

Cantower IV**Molecules of Description and Explanation**

July 1, 2002

1.1 An Existential Gap¹

The molecularity of being has been a focus for me since the mid 1960s, when I struggled with Thomas Aquinas' view of *vivens*, the living thing, in the context of modern biophysics and biochemistry. Some of the results of that struggle were expressed in print, but compendiously.²

Compendiously? Any standard dictionary will **tell you** that *compendious* is a way of saying "containing all the essentials in a brief form; concise but comprehensive". Already, literally, we are **up to our neck** and down to our toes in the problem of this essay. It is a problem that cannot be communicated **compendiously**.

Communicated? No: I am not going to circle round the dictionary again. I can assume, perhaps, that you and I can move up a bit into the shared context of at least a serious reading of what *Method in Theology* has to say about communication. So, we have a common experience of reading, at some level of comprehension, the three shortest section of the book: 3.6 on incarnate meaning; 10.10, a supplementary note on realms of meaning; 14.1, on meaning and ontology.

¹This title adds the context of Lonergan's reflections on 'existential gap' in *Phenomenology and Logic*: "The Existential gap consists in the fact that the reality of the subject lies beyond his own horizon" (281). We take an odd road here by focusing on the molecular conjugates in the subject.

²A first effort was "*Insight and the Strategy of Biology*", *Spirit as Inquiry*, Herder and Herder, New York, 1964. *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, (Gill Macmillan and Notre Dame, 1971) provided a context. Chapter one, on botany, and chapter three, on zoology, in *The Shaping of the Foundations*, 1976(now Website), were follow-ups. One could write an article about the word "compendious": but would it be read de-compendiously, sufficiently to reveal a massive axial illusion about human communication?

Do I **have the neck** to ask you to pick up that book now, or shortly if you are out walking-reading or such, and pause with me, necked over the words, necking with me, **neck and crop**?

These three short sections are clearly doctrinal, but it is unlikely that the *clearly* here is the same for you and me. At the age of sixty five, after nearly forty years “in the business” I began to distinguish with some characterized and characterizing clarity between doctrinal writing and foundational writing or, more broadly, pedagogical writing. The notions of character- , ized, izing, whatever, may give you pause. They call in the key, the key-signature, of our tune.

The capacity-for-performance and the activity of meaning “constitute part of the reality of the one that means: his horizon, his assimilative powers, his knowledge, his values, his character”.³ One might characterize this book of Lonergan as an effort to delineate a normative process towards character-formation, the “fruit to be borne”,⁴ an on-going genesis of improved foundational characters whose ontology would spin within and without the hodic sea-well. At its best it would be a spin-fire of meaning, a vortex source of global warming, a molecular agitation and oxidizing of the breath of meaning. So, Lonergan’s cyclotronic community, in a humbling twirl of riches of embarrassment, would answers Schiller’s question regarding aesthetic education:

“But are we not arguing in a circle? Is theoretical culture to bring about practical culture, and yet the practical is to be conditioned by the theoretical? All improvement in the political sphere is to proceed from the ennobling of character - but how, under the influence of a barbarous constitution, can the character become ennobled? We should need, for this end, to seek out some instrument which the State does not afford us, and with it open the well-springs which will keep

³*Method in Theology*, 14.1(p.356).

⁴*Ibid.*, 355.

pure and clear through-out every political corruption”.⁵

But for Lonergan, it is not a matter of some pure spring-well of meaning, but of a humble collaborative re-structuring of culture. And in a fresh pragmatism, let us slip over the modest proposal of “making conversion a topic”⁶ to the discomfort of making embarrassment a topic. “Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company”.⁷ In these *Cantowers* I am not being overly polite. Only too often (Fred would say) have I recalled Fr Fred Crowe’s “is there not room for a measure of bluntness at this stage?”⁸ So here I wish to spell out bluntly, but in a strangely comforting fashion, my main point, the main embarrassment.

In the place referred to in Crowe’s essay he is writing about the prolonged exercises in interiority necessary if one is “to assimilate Lonergan”. There is a nice little ironic crowking in the middle of the relevant paragraph to and on readers of Lonergan: “I think they will agree that unless his readers are ready to undertake a parallel labour (not necessarily as prolonged inasmuch as they may be less tardy of intelligence) they have little chance of understanding what Lonergan is doing and talking about”. Both Crowe and I have solid suspicion that there was no one less tardy of intelligence than Lonergan during this past century. So I would say - and this after more than forty luck-laden years of struggle - that assimilating Lonergan to any serious degree was quite beyond the culture of the century.

But my comforting spelling out refers to those who were or are attracted to Lonergan’s writings and manage to assimilate sufficient to improve their lives and others, perhaps even

⁵Friedrich Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1983, 50.

⁶*Method in Theology*, 253.

⁷*Method in Theology*, 299.

⁸*Spirit as Inquiry. Studies in Honour of Bernard Lonergan*, edited by F.E.Crowe, Herder and Herder, 1964, “The Exigent Mind”, 27.

professionally. By *sufficient* I mean, for example, following the naming presented in the diagrams of *Phenomenology and Logic* pages 322-3 with some degree of self-referent meaning.⁹ This sufficiency can be reached through the exercises involved in a first course. Such a first course - as I taught for twenty years in Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax and some of you no doubt similarly - does not aim primarily at any “conversions”, but at getting, in my case, the young ladies to notice that the fellows they met on their dates were not Cosmo Polis, were rather Cosmo Dim y Dici (the astute will read a hard *c* there!). They also noticed, with a little help, that they were being deceived or cheated in other classes, a phenomenon that became more horribly evident to them in so far as they took time to check the indices of books on education, psychology, children, to find that there was regularly nothing in the index between *pubic hair* and *rat*. If there was an entry under Q, it was more likely to be *Questionnaire* than *Question*.

And this obviously brings me to the meaning of *professional*. A few years ago I invented the slogan, the doctrine, “When teaching children geometry, you are teaching children children”. If you reflect on this seriously you should find that it is a popularization of Lonergan’s later definition of generalized empirical method. “Generalized empirical method does not treat of objects without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject; it does not treat of the subject’s operations without taking into account the corresponding objects”.¹⁰ My slogan particularizes as a pedagogical strategy, but for *geometry* you may read any topic and you can replace *children* by any age group. And of course the slogan implicitly includes the person that is teaching. The new culture, the new post-axial control of meaning, involves a luminosity of

⁹This is not at all an easy task - the passage in Crowe is about assimilating **is? is! is..**. The reason that I refer to these diagrams in particular is that I have noticed a curious tendency to omit an ‘obvious’ need when the slogan “be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible” is repeated. You cannot be responsible unless you have a plan. But there are a lot of complex issues lurking here.

¹⁰Lonergan, *A Third Collection*, edited by F.E.Crowe, Paulist Press, 1984, 141.

education or ‘elevation’¹¹: more popularly, the best teachers are the ones who are also learning, spiralling on even as they teach.

One can be thus professionally adequate, in a modest commonsense fashion, without any serious differentiation of consciousness at all. Yet it is a great step against the linguistic colonialism that I write of regularly in relation to Scotus. Students become sensitive to the abuse of the words *concept* and *definition*, and to the unreality lurking in phrases like *clarifying concepts* or *deducing conclusions*. Arriving at significant concepts grows to mean for them a lot of illustrative messing, and arriving at a conclusion is self-tasted as a leaping. Of course they also arrive at protective strategies of survival in a conceptualist education: a villainous smiling that can parrot heavy names, patch together learned essays, mnemonic their timely way through written tests.

Now if you have perused the fourth chapter of my *Lack in the Beingstalk* (or even without perusing it!) you will recognize that this isn’t a very advanced implementation of Lonergan’s foundational work. It is rather like the challenge in the Aenead that I describe there,¹² of roping off a maximum area with a fixed circumference length. It is quite remote from the advanced stage of the calculus of variation that is contemporarily discussed and implemented. What I would like to foster here, however, is a deepening of that recognition: that, really, is the key feature of the chapter in *Lack in the Beingstalk*. And it is more easily deepened if you do not **feel threatened**.

These last two word bring to about half-a-dozen the boldfaced groups of words so far. Is there something like a boldfaced threat here? That I, somehow **have the neck** to threaten you? I hope not. But my boldfaced words are an invitation to a more subtle self-reference, to

¹¹I am indebted here to Patrick H. Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle* (New York, SUNY Press, 1997), who discusses this translation in his first chapter.

¹²*Lack in the Beingstalk*, 115.

molecularity. We are back where we started, perhaps puzzling, like Schiller, about going round in circles?

The really good teacher does not, as a rule or habitually, threaten. But the commonsense professional that I have been speaking of does not even have to know this. You have memories, I hope, of such good teachers: spontaneous, enthusing. You may be one of them: then with “a slight tincture of system”¹³ from Lonergan, you can elevate students to richer living.

That richer living, indeed, might be for some of them the living that is the contemporary equivalent of Aristotle’s finest way. And my sense of the past fifty years of Lonergan studies is that this possibility and its probability-statistics twine round my key, the signature of this *Cantower*. The next generation of Lonergan students may be luckier than ours, but emergent probability asks us to scheme, to recurrence scheme.¹⁴ But what are we to recurrence-scheme towards? **Have I the neck to tell you comprehensively**, thus in an incarnate metadoctrinal obscurity that is itself obscure to our generation, even perhaps to invite you to go at it **neck and crop** even though it is “not merely obscure but shrouded in mystery”¹⁵? The *you* means you, of course, but the going-at-it is a variable ranging over all the shades of talent and luck and neuroptides of my readers, their children’s teachers, the globe’s emergent international leaders of molecular loneliness.

1.2 A Pert Direction

What we are reaching for, THEN, is a can-tower self-luminosity of molecular intelligence

¹³*Method in Theology*, 309, 329.

¹⁴*Insight*, 7.8.1; 7.8.3.

¹⁵Lonergan, “Mission and Spirit”, *A Third Collection*, 26. The fuller meaning here depends on the intussusception of the ends of both chapter 2 and chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*.

implementing its explanatory self-tasting in an efficient spin-in and spin-off of noo-feedback.

There you have it, in foundational fantasy, but not yet in doctrinal bluntness.

Here, then, you have a pert - saucy - attempt at doctrinal bluntness. That gives you one of my senses of *pert*. The dictionary may also give you PERT, initials for Program Evaluation and Review Technique, and that also pertains here. But the central meaning is the naming of Candace Pert.¹⁶

I am not settling here into a particular functional specialization - indeed the *Cantowers* in general can be read as popularizations, literary invitations, C₅₉,¹⁷ pointing towards the later hodic adventures. But it may be as well to be saucy up-front with a metadoctrinal statement of Lonergan that I make my own. Let us isolate it boldly, titling it *Tomega*.¹⁸

Tomega: Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view’.¹⁹

This sentence begins a powerful paragraph, a powerful stand, against commonsense eclecticism. Only a few years ago I began to grasp its significance as a foundational statement, a statement of general categorial orientation relevant to all human inquiry and life, a claim that goes counter to an accepted culture of specialization, a consequence of the fact that organisms live in a habitat but the human organism lives in the universe. Furthermore, in these last few years, the sentence has been further lifted, embraced, molecularly braced in a self-mediation - like a

¹⁶Candace Pert, *Molecules of Emotion*, Touchstone, New York, 1999.

¹⁷See *A Brief History of Tongue*, 108, for the relevant matrix. The “9” signifies that the communication reaches beyond the matrix of collaboration: see the diagrams on 109, 124.

¹⁸‘To Omega’ brings to mind, perhaps, Chardin’s vision of an Omega point. But I have in mind also Aristotle’s view of the finest life, and Thomas’ view of human happiness, and Lonergan’s view of the significance of leisure, and my own view of the radical failure of contemplative traditions East, West, and South.

¹⁹*Insight*, 417[442].

luminous watch²⁰ - by work that merges with and transposes the efforts of Candace Pert. And now I read, with fresh strange eyes, the last paragraph of my effort of 1989:

“The third stage of global meaning, with its mutual self-mediation of an academic presence, is a distant probability, needing pain-filled solitary reaching towards a hearing of hearing,²¹ a touching of touching, ‘in the far ear’²², ‘sanscreed’²³, making luminously present - in focal darkness - our bloodwashed bloodstream. It is a new audicity, a new hapticity, to which we must aspire, for which we must pray.”²⁴

That fresh strangeness is remote from you, something for your late adulthood, part of the quest for the Black Tower - to be spoken of later - that shall throw its illuminating shadow over the third stage of meaning. My last *Cantower* of this year, *Cantower IX*, “Position, Poosition, Protopossession” will give its core a fuller context, but perhaps it is as well to give the mood of that context here, by quoting from a book helpful to its task: “You never identify yourself with the shadow cast by your body, or with its reflection, or with the body you see in a dream or in your imagination. Therefore you should not identify yourself with this living body either.”²⁵

²⁰The implicit reference here is to Lonergan’s discussion of the mediation of Christ in prayer, where he moves up through analogy with the workings of a watch.

²¹“Merced Mulde!” “Yssel that the limmat?” (*Finnegans Wake*, 212, line 26, 198, line 13). The strange reduplicative process is the central drive and fantasy of this *Cantower*.

²²See John Bishop, *Joyce’s Book of the Dark: Finnegans Wake*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1986, 343-46.

²³*Finnegans Wake*, 215, line 26.

²⁴P. McShane, *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minds*, 1989, 162-3. Available, of course, on this Website. The notes internal to the passage are from the original.

²⁵*Shankara* (A.D. 788-820), Viveka Chudamani (Vedic Scriptures). Quoted at the beginning of Chapter 3, “Chasing Phantoms” of V.S. Ramachandran and Sandra Blakeslee, *Phantoms of the Brain. Probing the Mysteries of the Human Mind*, William Morrow and Co.,

What is theoretical understanding? It is the core aspiration of your sensibility. But I do not think that you can be in control of that meaning without moving towards the startlingly strange position which can slowly blossom into an organic poise, the position, and perhaps later reach a protopossession which is, I would say, a sublating of the state sought for vaguely by Eastern traditions of enlightenment.

And that brings me to my few pointers regarding the effort of Candace Pert: pointers, however, relevant to all contemporary theoreticians. What makes Candace Pert exceptional is her genuine reach for harmony and integration: in her reflections on life she reveals, indeed, the aspiration for protopossession, blocked by phantoms of our culture.²⁶ A few snippets and comments must suffice.

There is a short Foreword by Deepak Chopra, whose work I have commented on elsewhere.²⁷ His praise of Pert is well-deserved but there it is haunted by an overreaching and deviant obscurity. “Her pioneering research has demonstrated how our internal chemicals, the neuropeptides and their receptors, are the actual biological underpinning of our awareness, manifesting themselves as our emotions, beliefs, expectations, and profoundly influencing how we respond to and experience our world”. He considers this a validation of Eastern knowledge

New York, 1998.

²⁶How integral is the blockage to the molecules of our culture? The answer requires a venture into the zones of interest to Pert and Ramachandran. In the previous *Cantower* I drew attention to the power of the heuristic lay-out on page 48 of *Method in Theology*. But its power depends on our openness and humility. So, there is the word *plasticity* in that array. How plastic or how genetically fixed is our neurodynamic potential? There is the problem of “plasticity in the central nervous system” (Ramachandran, *op.cit.*, 267), of the variability of cortical maps. Is there “a residual plasticity left over after infancy” (*ibid*, 268)? Work described by Ramachandran goes against “the presumed absence of plasticity in the adult brain” (*ibid*, 31). How deep is the reach of the toxicity described by Pert? (see the index to *Molecules of Emotion*).

²⁷See note 73 on p. 229, “Elevating *Insight*. Spacetime as Paradigm Problem”, *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19(2001).

and practice, as apparently does Pert: “as Deepak’s sages in India understood....”²⁸ I am not questioning Indian practices: I am questioning claims of knowledge and understanding. What is meant by ‘underpinning’? How do neuropeptides manifest themselves? Neither Chopra nor Pert answer these questions. So, it is not true that “she shows us that our biochemical messengers act with intelligence by communicating information” (Chopra’s foreword), and I suspect that Pert would back off from such a claim. But what is the truth of the matter?

Pert is “a seeker of the truth”, “First and foremost I am a truth-seeker”²⁹, but her search and the common search is blocked, as she would agree, by “Descartes, the philosopher and founding father of modern medicine.”³⁰ Later she remarks “My feeling is that there is no scientific reason to leave spirituality out of medicine. It’s a habit that our culture has gotten into ever since the seventeenth philosophy when Rene Descartes declared body and soul to be distinct, separate entities, entirely unrelated to each other. But the truth that I have learned through my own late-twentieth-century science is that soul, mind, and emotions do play an important role in health. What we need is a larger biomedical science to reintegrate what was taken out three hundred years ago.”³¹ The rot goes much further back, but the point is sound. Further, I focus on understanding rather than spirituality, an unhealthy zone at present.³²

So, Pert’s genuine search is blocked by toxic layers of the axial period. Who is to converse with her regarding her existential question: “since our sensing of the outer world is filtered along peptide-receptor-rich sensory way-stations, each with a different emotional overtone, how can

²⁸Pert, 310.

²⁹Pert, 16,17.

³⁰Pert, 18.

³¹Pert, 304.

³²See *Lack in the Beingstalk*, 102, note 94, and the other references given there.

we objectively define what's real and what's not real?"³³ She writes of a "new paradigm"³⁴ to replace the Establishment's well-protected "prevailing paradigm,"³⁵ and her own tradition of work is a massive contribution. But it is partial, incomplete, for her, for any of us new millennium wanderers, phantoms beneath the opera of our busy world. Her strangely-acquired rug, "a dawning sun surrounded by yellow sunflowers and large black birds"³⁶, certainly sustains her, transformed as she has been by her search. "That is what had fascinated them, they told me, the idea of a person who had been transformed by her work, who has come to a spiritual place from scientific truth-seeking."³⁷

I have written nothing directly about her transforming work: what would the point be of summarily indicating what she does so well in the bulk of the book? My interest indeed is twofold: firstly, inviting you to take her seriously, to take seriously the reach of our molecules for the understanding of the molecules that are the bones of our universe; second, inviting you to notice that there is a massive need for a new paradigm that goes quite beyond that paradigmatic reach. We need the lessons of the sunflowers written of in *Cantower II*. We, and Pert, need a new community, a community seeking darkly and humbly "to embrace the universe in a single view". "The goal is to keep information flowing, feedback systems working, and natural balance maintained, all of which we can help to achieve by a conscious decision to enter into the bodymind's conversation".³⁸ The function of these *Cantowers* is to bring out the plausibility

³³Pert, 146.

³⁴Pert, 13, 17.

³⁵Pert, 19, 13.

³⁶Pert, 313.

³⁷Pert, 314. The occasion was a Wellness Conference in Provo, Utah, 1995.

³⁸Pert, 286.

and possibility of maintaining that conversation and information-flow by sharing, each in their own way, in the working of the hodic feedback systems.

Before concluding, with Candace Pert, on potential for such a sharing, it would be as well to return to **Tomega**, the doctrine on which I have centred attention in this section.

The invitation internal³⁹ to the dynamic orientation to understand is “to embrace the universe in a single view”. I have noted that this claim runs counter to the present ethos of specialization, and it seems best to pause over this before entering further into the subtleties hidden within the word *embrace*. It is a brief descriptive pause: the thematic pause is the core of *Cantower IIX*: “Slopes: An Encounter”, and if my description here seems implausible, unacceptable, please hold judgment till the foundational fantasy is thus enlarged.

The fantasy is of a taken-for-granted harmonious development of subjects - where the word *subject* means both topic and thinker. There is nothing strange in that double meaning if one is tuning into the meaning of generalized empirical method, or into my sloganizing of it: “When teaching children geometry, one is teaching children children”. But let me skip the temptation to thematize even descriptively and make some rambling, and perhaps annoying, points.

In recent years I have encountered old colleagues from different fields of inquiry. They attained, in their career, various degrees of eminence in their respective fields. But what was sadly noticeable was the imbalance in their perspective. When talking outside their field they were regularly victims of whatever culture they had grown up with or imbibed since. To a sophisticated view in one discipline - or at times more than one - there was added - or addled - an eclectic mix of conventional or sometimes far-out opinions. The culture never invited them to anything else, and the invitation of generalized empirical method was and still is a thing of the

³⁹There are difficult pointings required here regarding the ontology of the dynamic that relate to our personal involvement in it and commitment to it. They related to a deepening of the reading of chapter 12 of *Insight*, such as would throw light on problems regarding the notion of value. More on this in *Cantower IX*, section 9.6.

distant future. But let us not get into the question of the lift of that future perspective: let us just think of the forty odd years as, say, an academic that they spent in a particular zone. Here I am returning to a point I pushed in a Florida Conference paper of 1970, "Image and Emergence: Towards an Adequate *Weltanschauung*."⁴⁰ But at the time, although in the article I was writing about philosophy of botany, I was thinking more of philosophy than of botany: I had not come to grips with the culture-shift internal to generalized empirical method. Certainly I talked there of the botanist's need for the adequate world-view. But I talked more of growing up as a philosopher, through philotherapy and disciplinary diversification.⁴¹ Now I see that the botanist also needs to be humane, needs to be at the level of her or his times. In terms of the later Lonergan's writings, it is a question of categorial maturity. Envisage now his double optimism regarding the future: first he gives his impossible listing of general categories,⁴² then he sweetly suggests - was he grinning as he typed? - that "the use of the general theological categories occurs in any of the functional specialties."⁴³

Now you may say that what he says only applies to theologians: but that in itself is pretty shocking and indeed will carry us forward into the orientation to be developed in *Cantowers X -XXI*. The hodic cycling will gradually reveal that these categories are to be normative to cultural reflection - something especially discomfoting to those working in aesthetics who shelter behind C.P.Snow's talk of two cultures, indeed glory in their ignorance of

⁴⁰Now chapter one of *The Shaping of the Foundations*.

⁴¹One of my suggestions was that if one did the equivalent of ten 3-year degrees over the middle years of life, one would have something to say as an elder!

⁴²*Method in Theology*, 286-7.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 292.

science.⁴⁴ But again, the thematic is not the issue now, but a popular persuasive glimpse. Such a glimpse is contain in the question, Are you really going to keep your theoretic bent focused on your single discipline - or a corner of a discipline! - for forty years? “Well no”, the specialist may say, “I am obviously going to keep abreast of general culture”. Now what might that mean, “keep abreast”? You mean, read popularizations of other fields?

So we run into another mess. What might you mean by *popularization*, *haute vulgarization*? The question merited a chapter in *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, so I slip past it here with just two comments.⁴⁵ First, knowing what popularization is takes one out of one’s discipline into a very difficult zone of inquiry. Secondly, not knowing what popularization is leaves one vulnerable to illusions that are very damaging both to oneself and to one’s audience.

Chapter three of *Lack in the Beingstalk* lays emphasis on such illusions in the case of physics, an illusion stated boldly by Stephen Hawking: “The basic ideas about the origin and fate of the universe can be stated without mathematics in a form that people without a scientific education can understand.”⁴¹ But it is a prevalent illusion in the post-compact era of culture, a

⁴⁴Of course, we are back now at the question of what science is that we entertained, or entertained us, as we listened to the sunflower in *Cantower II*. The problem in aesthetics will be given a fresh focus in the fifth section of *Cantower IIX*.

⁴⁵ The title of chapter three there is “*Haute Vulgarization*”, but the chapter does not answer the question, What is popularization? You might find it interesting at least to read Lonergan’s brief popular comments on the topic in his *Collected Works*, Volume 6, 121, 155; Volume 10, 145.

⁴¹Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time. From Big Bang to Black Holes*, Bantam Press, 1988, 6. He followed up this book with an even more vulgar and illusional effort, *The Universe in a Nutshell*, Bantam Press, 2001.

phantom of the axial brain.⁴² Pert does not escape it: “the leading edge of biomolecular medicine becomes accessible to anyone who wants to hear about it.”⁴³ And her audience lives in the unlife⁴⁴ of that illusion: “I have come to believe that most of the lay people who find their way to my lectures are hoping to hear science demystified, de-jargonized, described in terms they can understand.”⁴⁵

The hope, of course, is a sick global hope, neural cousin of general bias, boned into schizothymia. But let us not be distracted from the main point, which has plausibility even in these axial times: surely a career of forty years permits theoretic understanding to reach for some multi-disciplinary theoretic? And I should leave the question there, for it reaches out in many directions that you may notice: obvious flaws in theology and philosophy, but also flaws of commitment in all areas of human endeavour. Perhaps a single illustration would help here. There is the community of mountaineers that I admire and regularly use as analogy for the inner climb. But what of the integral climb of that devotion (many of its devotees would squirm at the idea that the avocation is merely a sport)?

I have had occasion to read autobiographies of climbers and find that the question of the meaning of the pursuit does arise regularly. I do not wish to quote directly: the reflections in such

⁴²My implicit reference here is to V.S.Ramachandran and Sandra Blakeslee, *Phantoms in the Brain. Probing the Mysteries of the Human Mind*, William Morrow, New York, 1998. The book will come center-stage in *Cantower IX*: “Position, Poosition, Protopossession”. Further references to the book mentioned will be given simply as: Phantom, xx.

⁴³Pert, 11.

⁴⁴This is a core problem of axial decay, of our toxicity, a molecularity sustaining general bias, a dominant myth excluding mystery. You might like - or not like! - to re-read now with fresh tension the powerful first section of chapter 17 of *Insight*.

⁴⁵Pert, 16.

autobiographies are generally very personal. But there is an impression of a nagging sense of inadequacy of personal perspective, or sometimes a reflective stance that closes off issues. I recall a striking instance of one climber's account of standing over the body of a friend, dead through accident, in which he looks up at the stark magnificence of the peak above, deeply moved by the wonder and the sadness, remarking that "death too has its reasons". But the stance is unquestioningly fatalistic. Some climbers, acknowledging an inner reach - much as actors do in their profession - but accept it and go on. They go on in all sorts of ways: some are solo sprinters, some are dedicated to extremes of performance, some are committed to non-repetitive novelty. And, of course, there are the amateurs, who tend to annoy the dedicated, and there is commercialism.

It may surprise that I pause over this particular area of human commitment: but it is as well to see that the issue of the human climb to maturity is confined to no zone. Indeed, the climb in any zone is meshed into the same problematic that is the core concern of these *Cantowers*, and so I note here, perhaps astonishingly, that mountaineering too - with its history, its various interpretations, doctrines, its systems and plannings, its marketing, is grist for the mill of hodic method. You get then my strange point: whether it is the Himalayas or Hollywood, there is the question of what constitutes progress and the good life.

So, we circle round again to the proposition **Tomega**, and perhaps sense fresher meanings for the words *embrace* and *view*. Even on a low peak there is the exhilaration of coming to "embrace the universe in a single view". It echos the reach of Cezanne before his canvas, of Denzel Washington in his aspirations now as a director. Each of us, perhaps, has his or her Mt.St.Victoire: but is it not laced into the universe, and is that universe not the heart of the reaching, in some strange identity of embracing and embraced? And is there not some sense in

which the universe calls for the embrace? So, the cosmos groans⁴⁶ and “the universe can bring forth its own unity in the concentrated form of a single intelligent view.”⁴⁷ And perhaps now you have a glimpse of the intimacy of isomorphism of desire and destiny, of understanding and mystery, as you read for a fresh time that “the reality of proportionate being is **embraced** in its entirety by central and conjugate potencies, forms, acts.”⁴⁸ The embrace takes metaphysics to heart.

I have edged here towards *The Anthropic Principle*, a topic of contemporary physics and astronomy, and it seems worthwhile, for completeness, to recall what I have written elsewhere on the matter, in the third chapter of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*.⁴⁹

“There is some advantage in connecting our few rambling points to present popularization in physics regarding *The Anthropic Principle*. Lee Smolin, one of the jugglers with the principle remarks, ‘It is necessary to first clear away one very influential reflection on the idea that the world was made for us, which is the anthropic principle.’⁵⁰

⁴⁶The reference is to Paul’s *Letter to the Romans*, chapter 8. I discuss commentaries on this text in chapter 2 of *The Redress of Poise*.

⁴⁷*Insight*,520[544].

⁴⁸*Insight*,496-7[520].

⁴⁹Within the text I refer to the position and the poosition, topics of *Cantower IX*. I refer also to *the field*, a topic in Lonergan’s reflections on phenomenology in *Phenomenology and Logic*. See the introduction to the index there, and the index itself under *Field*.

⁵⁰Lee Smolin, *The Life of the Cosmos*, Phoenix Paperback, 1997, 251. There follows a chapter entitled ‘Beyond the Anthropic Principle’ (252-62) with various muddled popular reflections. For a muddle that is critical of its use, see Heinz Pagel, *Perfect Symmetry*, Bantam, New York, 1985. For its defence see John Barrow and Frank Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, Oxford University Press, 1986.

What is written here is within the position and the position on the field.⁵¹ To write adequately thus about what is called *The Anthropic Principle* is to write about something quite axially beyond present popular physics and popular philosophy. The weak and strong anthropic principles that I write of immediately, then, are *forms* of understanding finitude quite different from the shadows boxed in the cave of both modern popular physics and contemporary philosophy of science.

In that cave one speaks of the weak anthropic principle as ‘the realization that the existence of observers such as ourselves imposes some selection effects on what we see around us.’⁵² The strong anthropic principle comes in various shapes ranging from some vague sense of isomorphism up to some variety of theism. One might relate it to the view of Einstein, ‘the most incomprehensible thing about the universe is that it is comprehensible.’⁵³

Extreme realism would identify the corresponding forms as (i) the form of emergent probability⁵⁴, (ii) the form of positional isomorphism, where both forms are mediated by generalized empirical method in an adequate contemporary fullness.⁵⁵ The popular debate about them, and its results, become clear with the clarity of the black whole of meta-theory, beyond the

⁵¹See note 52 above.

⁵²John Gribbin and Martin Rees, *The Stuff of the Universe. Dark Matter, Mankind and Anthropic Cosmology*, Penguin Books, 1995, 287.

⁵³*Ibid.*, 284.

⁵⁴There is no point in enlarging on this here. Reaching clarity on the matter is a massive challenge, beyond popularization, beyond Bertalanffy’s followers. See P.McShane, *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, Gill Macmillan and Notre Dame, 1971; Kenneth Melchin, *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability*, University Press of America, 1999.

⁵⁵One can sublimate and span the various views of the strong principle by ranging from the question, What is being (*Insight*, 388[413]) to the question, What, then, is being? (*Insight*, 642 [665]).

see-wall of the popular and the counter-positioned.⁵⁶

And in the clarity of that black whole's special Christian categories there are to be luminously identified (iii) the stronger anthropic principle and (iv) the strongest anthropic principle.⁵⁷

The stronger anthropic principle would be a sublating into the contemporary context of all that Thomas wrote of *Imago Dei*.⁵⁸

The strongest anthropological principle relates to a divine incarnation that makes actual the unity of the universe in a full, but not comprehensive, single intelligent view.⁵⁹ How each of us is called to share that view is a pinnacle of searching that we can return to briefly in the concluding pointings of chapter four."⁶⁰

⁵⁶I am writing within the privacy of my foundations here. It is the hodic spiral that will slowly spin off and away an increasingly large percentage of counterpositional thinking, thus grounding a creative 'dark minder' minority. *Method in Theology* puts both the private invitation of *Insight* and the muddles regarding (is? is! is.) pointed to in *Phenomenology and Logic* in an optimistic if long-term context.

⁵⁷The definite article is used in each case here, but you will perhaps go on to detect a difference. *The* is absolute regarding the stronger principle, *the* is generic regarding the strongest principle, which is one principle of molecular intelligence's being within the genus of the absolutely supernatural spoken of in the last chapter of *Insight*.

⁵⁸Lonergan's *Verbum* articles, *Collected Works* Vol.2, open one up to this topic, but one must go to Thomas for the full richness of his perspective. He carries one to an overlap with the strongest anthropological principle. Also there is food for feminist thought in his reflections on possible incarnations in the early questions of the third part of the *Summa*. Might the Second Coming be the same Second Person who suffered as a man coming as a woman?

⁵⁹*Insight*, ch. 16, last sentence of section 4. Here Lonergan writes of a unity of the universe from comprehension: the prime instance is the mind of Jesus. Jesus' view was not, could not be, comprehensive (*Summa*, Ia, q.12, a.7; IIIa q.10, a.1): this has significance in understanding his patterns of contemplation, prayer, obedience, etc.

⁶⁰*Lack in the Beingstalk*, 104-5.

This quotation gives a glimpse beyond our present context, but it also echoes the reachings of the Sunflower reflections of the third section of *Cantower II.*, “The Organism that is God”.

But I must swing back from these misty peaks of human aspiration to the searching of Candace Pert, to your searchings and mine. Candace, in her searchings for integral meaning, has been let down by a deep global axial incompetence bred by the exclusion and the narrowing and the neglect, East, West and South, of the contemplative urge at the root of minding. Aristotle’s finest way, or Thomas’ contemplative Whatting, will not be for the few in the third stage of meaning. But to make a beginning we need many cultural shifts. I have focused here on the personal shift, and that will command my attention in the next year of *Cantowers*. But there are the conditions of that shift in reforms of education and reorientations of economics.⁶¹ In the latter case, we need a massive shift in perspective from a protestant and profit ethic of economics and employment - think of the title of Keynes’ over-rated book of 1936 - to an economics of leisure. So, one envisages a distant economic balance that prefers deepening to widening, that centers on the priority of the cultural phase of economic activity, that “must augment leisure. Such leisure may indeed be wasted, just as anything else can be wasted. But if it is properly employed, then it yields the cultural development that effects a new transformation.”⁶² Then success will walk in very different streets, and adult growth will have a Proustian poise.

That poise will be a poise of molecules that describe and explain. The bones and muscles of theorizing will send vibrations through lonely hearts, generating a “psychic force that links living human bodies together in joyful courageous, wholehearted, yet intelligently controlled

⁶¹See P.McShane, *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, Axial Press, Halifax, chapters 5 and 6.

⁶²B.Lonergan, *For a New Political Economy*, 22.

performance of the tasks set by world order.”⁶³ “But we are not there yet. And for society to progress towards that it must not direct its main effort to the ordinary final product of standard of living but to the overhead final product of cultural implements. It must not glory in its widening, in adding industry to industry, and feeding the soul of man with an abundant demand for labor. It must glory in its deepening, in the pure deepening that adds to aggregate leisure, to liberate many entirely and all increasingly to the field of cultural activities It must not glue its nose to the single track of this or that department. It must lift its eyes more and ever more to the more general and more difficult fields of speculation.”⁶⁴

It? You, perhaps, now, as an eccentric reaching forward, not solitary perhaps but certainly a rare bird. A female bird, reaching beyond the male flight to a fresh empire of nesting inwardly? Has not Candace Pert a point? “The heart of science is feminine. In its essence, science has very little to do with competition, control, separation - all qualities that have become associated with science in its male-dominated, twentieth-century form. The science that I have come to know and love is unifying, spontaneous, intuitive, caring - a process more akin to surrender than to domination.”⁶⁵ A process akin to embracing, to being embraced by, the universe? A process of giving birth within to an inward universe, in a sublating and correction of pop-physics illusions of many universes: for indeed, there can be as many universes as there are molecular minders to mind.

1.3 “Will you go, Lassie, go?”

And now I write to you of your daughter, or your lady-student, a Penelope or Molloy at

⁶³*Insight*, 725[745].

⁶⁴*For A New Political Economy*, 20.

⁶⁵Pert, 313.

the dying stages of this pale male axial odyssey. Or. If you are young enough and lucky enough I may be talking to you.

Am I to risk advice? Would you as teacher risk such council?

“...what skull-like laugh
Would break, what crutch ‘gin write my epitaph
For pastime in the dusty thoroughfare,
If at his council I should turn aside
Into that ominous tract which, all agree,
Hides the Dark Tower.”⁶⁶

And the advice is not at all as doomed and gloomed⁶⁷ as the poem would have it, even though the Dark Tower’s existence, location, attainability, are all obscure, obscured. Indeed, the Dark Tower I speak of, the Bower of love of the next *Cantower*, is to be constituted by the climb. And the ambience of my invitation and advice is the culture that I pointed to in the previous section, symbolized by that single sad page of *Insight*, page 417[442]. The search for enlightenment focused on **understanding** is subtly shunned as we move into this new millennium, a shunning that is veined and molecularized. I suspect now, more than I did thirteen years ago when I gave equivalent advice, much more than I did thirty years ago when I sketched a

⁶⁶Robert Browning, “Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came”(1855), lines 10-15. It is the beginning of mad Edgar’s song (Shakespeare, *King Lear*, III. iv. 171. A childe is a young knight who has not yet proved himself. Obviously I am thinking here of a new age lady, and perhaps not a tower but a well, a womb, of meaning.

⁶⁷Browning’s poem is considered by some critics as grimmer than Eliot’s *Hollow Men* or Kafka’s *Penal Colony*.

norm of searching, that the vast majority of my readers will miss, dodge, resent, my pointing.⁶⁸ Are we not all doing quite well, doing our own sincere thing? I do not question sincerity. So, all I ask is that the search I propose be admitted as a possibility, a mad possibility indeed, but perhaps attractive for a global few.

When I wrote *Process* in a single eccentric year in Oxford,⁶⁹ I was still optimistic enough to think of larger numbers. I drew on others who had pointed to eccentricity, focus, madness: Rilke, Clara Schumann, William Cobbett, Nadia Boulanger, the ‘two ‘Georges’.⁷⁰ Boulanger, perhaps, more than the others, lurked over the book from beginning to end, literally.⁷¹ And now I think rather in small numbers. I am haunted by the mood of *efficiency*,⁷² and will have more to say about it in *Cantower VI*. Plato’s *Republic* was not efficient so there arose no republic; Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* has been consistently misread for 2300 years, and at all events it lacks the unity of a metaphysics. Lonergan’s updating of their efforts and invitations in *Insight* has been shelved with faint praise. Here I write with a potential global reach: and perhaps I will reach a few lunatic ladies?

⁶⁸Thirty years ago there was the pointing of chapter one of *The Shaping of the Foundations*; thirteen years ago, the pointing of *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*.

⁶⁹The project was sketched as a book in 1974, a fifteen year project titled *Process: A Paedeiad*. The final product backed off from the full push for explanatory metaphysics (later begun in chapter four of *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*) to be a relatively elementary introductory work, written in Oxford 1988-89, titled *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*.

⁷⁰Not British Kings but the ladies Eliot and Sand.

⁷¹The book (p. 178 of the Website edition) concludes with her deathbed comments on eternal music.

⁷²On this question I have referred regularly to *Topics in Education*, 160. It will have to be dealt with a little more adequately in *Cantower V*.

But my advice has obviously changed, yet it has not changed. It has not changed, so that I can repeat what I wrote in *Process*, applying Nadia Boulanger's advice to a young musician now to a young **minder**.

“Do not take up music unless you would rather die than not do so. It must be an indissoluble love. And one with great joy of learning, the firm determination to learn, the unswerving perseverance, the intense faithfulness. But primarily if it is not better to die than to do music - then it is an excuse. And if not then why, why?”⁷³

You have been invited to meet Nadia before, in *Cantower I*, and we will meet her again, in *Cantower CXI*. Do you find her invitation, my invitation, extreme? But now my invitation is changed: there is a new context, the context described in *Cantower III*. You may well find the invitation extreme at the moment, yet opt provisionally for the climb that I go on here to suggest. The opting occurs in friendlier fashion within community. I recall a small gathering, in the 1970s, Lonergan and about nine others, expressing our views and hopes. Finally, Lonergan spoke, and his first words were “Well at least you know you're not crazy: you're not alone”.

My entire effort in this project is to establish a community of definite luminous psychic identity⁷⁴: all four of these words must be qualified by the realism of “Slow slow growing”. Now some of my Lonergan colleagues may object to this: are there not already many such communities in many nations? If so, my apologies: please get in touch with me so that I can share your search. But I am not optimistic, since my present meaning and intention is of a community that is focused quite precisely on the effort to implement the functional idea in a very strict sense that has so far not been not been fashionable. If other groups of Lonergan students pick up on this, all the better.

⁷³Alan Kendall, *The Tender Tyrant, Nadia Boulanger. A Life Devoted to Music*, with an Introduction by Yahudi Menuhin, Macdonald and James, London, 1976, 10.

⁷⁴*Identification* was the topic of section 3.3 of *Cantower III*.

So, back to my point: you are not alone, as Lonergan was in his strange climb to 1965 and beyond. I think now of Lonergan's marginal marking⁷⁵ of *Wealth of Self* where I wrote "I recall now Jung's remark that the truly contemporary man is alone - and the aloneness here is an aloneness of meaning". This is one of the benefits of the transition to functional identity as a thinker: the hodic shift seeds the grounding of a new cosmopolitan community. In that community one may seek to find one's place - or fade away, and this will be true, eventually, in any area of cultural reflection.⁷⁶ Further, you are not alone in your discernment regarding my advice. Further still, the choice, or rather being chosen by luminous circumstances⁷⁷ some of whom are colleagues, is a delayed choice. Fourth level functional specialization - dialectics and foundations - is not a young woman's specialty. Finally, my advice regarding "initiation" is providentially equally valid for anyone serious about contributing to the present cultural enterprise. "The use of the general categories occurs in any of the eight functional specialties",⁷⁸ and our obligation to the next generations of the trek is to go where few philosophers and theologians have previously ventured. Or at least encourage others to go where we can not. And where might that be, you ask? Well, let's sidle up to the nasty challenge.

A first element in sidling up is to lift your reflections into a biographic perspective. You

⁷⁵P. 102: the book is on the Website; unfortunately Lonergan's copy of *Wealth of Self* was not available for the scanning.

⁷⁶Yesterday someone spoke with me by phone on this topic. The analogy occurred to me of relay racing. The intellectual loner of the future is like a runner who takes on a relay team of five or ten on a ten kilometre run. Indeed, this will come to apply also to the lone school, and eventually to the lone discipline. See further *Cantower IIX*, section 5 and *Cantower IX*, section 6.

⁷⁷See, in the Website archives, "*Insight after Forty Years: Towards a Luminous Darkness of Circumstances*".

⁷⁸*Method in Theology*, 291.

may well be in this mode already, but I recall now mentioning the need to think biographically to a Lonergan expert some years ago and he looked at me as if I was suggesting a strange deviation. Our topic merits a reach forward in fantasy to your grey self of three scores years and ten. That reach may find a lift in other lives, like Nadia Boulanger's or Fanny Mendelson's or Kate Chopin's, or in fictional struggles like that of Emma Bovary or Aurora Leigh. How have you already been victimized, and where to now then your hours and decades?

“I learnt the collects and the catechism,
The creeds from Athanasius back to Nice,
And various popular synopses of
Inhuman doctrines never taught by John.
I learnt a little algebra, a little
Of the mathematics - brushed with extreme flounce
The circle of the sciences....”⁷⁹

You have, no doubt, suffered some equivalent colonization of your heartiness, but at least, in the new millennium, you do not have to battle openly like

“Georg Sand, whose soul, amid the lions
Of the tumultuous senses, moans defiance
And answers roar for roar.”⁸⁰

Still, there are subtler colonizations,⁸¹ so you need to add a fantasy of history to

⁷⁹Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Aurora Leigh*, Book 1, ll.392ff.

⁸⁰Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *To George Sand*, a sonnet: lines 2-4.

⁸¹Recall the colonization of language, the topic of day three of the August 2002 West Dublin conferring described in *Cantower III*. The colonization is much subtler than gender-bender language. What is called for is a communal reach, through a hearty etymological dialectic, for the flaws of linguistic development from the beginning of the axial period and even further back in the organic and phylogenetic roots of talk, the existential and historical parts and figures

biography, joining Browning's 'they':

“To see things as comprehensively
As if afar they took their point of sight,
And distant things as intimately deep
As if they touched them. Let us strive for this.”⁸²

For most of us, education up to our teen years was a mess: par for the Western and even Eastern course in which, for centuries “the social situation deteriorates cumulatively.”⁸³ Part of that deterioration is *haute vulgarization*.⁸⁴ And part of that vulgarity is a present popular culture of mythology in advanced physics, in popularizations of physics, and in ordinary schooling in physics. Recall Lonergan's comment: “It's about something I suffered from. Teaching physics without the student knowing the relevant mathematics is not teaching physics.... (20 lines of reflection)... the teaching of physics without a proper account of the fundamental notions gives the illusion of knowledge, a false idea of what science is. And it clutters the mind.”⁸⁵

Lonergan here is referring to the absence of mathematics but fundamental notions reach further, and mind-cluttering also: we will come back to these in later *Cantowers*. What I would wish from you, however, is your very private reaction to the notion that a categorial stand against deterioration involves one in the challenge to do some serious physics, and so some serious mathematics. Not so, sez you? And why not?, sez me.

of speech.

⁸²Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Aurora Leigh*, Book 5, ll. 185-188.

⁸³*Insight*, 229[254].

⁸⁴See Lonergan, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-64*, 121, 155.

⁸⁵*Topics in Education*, 145.

We are into an axial issue here, twined into the hodic problem of foundational education.⁸⁶ It is a problem needing the cycling, spiralling, that is our enterprise. But at any rate you may already suspect that the issue runs into the muddy depths of what passes for education at present. In a generation or three it will be quite evident and conventional for an adolescent to understand elementary calculus and basic economics: that is part of what Lonergan means by both correctly oriented leisure and democratic economics. Should we not encourage a start? Your generation may not be up to the effort, but why block off the next?

But I would have you muse over the decades ahead in manners briefly sketched in the conference outline of *Cantower III*. The patchwork of your education is probably not as cheerful as Aurora Leigh's who "danced the polka and Cellarius, / Spun glass, stuffed birds, and modelled flowers in wax."⁸⁷ Perhaps you spun essays, stuffed notes, modelled, "brushed with",⁸⁸ danced past, a random range of Rs, to name only one alphabet soup: Rahner, Rorty, Reductionism, Relativism, Are you to inflict the same soup on yourself and others through a half-century?

I recall immediately here, with sad amusement, parallel pointings and advice given at a Boston Workshop in the late 1970s. One listener, caught in my mood, asked what he might do in

⁸⁶*Topics in Education* obviously requires a massive relocation within a functional specialist perspective, as well as a rescuing from the pressure towards *haute vulgarization* that was a key aspect of the occasion of the delivery of the lectures. A detailed analysis of the text reveals how Lonergan juggles towards 'giving a general notion', a juggling that bedevilled a great deal of his presentational life. I did not have the privilege of hearing any of his Roman lectures, but I would like to think that he had a more adequate audience in his graduate seminars there. Of his regular course he remarked to me, "you can't lecture to the dull ones, because then the clever one's wont listen. You have to lecture to the top, and some things will trickle down". More than once he smiling told me of Lorenz' reaction to Hoenen being sent to teach in the Gregorian: the waste of a good physicist. Hoenan had worked under Lorenz (of the Lorenz contraction. etc) in Holland.

⁸⁷*Aurora Leigh*, Book 1, ll. 424-5.

⁸⁸*Ibid.*, line 404: as above, brushing with science.

the free Summer that he had. I suggested a shot at calculus. But, like the chap coming out of the British Museum in Lewis' *Screwtape Letters*, the 'real world' won him back. Now he professes religious studies with a descriptive alphabet brush.

In the massive cyclic restructuring of global education that is to emerge, this satire and humour will blossom into science and self-tasting. But meantime we have to cope with the twilight of the existential gap. In simpler terms that gap was noted discomforting by Lonergan, when he was asked, during a Boston Workshop question- session. How much physics should a theologian know? The reply: "Well, he [she] should be able to read Lindsay and Margenau".

Obviously I could go on, indeed with some heat. But I will make two final points. Firstly, I do not see how a contemporary thinker can go on towards the future without inviting, if not sharing, in a venture into this simplest of theoretic worlds. Without it one lives in the "illusion of knowledge"⁸⁹ that is just *haute vulgarization*, even if it has the lift of "the commonsense contributions to our self-knowledge of Augustine, Descartes, Pascal, Newman."⁹⁰ Secondly, your harmonious organic development remains warped (in a way that is quite acceptable at present, even by eschatologists be they of sacred or profane bent), and so too does your personality, in so far as your eschatological cosmology is, piously or poetically, a dated upstairs-downstairs of angel's wings and demon's horns.

So I halt abruptly with the hope that I have set some few of you thinking about the possibility of a life parallelling *Nadia Boulanger. A Life in Music*: a life in meaning. Deep within you, but massively scotomatized by contemporary schizothymia, is a molecular longing to twirl your descriptions, aggregated molecular orderings, into explanatory molecularization that are

⁸⁹Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 145: his reflections of popularization. See note 85.

⁹⁰*Method in Theology*, 261.

luminous in their darkness.⁹¹ You are meant, if your calling is foundational, to view the first of you and the last of you in something better than one more frame-up of Dorian Grey. You are meant to gently, darkly, climb and twirl into the fellowship and sisterhood of giants, beyond these giants in Then-Enlightenment.

“There they stood, ranged along the hill-sides, met
 To view the last of me, a living frame
 For one more picture! In a sheet of flame
 I saw them and I knew them all. And yet
 Dauntless the slug-horn⁹² to my lips I set,
 And blew. ‘*Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came.*’”⁹³

⁹¹A fuller indication of heuristic context is given in *Cantower IX*: “Position, Poosition, Protopossession”.

⁹²A trumpet.

⁹³The final lines, 199-204, of Robert Browning’s poem.