

Cantower XX**Intimates****November 1st 2003**

You have no doubt noticed the peculiar problem I faced in each of these ‘teen’ **Cantowers** that parallel, in number, the corresponding chapters in *Insight*. Here the problem finally bubbled forth into a rather neat solution. The clue was in the structure of the previous **Cantower**: there I surrounded a central pedagogical section - on Thomas’ ‘five ways’ - with some sort comments that did little more than point to the heuristics of the content of the chapter. The surprise there for you may well have been the late introduction of the zero-Word, W0, of metaphysics.

As I indicated already¹, that zero-word is not a beginner’s help, but an end product of a long initial climb, a climb in our culture of strange and persevering individuals, a climb in later cultures to be sustained by the vortex cycling symbolized in the third word, W3. In this **Cantower** there is a central pedagogical section corresponding to section 4, “The Notion of Belief” in chapter 20 of *Insight*, surrounded by comments on heuristics. But there should be no surprise about the word of metaphysics that is key here, for it is W3. It is the word that not only centers on the functional specialties as the dynamic of progress but also places “on top” the grounds of all being and becoming, and places below an indication of stages of intimacy of that grounding Mystery with finite meaning.

But in this **Cantower** it is the functional specialties that claim my attention, that I wish to place in your face as it were. The evil that I focus on here is the part of the problem of evil that dodges that piece of history’s revelation and invitation.

There is a bundle of reasons for this focus, some of which should be aired here. First, those of us - not too many now! - who were round for the first reactions to the

¹Particularly in *Cantower IX*.

book *Insight* in the late fifties and the early sixties will recall one that resented this final chapter, regarding it as a pitch for the Catholic Church. What I am making a pitch for here, and throughout these 117 **Cantowers**, is the slow admission into consciousness and into practice of the division of labor that is functional specialization.

Indeed, I have regularly gone so far, and will continue to do so here, as to identify the hodic enterprise as the cosmopolis pointed to by the heuristic description and needs of the final section of chapter 7 of *Insight*. This identification, I know, has been and will be, resented. I have been told that, no, cosmopolis is the reign of grace. I nowhere deny that: indeed, my Christian background has laced it into the present effort from the beginning and I have no doubt that humanity is searching, however unwittingly, for a “Place in the Son”.² Like Lonergan, I am a Catholic, though I worship with my minister wife in the United Church of Canada, and find sustenance in the Wesley tradition of hymns. But it seems to me high time to come forth from some strange narrow arrogance to the broader heuristic of history’s molecules’ search for home.

This brings me to the second main reason for my focus: for I aim, and have been seeking to aim you, at a broader heuristic focus, and this in various senses. The first sense should be evident: I arrived in at what I regard as a relatively adequate set of four metaphysical words, four heuristic symbolizations of a dynamic viewpoint. I would claim that W0, W1, and W2 simply symbolize what Lonergan is inviting the reader towards from the beginning of the book *Insight*. W3 is another matter: its centerpiece was a discovery of 1965. It was simply not a part of his heuristic of 1953.

Obviously, then, the heuristic here is broader in that simple sense, but I would wish it to be still broader in senses that are complementary. Those senses are to emerge in the sections to follow. Before describing those sections I would like to draw attention to one contextualization of this chapter of *Insight* that meshes agreeably with

²A piece of the title of *Cantower X*.

my own effort here, and that provided by Charles Hefling Jr. **Cantower IX** already made mention³ of features of his drive that correspond with my own: we will return to the context at the conclusion of section 3.

So, the following sections are different takes on the issue of a broadened heuristic. The first section corresponds to the bulk of chapter 20, but not in a uniform ordered fashion. The focus is certainly away from the actual 31 point presentation of the heuristic Lonergan presents, just as in the previous **Cantower** it slipped past the 26 point heuristic of God. But two sections of the chapter - section 4 on Belief and section 6 on the Identification of the Solution - are omitted in the contextualizing reflection of the first section and dealt with here in section two and section three. There is a sense in which these latter two sections, contextualized by the first, set the tone of the remaining 97 **Cantowers**.

Section 2 points to the need for a new mood of gentle patience in this difficult field of self- investigation, a mood to be favoured from **Cantower XXV** on. Section 3 is of a piece with these next few 'bridge' **Cantowers** that in different ways move round the problem of identification, ending this first sonata-movement of the entire work with a chording of the discord, disheartening, of the primacy of descriptive arrogance in these dying centuries of the axial period. I like to think of the second last and central **Cantower** of the bridge, "Redoubt Description", as my Brucknerian 8th Symphony conclusion to this first fifth of the **Cantower** project. And perhaps the stand of Shostakovich Fifth Symphony against communism could echo behind your reading of the reflections on the brutalization of common mystery that lurks behind the present

³See sections 5 and 6 there. The relevant article by Hefling is titled "On Understanding Salvation History", published in Sean McEvenue and Ben Meyer (eds), *Lonergan's Hermeneutics. Its Development and Application*, The Catholic University of America Press, 1989, 221-275. This work will be referred to below as *Lonergan's Hermeneutics*.

global trend towards a communism of meaning.⁴

20.1 Contexts

I might have titled this section with my eccentric word *Kontexts* to bring out better - a matter of elementary linguistic feedback - the meaning, that can so easily be lost, of context as "limited nests of questions and answers".⁵ I am thinking here very concretely of the readers of *Insight* of the past fifty years and of the next fifty years: they are a group of shifting Kontexts. That they are (the present tense applies also to the deceased) or are to be incarnate characters is to be of consequence when we reach the concluding part of section 3.

So, I force myself to come straight to the point as regards Kontexts. It is an old discomfoting point that underpins this entire project, but goes back to my first reaction to the book in the late 1950s, "this just wont take!"⁶ The point has, I hope, been made all too clearly in the five previous *Cantowers*. Readers with an adequate climbing viewpoint have been extremely rare. For some commentators I would say that the nest of questions and answers with which they began chapter 1 remained relatively

⁴This may be noticed as contrasting with the mood suggested by Hefling and Davis, "On this score there is, I agree, a sort of *marche triomphale* playing in the background of *Insight*'s final chapter." (*Loneragan's Hermeneutics*, 297). In the Website Archives there is (or will be, before the end of 2003!) a lecture given with the Shostakovich Symphony as background which adds to the present context. It was a talk given at Loneragan College, Concordia University, February 14 1980. I read the talk (22.5 minutes) against the background of the last two movements (24.5 minutes), with two minutes of full-volume in conclusion. The title of the lecture is "The Question of Progress that I am and the University that is", retitled on the occasion, "Collage for Wonderbones". At all events, I suspect that Loneragan was very much a Shostakovich in an unwelcoming territory. See *Testimony: The Memoires of Dimitri Shostakovich*, as related to and edited by Solomon Volkov. Translated from the Russian by Antonina W. Bouis, Harper and Row, New York, 1979.

⁵*Method in Theology*, 183. See also 163. One could fruitfully bear in mind the distinction between contexts and *the field*: see the index of *Phenomenology and Logic*.

⁶A context here is supplied by the article reproduced in the Website Archives, "*Insight* after 40 Years: Towards a Luminous Darkness of Circumstances".

invariant as they moved - and continue to move - through the book.

One learned and respected Lonergan scholar once asked me why Lonergan bothered to put in all that science stuff in the first part. Such commentators and scholars see no inconsistency in their assumption that they can home in on chapter 20 and discuss critically its meaning. A simple illustration may help. Hefling, on page 250, lays upon the reader the partial differential equation for the motion of a fluid of variable density. It is an equation used by Lonergan in the second chapter of *Insight*. Few Kontexts of the past fifty years share either writers meaning for the equation. But does that prevent them from moving on, even winding up commenting on chapter 20?

What is going on in this, going forward? We are back with what I call the Fenelon mentality⁷; we are back with the story I heard from the first lecture of Lonergan I ever attended - in Easter of 1961 - about the request to Einstein: “ please tell me about space and time, but in my own words: I was never good with equations”. In ***Cantower XXI*** will parallel the book *Insight* with some serious comparable texts in the relatively successful science of physics. But here I may make the point with brutal simplicity. Does the interested reading of, say, Steven Weinberg’s *The First Three Minutes*⁸, or Brian Greene’s *The Elegant Universe*⁹ put one in a position to critically assess recent string theories or more classical reflections on particle self-energies?

You may well add your voice or your heated nerves to the vast majority here who say, **unfair**. For that vast majority the self-energy of the human subject is altogether easier to understand than the self-energy of the electron, the fluid motion of

⁷See chapter 9 of H.Butterfield, *The Origins of Modern Science*, Bell , London, 1965. The issue is the sophistication of undifferentiated consciousness, *haute vulgarization* (see the index to Lonergan, *Collected Works*, vol.6).

⁸*The First Three Minutes. A Modern View of the Origin of the Universe*, Basic Books, New York, 1988.

⁹Vintage Books, Random House, London, 2000.

human decision altogether more obvious than the rhythms of the tide. Nor can I expect a sudden conversion of the vast majority - or perhaps of you - to this humbling fact regarding the mincings of human minding. That is the vortex task that is the center-piece of the third word of metaphysics, W3, the word that Lonergan did not reach until 1965. But the words he did reach, W0, W1, W2, are the heartland of every word of chapter 20 of *Insight*. He wrote from a moving viewpoint in regard to the readers, but even if his own viewpoint was moving - as he remarked to me in conversation - he was in a stable distant world when he faced writing about "The Structure of History"¹⁰, in the passionate dispassionate solitude with which he concluded this chapter in his final typescript of 1953: "the dispassionate, unrelenting at-oneness with all the true, the real, the good, that outlasts the fire-ball of the atom bomb and unmeasurably exceeds its power to change the living of man".¹¹

We are quite evidently here at a massive problem of cultural discontinuity, and of *haute vulgarization*, and of commonsense eclecticism: all problem of the Vortex Tower of the third stage of meaning that is ours to initiate. But one can gather, in present popular form, an elementary problem of interpretation, or misinterpretation. There is a sense, of course, in which that is what I have been doing all along in these *Cantowers*, but we can bring it into focus now by recalling two elements in my strategy, both relating to that most elementary science, physics.

First I recall the various discussions of the universal viewpoint.¹² In those discussions I drew a parallel between Grand Unification Theories (GUTS) or Theories of Everything (TOES) in physics and the GUT or TOE that is Lonergan's take on the problem of interpretation. GUTS, towards which present physics is struggling, seeks to

¹⁰See note a, *Insight* (1992) 805.

¹¹See note n, *Insight* (1992), 806.

¹²In *Cantowers XIII* and *XVII*.

reach an integral perspective on the dynamics of the beings of physics, one that would be relatively invariant and carry forward the search of GUTS towards its own replacement. Although it is massively incomplete and indeed massively muddled, it is miles away from the brilliant muddlings of Newton, who had no idea that the entities of physics, in their primary relations and their secondary determinations, grounded the real geometry of space and time.

I recall now my startled state in the 1970s when it dawned on me that Lonergan had done in economics something equivalent to going, in the field of astronomy, from Tycho Brahe's numbers to quite beyond Laplace. Might you not be startled, at least with the suggestion if not by the fact, that Lonergan in his view of the fullness of hermeneutics swept through centuries of muddles - or the millennia of muddles since *Peri Hermeneias* - to reach an explanatory heuristic of the beings of meaning that is the core of a future relatively invariant global collaboration?

My second pointing is simpler but in its way even more startling, since it cuts through current culture on both physics and philosophy. Lonergan begins the fifth chapter of *Insight* with the quiet suggestion that adequate attention to the topic of space and time "forms a natural bridge over which we may advance from our examination of science to our examination of common sense". What if one does not cross this bridge, if one thus has no idea of the relevance of the crossing? What, then, is being, in or out of time? It is being on the wrong side of the bridge.¹³ And this being on the wrong side of the bridge is a central flaw not only of philosophy and theology but of contemporary physics in both its elementary and its GUTS searchings.

A myth regarding the objectivity of something like a Euclidean space-time has possessed the human mind from the Hindus and the Hittites to Hawking. The bridge is

¹³Thomas might well say that it is the likelihood of having trouble with the size of God or whether God is a body: so his five ways is followed by a suitably related Question 3. a.1. See "Features of Generalized Empirical Method" on "The Bridge of Size" (*Creativity and Method*, ed. M.Lamb, Marquette University Press, 1980).

a bridge too far for all the myths new disguises, from Minkowski to M-theory.¹⁴ Yet that crossing is an integral part of the adequate comprehension of the zero word, W0, of metaphysics. Without it one simply cannot claim to be comprehendingly and comprehensively in “The Position” that Lonergan so quietly (and with measured inadequacy) describes half way through *Insight*.

And perhaps now we are in ‘a position’ to read the beginning of chapter 20 with more caution: I may have stirred into your character, the character of your present reading capacity-for-performance, the suspicion that you are a doctrinal reader, which led you to the implicit view that the book *Insight* is, or was, like those of Weinberg, pretty heavy stuff but manageable.

So, the second short paragraph of this last chapter never bothered you too much before. “General transcendent knowledge of God is the knowledge of God that answers the basic questions raised by proportionate being, namely, what being is and whether being is the real”. That knowledge comes only through the long culturally-unacceptable climb to a hypothesis of God sufficiently symbiotic with the beings of present meaning. It is a hypothesis that is not available to the man in the street or the woman in the university. But without it what is one’s axiomatics of “The Position”? A primary axiom of intentional identity of some feeble inner achievement with “the field” just wont cut it.¹⁵ One needs an axiom of real identity to round off and ground off an

¹⁴See the concluding chapters of *The Elegant Universe*. “Whatever the eleven-dimensional theory is, Witten has provisionally named it *M-Theory*. The name stands for as many things as people you poll. Some examples: Mystery Theory, Mother Theory (as in ‘Mother of all Theories’), Membrane Theory (since, whatever it is, membranes seem to be part of the story), Matrix Theory but even without having a firm grasp on its name or its properties, it is already clear that M-Theory provides a unifying substrate for pulling together all five string theories.

¹⁵One of my options in tackling some introductory reflections on this chapter of *Insight* was to enlarge on previous reflections on the “Anthropic Principle”....

axiom system of knowing.¹⁶ But what is identified - darkly, of course, but precisely, within critical method¹⁷ - is a verified hypothesis as remote from “what all call God”¹⁸ as the full contemporary quantum-thermodynamics of the Sun is, apparently, from a moment in the rose garden.¹⁹

Nor could this be considered odd except by the persistence of a 14th century decadence that could encourage a logic-chop reading of questions 3-26 of the *Summa*. Aristotle’s God and Aquinas God and Lonergan’s God are graduate achievements at the level of their times: and, as we shall come to focus on better in the following ***Cantower***, these are achievements of friendship.

The graduate character of the challenge in any of these cases emerges for the reader in so far as the first and second words, W1 and W2, of metaphysics are operative, within the strain of W0. But that simply brings us back to the message that the late ‘post-metaphysical’ chapters of *Insight* convey. The identification of W1, W2, W0 are merely a reach to lift that conveying out of its inadequacy.

But it is as well here to carry forward the remarks on the hypothesis of God, so, to the 27th question of the *Summa*, to a view of chapter 20 that would shift the numbering 1-31 of the heuristic to 27- 57. And here Lonergan’s pedagogical viewpoint scores over that of Aquinas. For, the series of topics 1-57 in Lonergan presupposes or integrates in the graduate climb the sweep of the second part of the *Summa*, transposed

¹⁶Refinements would mesh in the a thematic of “a certain participated likeness of the uncreated light” (*Summa Theologica*, q.84, a.5c).

¹⁷*Insight*, 685[708].

¹⁸The end of each of Thomas’ Five Ways.

¹⁹The Lindsay and Margenau Thermodynamics is a start, but one has to move into more contemporary treatments of the zone, as we shall do around ***Cantower XL***. There need be no clash or ‘gap’ between Eliot’s rose garden - or Ignatius’ *contemplatio ad amorem obtinendum*, or other contemplative yearnings - and an adequate inner human word of God. More on this in the following ***Cantower***: but it is, indeed a central message of the entire project.

by the words of metaphysics.

We are still hovering round the second paragraph, yet spiraling round the sections on heuristics. And I cannot help drawing attention in this context to Aquinas wondrous contribution to heuristics that he saved till the third part of the *Summa*, especially since the attitude there helps us to lift ourselves to a larger heuristic of history. I am thinking particularly here of that rich and strange reaching in IIIa q.3. In line with article 7 of that question I have occasionally disturbed my male colleagues with the notion and the image of an incarnate Word venturing, braless, into the Vatican, to claim dominion. But my point really is the importance of the central foundational task of fantasy. That task would seek to enlarge present categories, for instance, to sublimate the appearance of triumphalism that Charles Davis discerns in Lonergan's heuristics.²⁰ Ultimately, the chosen people are the global people: the identity of the Choosers can be an eternal hidden joy of those Choosers. And there can be much else hidden on the global road home. But let us not indulge in the "gulping"²¹ which Lonergan discourages. I would, however, offer two gulps that require decades of digestion: they are Lonergan's reflections on the tension of divine love,²² and his musings on Kimbanguism, opening "African religious experience in fresh ways".²³

But is all this really grist for the mulling over that short paragraph on the first page of this dense chapter? Try the first sentence of the fourth paragraph. "Indeed, since God is the first agent of every event and emergence and development, the question really is what God is or has been doing about the fact of evil". The "since", on the analogy of serious physics, points to a massive scientific achievement such as

²⁰*Lonergan's Hermeneutics*, 280 and *passim*.

²¹*Insight*, 688[710].

²²*Understanding and Being*, 374-7.

²³*A Third Collection*, 70.

“since the range of Lie Algebras reflect a corresponding set of geometries”. Here it is the rich and subtle achievement mentioned before, identifying you and I, each of us, as co-selectors of a total universe in each of our decisions. I cannot see that it is plausible to deny that the *since* of the sentence asks you to bear in inner word a beloved *theoria* pivoting on the 21st place of the previous chapter. Nor is that bearing, in its fullness, anything less than the molecular embrace, “the sensitive adaptation that vigorously and joyously executes the will’s decisions”,²⁴ and the wills decisions are focused by the neurotherapy of “a consuming love of God”.²⁵

I have been speaking here within an evolutionary sport, a realization by Lonergan of one development of “the possibility of a critical human science”²⁶, “a critical human science that supposes a correct and accepted philosophy”.²⁷ I have been reaching, as I have for over thirty years, through random dialectic towards positionally-grounded fantasy and its effect on the specialties, but especially on the forward specialties.²⁸ Here I have been fantasizing the emergence of a contemplative foundational community, unhampered by controversy, reaching to fulfil what was lacking in the mind of Jesus, a theoretic meshing of the implementable details of destiny.

The unity and beauty of the critical science, that I have been identifying as the hodic or functional specialist enterprize, gently demands that implementability have a

²⁴*Insight*, 689[711]. The drive against and away from the rationalist nominalism that dominates much of Western ‘thinking’ has been a presence from the beginning in theses *Cantowers*.

²⁵*Insight*, 692[714].

²⁶*Insight*, 690[712].

²⁷*Insight*, 693[715].

²⁸In section 4 of *Cantower I* I wrote about Lonergan’s temperament as dialectician. But I noted later how he certainly he pushed fantasy, as for instance in his implicit optimism in *Method* with regard to foundations and with regard to new precisions in doctrinal theology.

normal-law statistics of efficiency. That degree of efficiency requires that within the total demanding heuristic thinking about destiny there is a thinking of the actual and the probable of these coming decades. So it was that I arrived at the heuristics of a fresh pragmatism, identifiable here with a minimalist perspective on a necessary academic moral belief. The fragmentary and effete dynamic of present culture screams for some such a gentle nudge of belief. The possibility of progress in the absence of functional humility is the grossly weakest belief of our new millennium.

20.2 The Notion of Belief

At the beginning I noted a parallel with the previous *Cantower*: there a section was devoted to an elementary pedagogy of the five ways that dated from the 1950s, and I suggested something similar here, on the pedagogy of the heuristics of believing. But I need not dig out old notes of mine on this topic: the elementary essay is already there, in this chapter.²⁹ This frees me up to the opportunity to turn round the topic of pedagogy in a manner that points towards the effort of the last 4/5s of these *Cantowers*, beginning with *Cantower XXV*. I am reaching forward, if you like, to the pedagogy of the 2050s, when the colour of school walls and halls and indeed the tone of malls may well be - it is up to you and me, scheming within emergent probability - the slogan "When teaching children geometry, one is teaching children children". The final section of *Cantower VI* deals at some length with this slogan, but I will turn around it sufficiently here to make it somewhat luminous to you.

Or will I? The question is one of adequacy.³⁰ If the massive change were to occur in education that the slogan calls for, from kindergarten to post-graduate studies, then a wink would be increasingly as good as a nod. Linguistic feedback, fed and freshened

²⁹My own, more elementary but shorter, version of the analysis is "The Economy of Truth", chapter 7 of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, available in the Website Archives.

³⁰See *Insight*, chapter 17, section 2.4, on "Truth and Expression".

by characters of education, would nudge young minders gently forward, in a Bell curve normality, to a Tomega culture that would increasingly “embrace the universe”³¹, and especially the universe of their own minding.

Like Lonergan, I think here of the zone of mathematics not only because it is the simplest but because it would seem to escape my broad censure regarding the “heartlessness” of education: there is surely no need for heartiness in herding children over the Bridge of Asses or of hurdling over the obstacles of graduate mathematics? Thus has the full impact of the Aristotelian thematic, that at its best might have merged with primitive compactness, faded into a rationalism, even a nominalist rationalism: for without heart, the control of meaning even in higher mathematics can be paper-thin.³²

Think, then, of the parrot-defining of the circle that Lonergan mentions. Is it adequate to recommend instead, as he does, the imagining of a cart-wheel and the asking of a question, Why is it round?³³ Not in the foreseen culture of 2050. Nor indeed was it adequate in the book *Insight*. The issue is the genesis of the definition, the genesis as data. The issue is “not only to read *Insight* but to discover oneself in

³¹One must take ‘embrace’ in the fullness of the harmonious meaning dealt with in chapter 15 of *Insight*, sublating then the earlier meaning of the Tomega principle “...to embrace the universe in a single view”(*Insight*,417[442]).

³²The road back and backing-away from this culture is long. There have been a few eccentrics who never belonged to it. I think of a teacher of mathematics I had in the 1940s who taught calculus orgasmically. I think of Cornelius Lanczos of the Institute of Theoretical Physics in the 1960s and his style of presentation, represented nicely in his quoting, at the beginning of a chapter on “The Canonical Equations of Motion”, from Goethe’s *Faust*: “Was it a God who wrote these signs/ Which soothe the inner turmoil’s raging, / Which fill the lonely heart with joy / And, with mysterious hidden might, / Unriddle Nature’s forces all around?” (C.Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics*, University of Toronto Press, 1977,161) A context for the present reflections is “Systematics: A Language of the Heart”, chapter 5 of McShane, *The Redress of Poise*, available on the Website.

³³*Insight*,7[31].

oneself”.³⁴ The issue is a leap from the ethos of the ordinary and acceptable in our culture, whether in the classroom or in the debates about description in British philosophy or in Phenomenology, in Logic or in Pragmatism. “The intelligible in the ordinary sense can be understood without understanding what it is to understand; but the intelligible in the profounder sense is identical with the understanding, and so cannot be understood without understanding what understanding is.”³⁵

So, the reader of chapter 19 of *Insight* meets the now-familiar slogan, the very misleading slogan. What would a phenomenology of the genesis of the definition of the circle - or an adequate analysis of the use of the word ‘circle’ - be like? A lengthy quotation might seem a deviation from our topic: at a minimum see it as an enforced pause over the familiar slogan!

“When the phenomenology of *Verstehen*, of understanding is attempted, then what will you be doing? You will be seeking understanding as structured by understanding and that will be insight into insight, and it will bring you into an entirely different world from that of the phenomenologists.

Take it this way. You have your structured data and your insight. You can attend to the data as structured, and your attention centers there. Or you can attend to the insight, and it’s a different focus of attention But insight is an elusive thing. You get hold of insights properly only by considering the history of science, the history of philosophy, and so on. Just as if you just center on what is experience, in any given mode, it’s so elusive it tends to vanish. You put insights together in so far as you say, ‘Well, a geometer understands the whole of Euclid, he can tell you where the key propositions are, and prove all the propositions that follow from a given set of axioms. He’s got the whole thing right in his intellectual paw, so to speak. But that comprehensive grasp of the whole subject is not some phenomenon that you can pin

³⁴*Method in Theology*, 260.

³⁵*Insight*, 647[670].

right down and describe the structure. When you're seeking insight into insight, not only have you a different term of attention, but your methods of procedure have to differ if you are going to get anywhere".³⁶

I have jumped, you may claim unfairly, from the first pages of *Insight* to an answer of the second week of Lonergan's lectures of 1957. My point is that there is more to the seemingly harmless turn of these early pages than meets the needy eye of present disorientations. To Archimedes as first instance of insight - an instance that many readers do not really follow up - there is added a second 'familiar' instance. We are on the way already to the possibility and plausibility of "taking off" from an instance. I am not now talking only about teaching the school-child better: I am talking about a massive shift of culture that can be so easily minimized, slipped past, so that from those very first pages it is not true of the book that "it will bring you into an entirely different world from that of the phenomenologists". You can end up, in chapter twenty, conversant with the run of the book's argument like you would be in reading, say, Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*, but you would not have "got the whole thing right in your intellectual paws", nor would there be a serious shock of character-change.³⁷

The problem of the fresh teaching of *Insight* in 2050 is a problem of a cultural context of the acceptance of a field of inquiry that has far more specimens than evolutionary zoology. So, "for instance", the simple question, What is a circle?, pitches you into problems of real geometries in their primary relations and its secondary determinations and, at a more elementary level, it twists towards contexts like that of

³⁶B. Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 356-7.

³⁷I am led to mention *Being and Nothingness* here because of a startling memory of walking round Christ Church Meadow in the 1960s, with that book as companion, puzzling over the beneficial obscurity of the book as compared with the reducible clarity of *Insight*.

Fermat's Last Theorem.³⁸

But I must move to the present zone of believings as data. Just as one can close in and down on such an instance as defining the circle, so one can close in on a simple instance of believing and do with it something that does not differ considerably from phenomenology or linguistic analysis. Believings are as legion and as varied and as layered as the beings of botany. The reality of layering has been a topic from the beginning of our enterprise: so, one may come to read adequately, toned to its molecular layers, the word 'image' as it occurs in the frontispiece of *Insight*.

Any seemingly simple representative instance of the ethical activity of believing has a variable interpersonal layered complexity that should be gently adverted to even in a first academic course in generalized empirical method. One aims thus at a serious incarnation in the students of the distance between the tentative beginnings of an appreciation and the parrot-wise verbal control of the moves towards the insight that grounds a judgment of value. So there is an orientation distinctly - and self-luminously: this is the key component in generalized empirical method - different from contemporary descriptive reporting³⁹ in any tradition.

Consider the set of exercises that are associated with a reading of "the measure that one knows... (1) that the source uttered the proposition, uttered is as true, uttered it truthfully, and was not mistaken."⁴⁰ My memories are of hours of classroom laced with entertainments regarding the oddities of sources and our responses to them: getting street directions from the over-confident or the self-doubting, the tipsy or the trickster, the innocently confused. "... as true, truthfully, not mistaken ...": three quite different dynamics to take to heart and lift to hearty meta-theoretic embrace. Then one has to

³⁸The notes to the text of the lengthy quotation above, which I did not include, add contexts of both modern physics and functional specialization.

³⁹On phenomenology as reporting, see *Phenomenology and Logic*, 268, 275, 356,

⁴⁰*Insight*, 716[732].

shift from source to sink, to get the capacity and the measure of the sinkage, the layered neuromolecular - possibly psychothymic - self. And move eventually, perhaps at a graduate level, to the full perspective of discernments of discernments of discernments that has been increasingly a topic here.⁴¹

There are multitudinous books on the nature of belief: none of them meet any serious standard of generalized empirical method. Closer to the bone, there are many introductions to Lonergan's ethical thinking: and very many of those take off all too easily from the handy instance. Some of those even manage to putter along with the familiar slogan about being attentive, intelligent, reasonable and responsible, without getting serious about the What-to-do question which dominates listening to the source: one listens, not just for directions, but primarily for reliability, which is a complex metaphysical reality. But we have aired that topic already. Nor can I pause further over this massive cultural shift. My closing analogy would ask you to ponder a parallel with Galileo's discovery of measurement. No one four hundred years ago could have anticipated the rich problem-laden world of "taking the measure" initiated by that move of empirical method. This move is altogether deeper, a twilight, *zwielicht*, axis, of the second time of human subjectivity.

In closing this section, I wish to add something on the levels of teaching, but perhaps I have already lost you or caused you to suspect that this is just not what Lonergan is talking about, especially when he arrives at the condensed - and comfortable - prescriptions of *Method in Theology*. We have covered this ground before, but it is as well to repeat here that I am simply reading a single paragraph of that book. In his discussion of foundations he comes to sketch, in nine points, the impossible

⁴¹We are, I hope with some obviousness, pointing here to the complex context needed to assess the patterns and proprieties of "sinkage" of directions in beliefs and faiths in human history, and one would especially have to add refinements regarding the modern equivalent of the estimative sense (touched on earlier in *Cantowers VII - IX*). Such a context would certainly reveal the horrors of history's evangelical indelicacy.

challenge of maturing categorially - the missing tenth point would have been functional specialization. Then he gives a wake-up call, to the phenomenology and metaphysics of *Insight*, and (?tongue in cheek) he talks of the one that can go on. "From such a broadened base one can go on to a developed account of the human good, values, beliefs..."⁴² Can you imagine what this would do to Aquinas' project of the second part of the *Summa Theologica*? If you cannot, then you are certainly in difficulty in regard to conversation with the patterns of modern studies of the biodynamics of human survival.

The problem of teaching at present is to gently lift the imagination to analogies with successful sciences. That is a function of the periodic table regularly printed within the front cover of first-year university Chemistry texts. And it is the function of the three words of metaphysics, W1, W2, W3, that are the symbolic key to this million word project.⁴³ A first course has to be seen and sensed as just that: something that is usual in physics, but presently absent in such areas as economics, psychology etc. And, sadly, philosophy and theology. Here I am talking about the equivalent in teaching of "the slopes" reflected on in *Cantower VIII*. And in the present context the suggestion can be put quite simply: if a third year course in an area is comprehensible to first year students, then one can suspect the presence of an ethos of mistaken beliefs regarding that area.

I have carefully avoided the topic of Faith and the Gift, where directions and Source merge mysteriously, gloriously. Perhaps it can suffice to draw attention to

⁴²*Method in Theology*, 287.

⁴³There are special difficulties with W0: a context is *Cantower IX*.

Loneragan's own effort at pedagogy in this regard?⁴⁴ It is the heart of our contemplation, to be cherished in a life-long graduate effort. It is the heart of this final chapter of *Insight*.⁴⁵ But it is not the heart of my topic or my challenge here. That challenge is contained in the final sentence of the previous section: the challenge of facing our most evident cultural mistaken belief.

I pose that challenge in a minimalist sense: a fresh pragmatism that would sense the global advantage of functional collaboration. How one conceives this advantage, what one's motivation is, that is another matter. It too can be minimalist, a matter of not being left behind, or of being embarrassed: "doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company."⁴⁶ Or you may take your motivation from Paul's perspective on the functioning of one global body. Or you may lift the motivation to the fuller level of the worded gift, seeking to make up in communal functional minding what was lacking in the Galilean minding of Jesus.

20.3 The Identification of The Solution

Loneragan's equivalent section 6 is a brief two paragraphs. I have gone a different route. Yet, strangely, the two paragraphs may be read in the present restricted context. So, the five "its" of the long second sentence of the first paragraph can be read of the modest solution that I have suggested, and I leave that reading to you. But I also leave to you the problem of personal identification which I will contextualize further in these next four **Cantowers** in a moving towards the existential issue in **Cantower XXV**. We pick up there, discomfortingly, the challenge of the first sentence: "There remains the

⁴⁴ B. LONERAGAN, "Analysis of Faith", *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*, 20(2002) 125-154.

⁴⁵As I laboured with the index to *Method* in December of 1971 it was quite evident to me that the Gift was the heart of the matter: the lengthy entry under *Gift* symbolizes that centrality.

⁴⁶*Method in Theology*, 299.

problem of identifying the solution that exists”.

The solution that exists is layered. At some stages in this essay and in these **Cantowers** I have been proposing a solution that could parallel Wiley’s (and) solution to Fermat’s Last Theorem. But the solution I would have you attend to now is the minimalist solution: might you not begin to think committedly of your own cultural effort functionally?

The existential consequences of that commitment is a further matter, to be met gradually. I am asking simply for an elementary identification of your own culture, your own academic efforts. Certainly wider issues can help. One does not need to study Wiley’s lengthy thesis to glimpse that it excludes globally a sequences of non-starters; similarly, one does not have to track through the functional needs of music, law, mathematics, whatever, to glimpse that my thesis about the slopes and spirals of global collaboration meets beautifully the shambles of present slumming in seminars and streets. The beauty, of course - and the concomitant unity and efficiency - are merely potential. Lonergan’s fragmentary last symphony, like Beethoven’s sketches of the tenth, offer directions that may seed further unimaginable directions towards ever-richer global “fullness of life”.

I might well have halted there, with two paragraphs, and proceeded to my twist on the Epilogue, “Epilodge”. But it seems worthwhile - skip the rest if you wish - to venture further here on the matter of identification. First, then, I repeat the short reflection on “The Appropriation of Truth” that I included in **Cantower III**, where facets of the problem of identification emerge. Secondly, I add some reflections on the context given by Hefling, Davis and van den Henel for this same chapter of *Insight*. This gives a context more familiar to theologians and so may serve as a bridge to my efforts throughout these essays to recontextualize the two works, *Insight* and *Method in Theology*.

20.3.1 Identifications

“... There is the problem of identification.....ability is one thing, and performance is another. Identification is performance.”⁴⁷

Perhaps if I were to sum up the problem of my **117 Cantowers** it would be in terms of **identification** as Lonergan discusses it in this particular section of *Insight*. And perhaps, if nothing else, this particular section of this **Cantower** will tempt you to read that section, gather you willingly round it in a fresh scratching ratting reading.

I could well tackle the invitation to read the section as Aquinas tackles a section of Aristotle, ending up with a text much longer than the original. Indeed, there is a book to be written about the topic. What to do? Throw out a few pointers. And it is useful, in so doing, to number the nine paragraphs in the section. That will be the meaning of bracketed inclusions e.g. (9.3) means a third of the way down paragraph 9. Add to this a second piece of my strategy: a parallel that I have used regularly is the parallel between the periodic structure that emerged in the 1860s for chemistry and what I call the hodic structure that emerged in the 1960s for culture.⁴⁸

Immediately we have a problem, the problem of identification: an adaptation of our sensibility (1.8) to be met on the level of experience in its broadest sense (5.5). I speak of culture,⁴⁹ not of theology. I think back now to my own struggle towards

⁴⁷*Insight*, 558-9[582].

⁴⁸I spell this out a little around page 94 of *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*. An examination of the Journals of Chemistry in the nineteenth century shows a discontinuity in the 1870s; no parallel discontinuity has so far occurred in theology.

⁴⁹I invite you, at some stage, to pull into your reflections here the section “Culture and Reversal”, *Insight* 7.8.6. I hope that you will find a lift in your reading of such sentences as “There will be a division of labour and a differentiation of function. There will be an adaptation of human intersubjectivity to that division and differentiation”. The new reading is not, of course, Lonergan’s. The cosmopolis of the hodic structure was still about thirteen years away.

performative identification, beginning in 1969 with musicology and wending its way to geometry in 1999. You must somehow reach out, if only by a pensive ramble through the full journal holdings of a university library.

In ***Cantower I*** I drew attention to Ezra Pound's suggestion of a dominant image⁵⁰, and my image, as you know, sublates Vorticism. But what do I mean by **my**? What would I wish you to mean by you cultivating **your** image? The word *cultivate* refers to a culture, and a serious culture is a culture of bloodstream and bones. **My** image I eccentrically intussuscepted over more than three decades of daily rumination, molecular cud-rumening. The culture of your grandchildren will, I hope, be such as to cut back on the need for eccentric solitude: the periodic structure of chemistry has now a household.

So, I appeal to some eccentric daftness in you to home-in, room-in, the key⁵¹ “dynamic images” (9.3) that “possess in the sensitive field the power to issue forth not only in words but also in deeds” (9.4). The “well-formulated became mine” (6.6) and I would wish it to become you - not just become yours - so as “to generate the stresses and strains in knowledge that will lead to” (6.9) the “more adequate account of reality” (6.9) that is the hodic structure of the search for the being of meanings. The vortex, ***Cantower***, imaging allies our sensibility against “settling down like good animals in our palpable environment” (4.5) of the usual nests and lairs of academic denizen. It battles against plane, plain, and clear, meanings, with its new imaging of ex-plane-ing and its infinity of towering. It is “an adapted and specialized auxiliary”⁵² to the “boxed

⁵⁰See there the text at notes 25, 38, 39.

⁵¹*Process*, 112, gives a keyhole image related to Joyce's conclusion to the cycling book *Finnegans Wake*, “the keys to, given”.

⁵²I am recalling a key piece of the thirty-first place in chapter 20 of *Insight* (726[747]). I would claim that the pragmatic answer to the search for such an auxiliary is the hodic structure.

in” (8.8) humanity of this axial period, pointing to a twisting, sloping,⁵³ round and up in a radical new control of meaning: that new “control of human living can be effective only in the measure that it has at its disposal the symbols and signs by which it translates its directives to human sensibility” (9.8).

In the last two days I spent many hours with a medical doctor who had been struggling, in the past decade, to express in publishable form his view of the horrors and inefficiencies that he has witnessed in his profession. In the final hours of our reflections he began to appreciate the hopelessness of his effort. We talked of Ivan Illich and others who had expressed their criticism and of great medical workers who had set standards, expressed ideals. At one stage the doctor remarked that the hope was that his new view of curriculum for medical studies will come to the attention of someone in authority who would put it into practice. We paused over this optimism and finally I added wit by noting that he was just as optimistic and dull as Plato. Certainly he could run seminars for the local doctors and nurses, continue to set an example, do some local good, even push to publish versions of his view of medical caring.

Eventually I spoke of the division of labour that is our present topic and sent him away with the relevant pages of *Method in Theology*, on the need for the division and the character of the division. I asked him to have a shot at expressing the parallel problem as he saw it in medicine. I doubt if he will: the problem as so envisaged and as so solved is quite beyond his present horizon, his present imaging of reform. I certainly could not blame him for that. This is a massive cultural shift, solving Plato’s problem of implementation in a modest but humanly-efficient way. This is a vision that was quite beyond Academus’ garden. Its data is the past centuries of fragmentation and pretense in the groves of academe, in the sacred garden of God’s revelation.

You surely see where I am going with this. I can excuse my doctor friend. But

⁵³The structure and strategy of sloping will be the topic of *Cantower VIII*, “Slopes”.

what excuse have the disciples of Lonergan? Surely they don't think that he spent decades contemplating the mess of theology since the thirteenth century only to invent a new filing system, a handy way of sorting out one's own work? What is going forward at the moment in so-called Lonerganism is an absorption of Lonergan's vision into the roles, tasks and institutions of previous theological and philosophical debate. What effect has this? The efforts can be as sincere as those of my doctor friend. That is not the point. Perhaps the point is the pointing that I emphasized to the doctor when I twisted his own reflections on horror and inefficiency back on those reflections: there is the horror and inefficiency of present theological reflection. No more than the doctor can students of method and religion seem to be able to glimpse the way out suggested by Lonergan.⁵⁴

There is, THEN, a deep crisis of image and identity and identification. Can the crisis be met? Might there be a way of shifting the statistics of conversion to his global vision? Well, at least we can "make conversion a topic"⁵⁵, an embarrassment⁵⁶: first of all a topic and embarrassment for ourselves, gathered willingly round one particular section of *Method* on the need for, and the structure of, the division of labour. Some of us may find that, like the concerned doctor, we are not up to the role or task of functional specialist work: then we are liberated to get on with doing some good in our own back yard, to be involved with Lonergan's effort as popular implementers. Such

⁵⁴Some may well argue that Lonergan's vision was not of a new academic method reaching and recycling all disciplines. But at least the vision was of a new differentiated structure for theology, for methodology, for philosophy. The days of the lone-rider cleaning up the town are gone, and perhaps it is worthwhile to think of Lonergan in those terms. *Insight* will remain as the last great classical effort in the tradition of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas. It has now been shelved: in fact, it is not to be found on the shelves of good bookstores. Indeed, Lonergan's disciples don't take it seriously. But then, do they take seriously *Method in Theology*? The brilliance of Lonergan's recycling theory, with its pivot of p. 250 of *Method in Theology*, is that it guarantees the eventual recycling of *Insight*.

⁵⁵*Method in Theology*, 253.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, 299, "Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company".

implementing is desperately needed. But we will get to the related existential questions slowly, especially as we gather round willingly on Day Three.⁵⁷

But before describing the process of conferring in some broad manner, it would be useful to turn - if you would turn, in these months before the meeting - to Lonergan's reflections on *institutions, roles, tasks*.

20.3.2 On Understanding Salvation History

I stay with Hefling's title, and remind you that I already considered his essay and expressed substantial agreement with his conclusions. It seems best, then, to move forward through his respondent, Davis and van den Hengel, ending with Hefling's own response. I must note that what I say here is skimpy, doctrinal, almost anecdotal: we are dealing with 80 heavy pages of discussion.⁵⁸

My agreement with Charles Davis on the question of a broader heuristic should

⁵⁷Lonergan once remarked to me that "lecturing went out with Gutenberg" (a quip he would certainly qualify). But there is no replacing live dialogue in the search for personal identification, orientation. Each of us has different bents, different cultures, different potentialities of imagery. My own, clearly, are Irish: Joyce's transposition of Vico obviously, but less obvious is Sean O'Riada's searchings in music. I listened to his *Vertical Man (Nomos no. 1 for Strings)* recently, with its post-Schoenberg structures and its 8-fold division. I could well mesh it, for myself, in a new aesthetic inner lift to the *Nomos* of the Eightfold Way. We need a lift towards *Vortical Mind*, a **Mollyculling Blooming**. O'Riada lifted traditional Irish music into the new musical context. "He claims that the genius of this is cyclic repetition with small variations, as opposed to the dramatic opposition of pre-Schoenberg European art music, which he sees as a final inheritance from classical Greece". (Charles Acton, on the Record Sleeve of *Vertical Man*.) And now you might enjoy going back to note 42: does this not give a new twist to Lonergan's *Insight* as a final inheritance? Can you smell a new Calculus of Variations? (See Chapter four, "The Calculus of Variations", *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*).

⁵⁸One might recall, from section 5 of *Cantower IX*, another reason for brevity. Debates of the kind illustrated here are not efficient, much less beautiful. They will not be part of the unity of future formal theology - though no doubt they may occur in informal contexts, in looser dialogue. But formally, *per se*, comparison, contrast, counter positioning, etc become part of the drive of dialectic: this is a large and later topic, to be taken up for the long haul in *Cantower XXV*: "Redoubt Method 250".

cause no surprise. I have picked up on his question, “What would be a genuine heuristic for investigating salvation history?”,⁵⁹ and if I drop the word *salvation* the question it is still in line with his thinking: “The history of *salvation* is as wide as the history of humankind”.⁶⁰ The broader heuristic that I point towards would also shift his concerns about triumphalism into a larger sad but edgily forgiving context: As Chesterton would have it, the question is, has Christianity been tried in these two muddled millennia?

Since Paul, there has been an unwarranted haste: the Mysterious Three may not be that concerned, Now, about the continuation, through European mail, of the promulgation of Their identity. What may matter more is the existential turn to the unattainable Idea, a turn that underpins the lift towards theory, a turning lift that is the concern of these ***Cantowers***.

I do not think that Davis was ever happy about the lift towards theory that history twists us towards: so, while I can resonate with him when he identifies realism and religion “with the living out of our ordinary lives in the one world of everyday existence”,⁶¹ my emphasis on genuine theory as reaching into the bones of that everyday to make that everyday vibrate with mystery would have remained alien to him in his earthly stay. What genuine theory, genuine science, genuine scholarship are: that is a massively tough and discomfoting question that has lurked in these pages from the beginning. Perhaps the question was best intimated to you in the bone-problem of nerve-attitude raised by the mood of asking my sunflowers, How do you work?⁶²

⁵⁹*Lonergan’s Hermeneutics*, 281.

⁶⁰*Ibid*, 283.

⁶¹*Ibid*, 288.

⁶²See *Cantower II*.

Here Davis' problem merges with the key difficulty of van den Hengel: scientific history in the proper normativity of the integral third hodic stage of meaning will neither "relegate"⁶³ nor "limit"⁶⁴ nor "squeeze out"⁶⁵ nor "reduced"⁶⁶. Metaphysics adequately conceived includes history and reaches, for example, into the millennia of Manhattan and Mongolia alike.⁶⁷ That historical work is not a pursuit of some objective factual bones but of subjective integral character. The characters of the hodic enterprise reach for a Remembrance of Things Past in order to Re-member the Future.⁶⁸ But all this is a matter of a fermenting of present decisions.

And here the main gap between Davis and, on the other hand, Hefling and myself can be identified. In the spontaneity of everyday living there are, vibrant and operative, the gifted decisions of a supernatural order, not spontaneously identified as such.⁶⁹ Within the Christian tradition the intimacy of that spontaneity is variously identified as a tripersonal befriending, and within a developed theology the befriending can be cherished as absolutely, gloriously, vibrantly supernatural.

⁶³*Ibid*, 291.

⁶⁴*Ibid*, 292.

⁶⁵*Ibid*, 292.

⁶⁶*Ibid*, 298.

⁶⁷Section 2 of *Cantower XIV* deals with the metaphysics of Manhattan.

⁶⁸There seems no need, at this stage of the *Cantowers*, to enlarge on my dependence here on Proust and on J.L.Syngé. The task of remembering the future, however, requires a great deal of foundational development to tune the heuristic notion of fantasy - within the reachings of molecular finality - to a sublation of Thomas' *respondeo dicendum*.

⁶⁹We are back here at the problems, aired in section 2, of the future pedagogy of everyday life's beliefs, the raising of plain meaning to a plain of everyday mystery etc. In that fuller context Davis' talk of 'realism' and Jesus and everydayness will become communally suspect in a more luminous fashion. But within a present mature theological context of present religious orientation it is already suspect. The Jesus of my low-church congregations' prayers and practices is the now-incarnate God.