, to "embarrass wakefulness, disturb sleep" with the remembering and institutional membering of each our molecular yearnings for a sloping, a slow pinguidity, towards terminal value. (The quoted phrase, from "Mission and Spirit", *A Third Collection*, 29, slides that context of being's passion into the key diagram of *Method in Theology*, 48).

<sup>56</sup>The meetings were in the early 1980s; the volume, *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, was published by University Press of America, 1983, edited by P.McShane; the contributors were F.E.Crowe, R.Doran, F.Lawrence, M. Vertin, and P.McShane.

be fruitful. But that entrapment fed back negatively on opportunity.<sup>57</sup> *Insight* is rich in foundational pointers, but neither he nor his followers have turned that richness into an implementable futurology. I recall asking him about publishing *Topics in Education* - long before the *Collected Works* were envisaged - and he was not enthusiastic: "I was just trying to work out a few things". The book illustrates both my points. He faced the massive task of sifting through the past in the field of philosophy of education in order to reach a fuller foundational perspective. He expressed that result partially and popularly.<sup>58</sup>

I might suggest that these *Cantowers*, too, can be seen as popular expression. The struggle for foundational and functionally differentiated expressions is a later communal task. But I wish to get my readers thinking about one particular suggestion: the suggestion that Lonergan's foundational effort is to be located primarily in the end of the task of dialectics - if you like, towards the bottom of page 250 of *Method in Theology*. This suggestion throws the rest of the book into a peculiar perspective.

Let me continue in apparently popular vein.<sup>59</sup> What should have come after p. 250 of *Method*? Not an asking whether what he proposed satisfied the definition of method, Lonergan's next statement; not a dialectic history of methods: his next sections. What should have followed

---

<sup>57</sup>Certainly he was pushing on; certainly there are 'pointers', as in the Education lectures or in *Insight*. However, it takes sophisticated listening to be clear on doctrinal and metadoctrinal speaking as such. My *Cantowers* may be regarded as metadoctrinal: but we are too young in following Lonergan's differentiatonal pointers to reach for refined distinctions of function.

<sup>58</sup>It is a worthwhile exercise to work through the book from this perspective, identifying the presentation as a curious mix of doctrinal presentation and of the *haute vulgarization* that he condemns in Volume 6 of the *Complete Works*.

<sup>59</sup>Continually here we must glide over complex issues. For instance, I might write of the foundational need to cope efficiently with the actual, probable, and possible world scenarios. The meaning is popularly obvious; but for the person with a precise horizon of emergentism and frequency-statistics, there is here quite a different remote meaning.

was a distinguishing of the foundational enterprize from the dialectic enterprize. I shall have more to say about that complex issue in *Cantower V* : “Metaphysics Then” - but I wish here to emphasize one distinction. Central to the foundational person’s task and vocation, **character**, is the scientific effort to fantasize. If foundational persons are merely repeating, even in an integrating and selective fashion, the achievements of the dialectical community, then this specialty has no significant creative function. The foundational community has the massive challenge of picking up on the best seeds and weeds of the past and pointing to relatively invariant structures of hope. A preliminary foundation treatment of the forward specialties would push for illustrations of this dynamic. Of course, such a preliminary foundational reflection would touch also on possible future innovations in the first four specialties. The challenge is a transposition of Thomas’ *respondeo dicendum* to the new context. Lonergan’s tired *respondeo* in the rest of the book is a minimalist sketching of applications of the foundations he had reached. The chapter on doctrines homes in eventually on the tasks of the ‘backward’ specialties; systematics is breezed through as lightly as possible; communications compactly says it all - to the wise - in the first two sections, but with a concluding paragraph in section 2 that echoes the darkness of the end of chapter seven of *Insight*.

What one would have liked would have been, rather, an echo and blossoming of the end of chapter twenty of *Insight*, driving towards a fantasy of the probable and possible operations of the “advance from a generic reinforcement of the pure desire to an adapted and specialized auxiliary”<sup>60</sup> that would constitute a vortex of concrete meaning twirling and cajoling us “to mount from an affective to an effective determination to discover and to implement in all things the intelligibility of universal order”.<sup>61</sup> That foundational fantasy would mediated a layered operable network of counter-structures to present social doctrines and systems and structures. That

---

<sup>60</sup>*Insight* 726[747].

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, 727[748].

network is, of course, quite beyond present fantasy, but the younger Lonergan had the energy to dream “that further developments in science should make small units self-sufficient on an ultramodern standard of living to eliminate commerce and industry, to transform agriculture into a superchemistry, to clear away finance and even money, to make economic solidarity a memory, and power over nature the only difference between high civilization and primitive gardening”.<sup>62</sup>

Can we pick up the baton and run, trot, walk, limp, forward with it creatively?

#### 4. *Cantowers Then?*

Can towers of hodic collaboration emerge to lift efficiently the schedules of probability of progress? I can only contribute the nudges of one eccentric. And I propose to add these nudges on the first day of each month. But clearly I am looking for a fresh beginning, particularly towards the genesis of a scientific futurology. No doubt there will be annoyance at my eccentric initiative, but I would hope for the emergence of those not shaken but stirred, a bonding towards efficient ongoing collaboration in this vortex movement. Pound wrote of artists as prophets, “the antennae of the race”<sup>63</sup> and “drew it into the basis of his Cantos”.<sup>64</sup> It was a larger enterprise than Heaney’s *Redress of Poetry*. But what is needed is an optimistic axial *Redress of Poise* that would twirl forward and tower as a respected embarrassing science, a “generalized method”<sup>65</sup> relating Then “aggregates and successions of instances of common sense to one another”<sup>66</sup> in “a

---

<sup>62</sup>Lonergan, *For a New Political Economy*, 20.

<sup>63</sup>*Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*, 48.

<sup>64</sup>Peter Makin, 10.

<sup>65</sup>The final page of chapter 7 of *Insight*.

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*

highly differentiated and specialized reflection”<sup>67</sup> that would be “not only a new and higher collaboration of intellects through faith in God, but also a mystery that is at once symbol of the uncomprehended and sign of what is grasped and psychic force that sweeps living human bodies, linked in charity, to the joyful, courageous, whole-hearted, yet intelligently controlled performer of the task set by a world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended”.<sup>68</sup>

The first page of my Nocturne must end, sliding from high melody to low notes. I mentioned at the beginning six initial *Cantowers* pacing along with the six pages of Chopin’s Nocturne in C minor, op.48, no.1.<sup>69</sup> At least I should name those six *Cantowers* now:

|                     |  |             |
|---------------------|--|-------------|
| <i>Cantower I</i>   | Function and History                   | April 1     |
| <i>Cantower II</i>  | Sunflowers Speak to Us of Growing      | Mayday      |
| <i>Cantower III</i> | Round One Willing Gathering            | June 1      |
| <i>Cantower IV</i>  | Molecules of Describing and Explaining | July 1      |
| <i>Cantower V</i>   | Metaphysics Then                       | August 1    |
| <i>Cantower VI</i>  | Gathering Round One                    | September 1 |

---

<sup>67</sup>The first page of chapter 14 of *Method*.

<sup>68</sup>*Insight*, 723-4[745].

<sup>69</sup>Am I making enemies, discouraging you? Please tolerate my eccentricity. And there is some meaning in my madness. Recall Whistler, in his *The Gentle Art of Making Enemies*, New York, 1890, 126-7. “Why should I not call my work ‘symphonies’, ‘arrangements’, ‘harmonies’ and ‘nocturnes’?... My picture ‘Harmony in Grey and Gold’ is an illustration of my meaning.... As music is the poetry of sound, so is painting the poetry of sight, and the subject has nothing to do with the harmony of sound or of colour”. The harmony at issue here is the harmony and rhythm of the human subject’s accumulating meaning; the crisis is the longer cycle of decline’s facilitation of facile reading, non-intussusception. One read’s Chopin the way one should read Aquinas.

And what of *Cantower VII* and the following months?

While title and orientations are available, their contents depend on the gatherings and stirrings. Even with such cumulative twistings that may call towards other whirls, THEN it seems to me best that I should begin again myself<sup>70</sup> with the simplest zones of inquiry, mathematics, physics and chemistry. I began there academically fifty years ago, in 1952: perhaps if I give it a new whirl I might have better vision the second round time? Might it generate, with a community's help, an escatalogical *Cantower*?<sup>71</sup>

But the *Cantowers* are meant to meet, meet, ongoing needs, suggested directions, blocks in methodology, and, above all, to mediate a new communal effort. So there will be a randomness in

---

<sup>70</sup>Not alone, I hope: the fresh beginning could be a slow circulation through exchanges reaching for modest turns or even for denser mappings, metadoctrinal pointing. I would note here, in regards to collaboration, that my article "Elevating *Insight*. Spacetime as Paradigm Problem", *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19(2001) can be regarded as an appeal for collaboration. There is a further appeal in the first entry in the Archival Section of the present Website: "Lonergan and The Philosophy of the Lower Sciences". These efforts can also lead to the achievement of doctrinal pointing to observers or bewildered contemporaries in different areas of culture: a type of explaning of the Tower, the sea-wall, the future dynamics of cultural life. With that in mind the West Dublin Conference of 2003 (August 11- 15) has as its topic "Functional Specialization: Physics as Elementary Paradigm". And it seems likely that the main focus of *Cantowers X-XX* will be in the area of physics, the lower ground of loneliness.

<sup>71</sup>It is best to halt there. Those who wish a broader sweep might venture into the two books referred to above, in note 21: Bush and Mankin. These first six *Cantowers* are my equivalent to Pound's 'Ur-Cantos' (Mankin ch.3), but they will not be revised. Like Pound, I must reach beyond Dante's stable vision, "By no means an orderly Dantesque rising/ but as the winds veer" (Canto LXXIV, 443). Mankin's chapter 4 begins a discussion of structures, drafts. A quotation there is relevant: "One must experience the world until the meaning is perceived. One cannot sit around and wait.... Answers came, positively from Browning and from Hanno; in negative form, from Dante"(55). The key to my discontinuous leap is my category of SensAbility, which places yearning mind in the twist of senses' molecules; answers come positively from Lonergan, through fantasy, methodologically fermented and controlled. You may gradually see how the consequent foundations twist towards a discomforting displacement of the poets and the critics.

the sequence as it moves along from *Cantower I* to *Cantower L* and beyond.

### 5. *Cantower I, Now Then*

The many-layered beginning is a Nocturne, invented by the Field.<sup>72</sup> The nocturne is a bounded organic trill in the symphony of that field, so the bounded is unbounded. “To paint is to draw boundries,”<sup>73</sup> but the boundries of the canvas, the Joycean basket<sup>74</sup> of delight is at once an integral now making present all then: the living little flower is rooted and rooting in the whirling cosmos, speaking of growth, of now and then, of Now and Thend.<sup>75</sup> Are we in the shade of *Cantower II*?

I am at the now the end of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*. For you to shade into *Cantower II* more adequately requires that you brush your moleculed eyes and ayes through and round that outprint. At least the Bacchuspige at the end of that book, must be perused to glimpse my realism regarding the shading and sharing. If I am now a stranger to the person who finished that book, incapable of sharing present meaning with myself of last week, THEN what I write here is very distantly semaphorus to you, nowthere. “I am leaving Rome in the direction of

---

<sup>72</sup>The musical form, nocturne, was invented by the Irishman John Field( 1782-1837). But the fuller meaning of molecular vertical finality’s invention is reached by reflecting on *Field* as it is discussed by Lonergan in *Phenomenology and Logic*.

<sup>73</sup>A comment of the author of *Shuuo wen*, the first Chinese dictionary, around A.D. 100.

<sup>74</sup>I refer here to Joyce’s discussion of Aquinas’ definition of beauty in chapter five of *A Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man*. In my edition, Viking Press, New York, 1962, the basket appears in page 212.

<sup>75</sup>That rootedness is normatively part of the foundational perspective: the understanding of the flower is ”part of a context, loaded with the relations that belong to it in virtue of a source which is equally the source of other concepts”, “the conceptualization of understanding is, when fully developed, a system”. (Lonergan, *Verbum*, 1997, 238)

China: along the way I shall become increasingly different from what I was when I left".<sup>76</sup> If you hold otherwise, at any age, to some notion of shared or settled plane meaning, you are killing off your sequential suck-seeding, joining the more than 99% of Maslow's famous statistic. You are bounding the semi-quaver of this *Cantower* in a manner that I would parallel with bounding our Nocturne's wonderous semi-quaver G-chord<sup>77</sup> that Nowends a first page towards the fresh beginning of the Proustian new tease of the second page. But that parallel may not help you; you must find your own molecular lift out of axial mortmain.

Till Mayday, Then.

---

<sup>76</sup>A remark of Pound in 1934, at the age of 49, quoted in Forrest Read, *One World and 'The Cantos'*, University of North Carolina Press, 1981, 11.

<sup>77</sup>It concludes bar 16 of the nocturne.