

*Cantower IX***Position, Poosition, Protopossession****December 1st 2002**

He had the knack of making men feel
 As small as they really were
 Which meant as great as God had made them
 Though as males they disliked his air¹

1.1 Preliminary Years

So we come, at the end of this first year, to the other or new beginning mentioned in note 2 of *Cantower I*. There I promised to replace a brief doctrinal statement with foundational conversation. But obviously that conversation is limited. Foundational conversation, C₅₅, is conversation between two strugglers of that specialty reaching within their developed categories for envisagement, fantasy, of advances. The one may be more advanced than the other: then you may view the conversation as teaching. But a cautionary note is required here. The conversation of generalized empirical method is always a self-reaching. There is feedback: one is always climbing. So, both climb together, the more advanced normatively at a larger pace so that at the end the distance has grown between the two climbers. This is part of the reality and the obscurity and the mystery of foundational adult growth.

Then there is Foundational Address: C_{5x}, where x refers to any other functional specialty, or indeed can be '9', an address to non-members of the cultural effort, an ex-planeing in the strict sense.² But when it is that type of address it does not expect much of the non-doctrinal response that is actual

¹Patrick Kavanagh, *If Ever You Go to Dublin Town*.

²I introduced the meaning ex-plane first in section 3.6 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*. It gives a more precise image and meaning and lift to *haute vulgarization*.

climbing. Think of a climber addressing an audience about the difficulties of the North Face of the Eiger. The audience are there to be thrilled at some level: but they are not about to venture to some climbing wall or ice-face.

One of the handicaps of the present developed axial decayed culture is that foundational address, or address that requires climbing, is that it is not recognized as such. The classic instance of this problem, for me, is the manner in which many readers of the 1940s read the *Verbum* articles: they were the audience that Lonergan had to address in the Epilogue of the work. Are we much wiser in the new millennium? The question, surely, is yours here now. My regular analogy here, and elsewhere, is my own teaching of mathematical physics. You may find it better to think of the Master classes of Nadia Boulanger with which we began in *Cantower I*, or of Cello Master classes given by, say, Yo Yo Ma. One has to go home and work, perhaps ten hours for every hour of the class.

The difficulty of the present topic is that it is what I would call a core lifework, especially for a foundations person. But it is also the core, the eye of the storm³ of the pilgrimage in culture, for any hodic collaborator. Indeed, I might say that it is the core of the non-hodic world of any contemplative: but that is a topic for *Cantower XXI*. At all events, the present address is not, then, like a master-class or a class in any year of mathematical physics studies: it is like a pre-degree address, sketching the climb. It could be like pointing towards the heights of ice-skiing or concert-performance to enthusiasts whose enthusiasms are quite generic.

I am presuming now that you are enthusiastic, and not a beginner. Indeed, you may be up there beyond me, protopossessed, delighting in my struggle to present your homeground. I think now of my very first conversation with Lonergan, still vivid to me after 41 years. It was on this topic, in a way that is very relevant for us now. I asked him about “startling strangeness”⁴: when he reached it. We were in a room overlooking Leeson St. in Dublin, in the days before he gave the lectures of Easter 1961. I sat as he paced the floor and talked in his strange vocal rhythms, up in pitch at the end of sentences. “When I got that I had to go and ask someone”. He never did tell me When. But, as you may

³See the Bacchus page at the conclusion of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

⁴*Insight*, xxviii[22].

remember, he regularly recalled to audiences how it took Augustine ten years to get somewhere equivalent, like the halfway house of Platonism. But the point that he made is significant when you connect it to the first page of chapter fourteen of *Insight*, which he begins with the personal problem of metaphysics and ends with the interpersonal problem of conversation. One can arrive at “The Position” described a few pages later, but when you go and talk to someone, even to someone who has arrived at the position, both of the conversants are - or may be - already-out-there-real. I had managed to break through, in an elementary sense, to the Position at the end of the previous decade.⁵ Lonergan had that achievement years earlier, and it is interesting to puzzle about whether he had pushed on to what I call the Position, the overcoming of the interpersonal problem described at the bottom of that first page of his fourteenth chapter.⁶

Indeed, the puzzle can be extended historically, and you, like I, may spend time puzzling over people like Aristotle and Plotinus in regard to the same point. The puzzle is eventually a matter of functional specialist work, and the refinements that I am indicating here, in these next sections, become refinements that need the sifting of p. 250 of *Method in Theology*. If you have been with me through

⁵From 1952 to 1956 I had been working in mathematics and mathematical physics, ending in the autumn of 1956 with a Master’s degree. Then I was led into a pretty high-grade scholastic philosophy: Marechalian stuff, German epistemology, Hoenan’s cosmology. The teacher of the third year course in Philosophy of God, Fr. John Hyde, was interested in Lonergan. I battled with *Insight* in the second and third years of philosophy but it was while I struggled with the *Verbum* articles - in particular with the passage, “dogs know their masters, bones, other dogs, and not merely the appearances of these things” (p. 20 of the University of Toronto edition) - that the shock occurred and I looked out the window at the farm yard in a fresh strange way, inwardly.

⁶This is a difficult problem of interpretation, especially when one considers the moving viewpoint of *Insight*. Perhaps I can place the puzzle nicely for you by quoting a central text of the protopossession which is only introduced below: the Tower protopossession is indeed the topic of the 117 *Cantowers*. But heart-hold the following sentence, and think of the years swept up in the four words, ‘so it comes about’. “So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extension and experiencing duration gives place to the subject oriented to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies”. *Insight*, 514[537]. Does this text of 49 years ago bear witness to the 49 year-old’s solitary drive towards protopossession? *Cantower XII* will focus on a discomfoting component of the drive away from visualized extensions and experienced durations.

the previous *Cantower* and through the equivalent fourth chapter of *Lack in the Beingstalk* then you can imagine and envisage, fantasize forward to, the circulation and sloping upward involved in lifting the hodic enterprise up to new towering levels where displacements and transformations are more precisely specified.⁷ Instead of Lonergan's few conversions there are to be species and genera of displacements, within each of which there can be genetic and dialectic order.

Certainly the last paragraph is a type of foundational conversation: I am writing in direct voice and in definite fantasy of future performance, I am hinting at some of my meta-doctrines of foundations. But it is not our present topic. That topic is your personal climb up to and through the Position described on the top of that so-memorable page 388 of the old *Insight*, laid out in three clear points.⁸ Above I mentioned an interest in whether and how Lonergan or Aristotle or Plotinus struggled 'through and beyond' to what I call a Position or even to what I call a Protopossession.⁹ Again, not a present topic, but relevant to our conversation, since this interest haunts me these days in regard to all the Giants who stepped away from the already-out-there-now-real, and it will colour my present pointing. But this may not haunt you, at least not yet! I recall a conversation I had some years ago with a respected Lonergan scholar, one in which I slipped into hints that will be developed in section 3 regarding positional conversation, eye to eye talk that involves a mutual self-mediating struggle against "objectivity spontaneously becoming a matter of meeting people and dealing with things that are 'really out there'".¹⁰ My very honest companion remarked to me with a grin: "Phil, I've no idea what you are talking about!"

Now, you may be in the same state when we get to my hints about The Position: well, that's

⁷I regularly prefer to use 'displacement' instead of 'conversions' and 'transformation' instead of 'differentiation'.

⁸*Insight*, 388[413].

⁹The topic **Protopossession** is complex and difficult. I introduce it in section 3, but it has a fuller meaning relating to the search - oriental and occidental - for enlightenment that will be faced more fully later, after *Cantower XXI*.

¹⁰*Insight*, 385[411].

O.K. You may even be in some such state with regard to The Position. No problem: come, enjoy the ride. Or perhaps just the weird description of the ride: for it is not everyone's climb in life.

I am hoping, of course, that there are some few who have the strange bent that makes it possible, vital, necessary, to push the "self-study of the organism" towards larger luminosity. And I think it best to address what I have to say to them: to you, then. If YOU, my present reader, are not of the bent - and there is no reason why YOU should - then You can consider yourself as listening in, like Tucker in *Cantower I* listening to Nadia Boulanger.

It is time to halt these introductory reflections and get down to business, the business of a lifetime if you aspire to foundational control.

In section two we will ramble round the problem of The Position described in *Insight* and I will struggle to lift it, for you and me, into a better biographic perspective. The third section, as I mentioned, will deal with The Position in a way that will reveal it as central to this whole enterprise, if this is your Way, your Calledness. The fourth section will carry that reflection forward to the odd third word in the title, Protopossession, something that parallels Enlightenment in the East, that sublates various traditions of contemplation in the West. The fifth section, Possession Procession, envisages on-going self-mediations and cycles of positional searchings. The second last section, Pro-Positions was originally intended as a return to the incomplete statement of the Position in *Insight* so as to take up the challenge of axiomatics proposed in *Phenomenology and Logic*. But I postponed¹¹ that task in favour of carrying forward the work of *Cantower VIII*, section 5, in what I hope is an enlightening and complementing fashion.¹² The final section will hover over the problem of the goal and the problem one might associate with that odd statement of Lonergan, "God is not an object"¹³, but it points to the larger

¹¹Some progress will be made in section 2 of *Cantower XVII*, and the topic will be formally treated in *Cantower XXXVIII*.

¹²A fuller discussion will occur in section 1 of *Cantower XVIII*.

¹³*Method in Theology*, 342.

issue of reaching for a heuristic of “destiny”.¹⁴

So, you have here my favourite number - seven - of sections, calling to mind the stages of a human life, calling to mind also the noble search for the Tower of *Cantower IV*, the loving search for the bower of *Cantower V*. The whole gentle description of a particularly strange life - for that is what it is - at least makes biography a topic, indeed conversion to a certain type of life-style a topic. It is easier to read in that its invitation to an Arctic Grail¹⁵ may not be yours. But you may, on the other hand, in this ninth *Cantower*, find a discomfiting calling, embrace of the universe, that makes you ask, like that daft Irishman Stephen McKenna asked on his 36th birthday, in sensing the challenge to translate Plotinus’ *Enneads*, “Is this worth a life?”

1.2. Position

I very deliberately used the phrase ‘ramble round the position’ about this section because it seems to me that a ramble, indeed an autobiographical ramble, is a good place to start. Recall Lonergan’s answer to me, in 1961. In note 5 above I recalled for you my bump into “startling strangeness”. A bump, not a transition. Very much the business described at the beginning of chapter fourteen of *Insight*. I could then - after seven years of mathematical and philosophical studies - resonate somehow with the problem of Plato’s cave, and with Descartes’ and Kant’s problems. I would have been, I supposed, in a position to write an essay much like chapter five of *Wealth of Self*, though that came a decade later. What I could not have written was the small hint about the notion of thing that I gave at the end of the third chapter of that book, the hint contained in the story about Jonah. Certainly, I had some grip on the ising (is?is!is.) activity, and developed a way of gesturing that conveyed the difference between ‘is.’ and ‘out-there-iness’: a vertical hand-yes as opposed to an outreach-pointing, and I associated the vertical with the ising and nodding that belongs to religious conviction as expressed in a Creed. But the notion of thing, the key point of chapter 8 of *Insight*,

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 292.

¹⁵“The Arctic Grail” is the title and topic of chapter three of *The Redress of Poise*, available on the Website.

baffled me. This may well have been an eccentric personal block, not part of your struggle, but I mention it for what it is worth, as an encouragement. The struggle with chapter 8 of *Insight* was something that I undertook during a year in France 1964-65, and the break-through was in fact associated with my ponderings about Jonah inside the whale. Somehow my imagination took off on all the surroundings he could see - he must have had a lamp or a flaming torch (poor whale!) to view all the smelly surface of the 'cave'. Then there is the dawning, nudged perhaps by a shudder of the 'cave', that led him to 'pull together' all the 'things' and properties. Etc: this may help you, or you may recall your own personal illustrations.

But it surely should encourage those that are slow like myself. After eight years of reading *Insight* very seriously and very continuously I got, to some degree, the point of chapter 8. And I suppose I could claim that I was, to some degree, in The Position. To what degree? This is a matter of personal self-judgment on one's own advancing standards. I think of a conversation I had with Lonergan one evening in Dublin in the summer of 1971, when I asked him when he became clear on the meaning of 'is'. His reply: "when I got that far in *Insight*".

But I should pause here and express some doubts about the pedagogy of The Position as I have experienced it, through reading, lectures given and heard, conversation etc, in the past forty years. Bluntly, I do not find people either talking about it or writing about it as if it were a massively difficult business: which, I claim emphatically and foundationally, it is. What do you think? My suspicion is that Lonergan would agree with me. I am not going to collect texts and do a shabby run through the first four specialties. I simply point to the 1957 lectures of Lonergan for remarks that resonate with my Position about the Position - a doctrine about foundations. Central to both the sets of lectures in *Phenomenology and Logic* is the problem of truth and objectivity. It is an unsolved problem of all modern philosophy and all modern science. Surely it is not the sort of problem the solution to which can have become the possession of a community of enthusiasts who have read Lonergan? And it seems that the Lonergan of those lectures agrees with me. "The problem in philosophy is to start off from the average naive realist and bring him on to something that involves a fuller grasp of all the issues and a more profound understanding of what his real basis is. The problem is not having people repeat with

Augustine that ‘the real is not a body, it is what you know when you know something is true’. The problem is to get people to *mean* as much as Augustine meant when Augustine spoke about truth. And that is a transformation of the subject. It is bringing the subject up to the level of thought of a Plato and an Aristotle and an Augustine and an Aquinas. And that is a terrific development of the subject.”¹⁶

Undoubtedly people will disagree with me on this, especially as I add something like the famous Maslow statistic “less than 1% grow” in regard to position, poosition, etc. Perhaps I might make the disturbing suggestion that less than 10% of Lonergan followers have seriously been shocked to an intellectual awakening by “startling strangeness” and that fewer still push forward from that to a coherent stand on The Position? If nothing else, my proposal “will make conversion a topic and thereby promote it”, so adding the random nudge of dialogue to dialectic. Or will it? But that is not the point in our conversation. The point, perhaps, is to encourage you. You may have had lectures on Lonergan that never pushed you on this strangeness issue. And here I introduce my back-up reading for this *Cantower*: V.S.Ramachandran’s *Phantoms of the Brain*.¹⁷ “Like most people, you probably take vision for granted. You wake up in the morning, open your eyes and, *voila*, it’s all out there in front of you. Seeing seems so effortless, so automatic, that we simply fail to recognize that vision is an incredibly complex - and still deeply mysterious - process.”¹⁸ As I woke up this morning, reaching out of the dreams of morning into the topic of The Poosition, there flickered from my memory a story told by the great late Anthony Quinn. It was about his sea-voyage to Europe where he was to make the first version of the film, *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*. He had been working on the character, his walk, his poise. He had to get up during the night to take a leak and found himself actually walking in character, with strange rolling gait. “I knew I was ready”. When *you* wake up like *that* in The Poosition

¹⁶*Phenomenology and Logic*, 132.

¹⁷V.S.Ramachandran and Sandra Blakelee, *Phantoms of the Brain. Probing the Mysteries of the Human Mind*, William Morrow and Company, New York, 1998. To be referred to below as *Phantoms*.

¹⁸*Phantoms*, 65.

then you have arrived. Go, then, find someone to talk with! But we are getting ahead of ourselves. We have slid into the topic of The Poision.

And perhaps it is as well so to slide. The last thing I wish to do here is to give any impression of communicating the relevant moods and insights. The first thing I wish to do is to make this shocking change in oneself a topic, a topic certainly for yourself: but it is massively useful not to be alone in this struggle. The two zones in my own writing that you might find useful are chapter 5 of *Wealth of Self* and the more sophisticated invitation - it, like this section, slides towards positional analysis - of chapter five of *A Brief History of Tongue*. Certainly, I could make a third attempt, or gather pointers from Lonergan's work, or turn back to Plato and Kant, or reach out to Oriental searchings. But I am interested in local living, in a democracy of minding. Minimally, I am interested in making a topic of my meta-doctrinal claim: **This changing of your mind is not easy.**

1.3 The Poision

I have been concerned about this reality, even though I had no name for it then, since I read Proust's *Remembrance of Times Past* in the early 1970s. The issue was *memory*, and the focus was on that word as it occurred in Lonergan's statement, bracketed in the old *Insight*, "and one has not made it yet if one has no clear memory of its startling strangeness".¹⁹ Michel's search, spanning decades, was for the early taste of tea and little cake; his final stature pivoted on the memory of it. Was there not a parallel with the first taste of self, relatively early - for me, at the age 27? It was not a matter of "clear memory" in the sense that the event could be forgotten. It was "clear memory" in another sense, ill-defined. Some of my reflections on the topic found their way into chapter four of *The Shaping of the Foundations*, originally a paper for a Boston Workshop in the mid-1970s, where I began to sense the need for fantasy and for the more fully molecularized philosophy that was touched on in *Cantower IV*. Twenty five years later, Proustwise, that search and that sense is a memory that has gone clear through some neuro-boundaries. What was at issue, as I already knew at that stage, was a membering, a boning in and up and round. So, I was led to write some years later of "The Bridge of

¹⁹*Insight*, xxviii[25].

Bones”, one of seven bridges that were the topic of “A Bridge too Far: Feature of Generalized Empirical Method.”²⁰ And what is the point of repeating myself? I recall having lunch with Lonergan after Matt Lamb invited me to write for this *Festschrift*. I mentioned to Lonergan that Matt had asked me to write on mathematics, but I had done that more than a decade before. Lonergan’s remark was that I should pass the article on again. So I leave you with that reflection on too-far bridges, handily located on the present website. But I must note, for your encouragement and enlightenment, that the article has new meaning for me these days. “The Bridge of Size” takes on now far more significance as a “natural bridge over which we may advance from our examination of science to an examination of common sense.”²¹ This new meaning is one of the reasons for the direction of the next twelve *Cantowers*.²² And I must pose the question, Can I give you some notion of this shift? I recall the concluding Bacchus-page of *Lack in the Beingstalk* and note that I could not even give myself of last year such a notion. Proust’s elder taste was quite beyond the tongue of his younger self.

I suppose I could start this section again by noting that it is all about a certain way of going down that first page of chapter 14 of *Insight*.²³ The reading obviously depends on what you bring to the page. As I noted in the previous section, it was years before I brought to it a serious self-taste of myself as organism, kin to the invisible and blind tree of chapter eight.²⁴ It is only in recent years, in my sixties, that I read now, but with you someway along for the ride, the challenge as a self-studying

²⁰Published in the *Festschrift* for Lonergan’s 75th birthday, *Creativity and Method*, edited by M.Lamb, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 1983.

²¹The first paragraph of chapter 5 of *Insight*. The problem of Space and Time will be tackled afresh in *Cantower XII*.

²²That direction was modified after I wrote this, but I leave the reminder. The aim, expressed in *Cantower IV*, of locating serious reflections on a new physics in next year’s *Cantowers* would, I suspect, have lost me much of my readership. But the reflection will be twined forward and blossom in 2009 as we venture towards the heuristics of eschatology.

²³*Insight*, 385[410-11]. The reader with the Latest edition has to finish out the paragraph with eight lines from the next page!

²⁴*Insight*, 250[275].

organism in the mood of that other key page.²⁵ You may well, even as a beginner, read the top of the first page of chapter 14 of *Insight* - what real metaphysics is all about, finding you way - with more agony than I or Lonergan did, but you arrive at the end in a way that is common to all of us. That way is a way that places a question mark at the end. Can one remain in this so-called intellectual pattern, like Anthony Quinn in spontaneous poise? Have you ever met a person not 'really out there', and this in a vibrant mysterious luminosity? Indeed, has there been a meeting of "Jack and Jill", both bright-eyed in this lightness of being, eyeing aside these obvious living bodies? "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"²⁶

But you must find your own way to the mark, the dark, of the question, the molecular quest. Some I have known have been shocked into it by drugs. For others it tends "to make its force felt in the tranquillity of darkness, in the solitude of loneliness, in the shattering upheavals of personal and social disaster."²⁷ And there are ways of contemplation, Zen ways, aboriginal ways. Here I simply offer another help-line, continuous with the molecular and dark tower searchings of *Cantower IV*. Might you profit from the oddities of phantom limbs as presented by someone of the Hindu tradition?

"In the first half of the next century, science will confront its greatest challenge in trying to answer a question that has been steeped in mysticism and metaphysics for millennia: What is the nature of the self? As someone who was born in India and raised in the Hindu tradition, I was taught that the concept of the self - the 'I' within me that is aloof from the universe and engages in lofty inspection of the world around me - is an illusion, a veil called *maya*. The search for enlightenment, I was told, consists in lifting this veil and realizing that you are really 'one with the cosmos'. Ironically, after extensive training in Western medicine and more than fifteen years of research on neurological patients

²⁵*Insight*, 464[489].

²⁶Phantoms, 39. This is a quotation from Shankara (788-820), *Viveka Chudamani*, (Vedic Scriptures).

²⁷*Insight*, 625[648].

and visual illusions, I have come to realize that there is much truth to this view.’²⁸

So, I invite you to brood regularly, but Proustwise, incensed, over the startling suggestion of The Position foisted or forced on you by chapters, 8, 12, 14, whatever of *Insight*. Perhaps my two chapter fives - in *Wealth of Self* and in *A Brief History of Tongue* - might help, have helped, to find the thumb or nipple sucked, the tingle of orange or orgasm? The brooding must be an eye-stressing - both because of binocularity and because of estimative sensibility - pulling-in and negating-of the solidity of Jack or Jill’s face and body as well as your own, creations of your neuro-dynamics that haunt you with the vigour of a phantom limb. Ramachandran’s work may help you here, and doubly so: there is the issue of phantom limbs, but there is also the issue, outcome, of reaching for the invisible, reaching for the beginnings of an explanation, indeed an explanation of the explanation, of ‘describing’.²⁹ Have you a friend crazy enough to share with you this exercise of in-membering of eyes-not-seeing-eyes-out-there? Thus you two may reach a bridge to a protopossession.

It seems foolish to go beyond these few pointers towards reading the book and yourself in an essay. The effort required is decade-long: memorizing, in-boning, a one-act play where you are the stage and the play. The quotation above, about the task of this century, leads into a final chapter that will force you, within The Position, to grapple with the ‘position of’ the integral qualia of sensibility: especially since Ramachandra is deeply but eruditely confused, counter-positional. You will get a sense of the challenge he would present were he to write his book of page 250 *Method in Theology* so that you could read it self-critically!

But you need the whole book, especially if your methodological education did not expose you to the neuro-dynamics of phantasm or of the *vis cogitativa*, (which I call here estimative sensibility). Then you can ask yourself (or a friend), in regular revisits to the crime of the seen, What am looking at

²⁸Phantoms, 227.

²⁹This is a central and massively complex topic, but it can be made solidly personal by a self-questioning about just what one knows when one describes - richly, poetically, whatever. I add the discomfiting suggestion here that the standard conviction even of purportedly serious thinkers is that an understanding of the lower conjugates and their aggregated acts *really* adds little to the *essence grasped in description*. We will confront it seriously in *Cantower XXIV*.

when I look at diagrams of my brain?³⁰ The diagrams - of course, or off course? - are simply further neuro-dynamic products, organic crutches in our clumbering wormwise quest towards an in-being universe. It is a universe that is no more 'in' than 'out', but one-sided no-sided, a Moebius strip with no side, a trans-Klein Being-bottle.³¹ You must find your own metaphoric crutches that conflict with conative sensibility. Indeed, you may find metaphors in his chapter-titles as you read, with a tentative molecularised generalized empiricity, about the large and strange variety of phantoms. Rather than "Chasing the Phantom"³² we are chasing the phantasm. It does not offer "The Unbearable Likeness of Being"³³ but a total unlikeness, for likeness-seeking is like looking "Through the Looking Glass"³⁴, with Plato or Kant as guide. Have I been a help? This is a matter of you in your there-then here-now, having heard directions for a journey. I have been a help if I have given you a life-line, pointed to a road not travelled by many but somehow welcome. You may welcome but find that it is not for you to travel it: that is all right. But if you deny the road's existence, you are some form of naive realist, even if you profess The Position.

So it seems appropriate to end my guiding words where Ramachandran begins his book, quoting John Archibald Wheeler: "In any field, find the strangest thing and then explore it". The field for me is the field of Lonergan's *Phenomenology and Logic*,³⁵ and the strangest thing is the topic of the last note of this *Cantower*: the sensibility and the sensability of the nervy Galilean God. If you find

³⁰See *Phantoms*, 9, 16, 26, 32, 71, 74, 163, 174. You have, no doubt, seen such diagrams before. The problem is, to take a new shocked look.

³¹You can quite easily make a Moebius strip by taking a length of paper that is not too broad, giving it a single twist and gluing it. A fly can walk all over it without taking flight. The Klein bottle is a three dimensional version of this. I have found it a useful counter-image for false objectivities and subjectivities.

³²*Phantoms*, title of chapter 3.

³³*Phantoms*, title of chapter 8.

³⁴*Phantoms*, title of chapter 6.

³⁵See the index, under *Field*.

exploring the position and the position beyond you, know that it was not explored by the organic Word. But it is the burden of some hodic minority to so explore, making up what was lacking in His pilgrim way. For the majority, Wheeler's quotation can take on another meaning, for Jesus is the strangest thing.

1.4 Protossession

I began this *Cantower* with talk of foundational conversation and two lines of talk emerged, all centered on that first page of chapter 14 of *Insight*, on "The Method of Metaphysics". We have wandered round that centre, picking up especially on The Position as it is named a few pages later, but our attention has been moving back to the conversational problem with which that first page concludes. We are talking about Positional conversation which concretely is not pro-positional but what I risk calling phobe-positional. One may recognize there the Greek root for fear; less familiar are the Latvian and the Hindu words for flight: further back is the hypothetical Indo-European base *bhegw-*. This last sentence is not just idle erudition: it is rather an expression of curiosity about primitive human sounds of flight, a reality in animals of the *vis aestimativa*, the estimative sense that was a topic in *Cantower IIX*. We use words like *hydrophobe*: perhaps I should be thinking of a word like *poisephobe*, for that certainly would suit the condition that was the final topic in section 9.3. It is a condition that seems to run neuro-dynamically deep.

If you have been following me through the previous section you will be nodding your head here, a positional gesture, even as phobe-positionally you look our there at the print. This is a magnificent illustration of self-attention, so to speak, staring you in the brain. It is, for you, "a matter of meeting " me "and dealing with things [page, print,...] that are 'really out there'". What is this deep difficulty I write of, that I have experienced now for some decades, that you may have only encountered recently? It has to do, I think, with our estimative sensibility. The twist to the position that I write of is a twist that, perhaps, is sensed as harmful? Perhaps an illustration from my introductory classes would help. There we would at some stage get into the topic of "The Inside-Out of Radical Existentialism"³⁶ and I would

³⁶The fifth chapter of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*.

warn the students not to try thinking it out as they drove home!³⁷ These beginners, of course, had little clue of what I was talking about, but the pointing was mainly to some form of authentic nescience. But consider me teaching, driving the class or driving the point home: I found it enormously difficult to maintain the poise, even briefly.

Now the question I am raising in this section is the possibility of this difficulty being reduce by community - and indeed, I am raising here the broader question of community. You would benefit here from connecting this section to another context: “The conjunction of both the constitutive and communicative functions of meaning yield the three key notions of community, existence and history.”³⁸ One may be sufficiently constituted in The Position to control private reflective meaning, but what of Jack and Jill talking about The Position?³⁹

Here, certainly, I may be reaching into a zone of a possible future tradition of authenticity. I reach in proleptic systematic but also in existential stress: is the stress revealing of present in-authenticity? “History and, ultimately divine providence pass judgment on tradition”.⁴⁰ But it seems to me that the existential stress faces a presently emerging need and a glorious future possibility for the human organism. The ‘reality’ question is being heightened by advances in the lower and middle sciences and technologies. It invites the community of culture not only to struggle with “the truth”⁴¹ but also to handle that struggle as it resonates in popular ethos and mood. Might not the struggle, especially as it is whirled up efficiently into the Can-Tower See-well, breed an organic humanism that sublates the Indian suspicion regarding *maya*? And might not that breeding flow in the veins of elementary education, so that Plato’s Cave would cave in to support a dark vertical Metaxy?

³⁷I would suggest, though, that you might puzzle about it when using some of the virtual reality technology: you will uncover some curious puzzles.

³⁸*Method in Theology*, 79.

³⁹*Collection*, 1988, “Cognitional Structure”, 216-7.

⁴⁰*Method in Theology*, 80.

⁴¹The key positional problem of both logic and phenomenology brought out by Lonergan’s lectures in *Phenomenology and Logic*.

But even if such fantasy is of a distant glory, it is not distant fantasy but present dire need that cries out for Positional and Kataphatic community in all the advanced cultures. My own Christian tradition has failed astonishingly in this regard: it relates to a divinity that is Understanding, yet seems mainly to be content with an anaphatic contemplative way. I envisage, THEN, not just the possibility, but the crucial, crossing, need for that turn in Christian religious culture. But the call to **Tomega**⁴² is global, and internal to it is the positional call. The Japanese physicist, the aboriginal poet, the Hindu guru, cannot long avoid the echos of that call in milieu and molecules. And, furthermore, that netted global call to understanding, clouded certainly at present by illusions about information, will mesh with seeds of cooperation and even convergence of religions.⁴³

The communities I envisage would institutionalize, in the best sense, the reach for a Proto-possession within the tradition of **Tomega**. To what extent they would sublimate, or merely live beside, anaphatic communities of East and West, is another matter. Certainly, there are components in various anaphatic traditions in Christianity that cry out for sublation if not replacement: but that is an issue for future dialectic and foundational searching.

1.5 Possession Procession

There are processions, in the ordinary sense of that word, of the possessions that we have surveyed in the previous three sections. There are sequences of the possessions in individuals; there are

⁴²The **Tomega** principle was introduced in *Cantower IV*. It simply draws attention to the genuine drive for a coherent life that lurks in the statement: "Theoretic understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view" (*Insight*, 417[442]).

⁴³Recall the work of Friedrich Heiler, "The History of Religions as a Preparation for the Cooperation of Religions", *The History of Religions*, edited by M. Eliade and J. Kitagawa, Chicago University Press, 1959, 142-153; also Whitson's book, *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*. In note 9 I drew attention to the difficulty of the topic Protopossession. In this section I am obviously only touching on one small aspect of the dynamics of that movement. There are genetic sequences of subtle protopossession and enlightenment to be specified in the coming centuries. But the core of protopossession would seem sufficiently hinted at here: an interpersonal luminosity that can lift landscape and seascape to God's Cape. Such a poise is intimated by the final poem here, of Kavanagh. See note 29 above on difficulties associated with remaining at the poetic level.

sequences in human groups; there are to be, as can be surmised from the previous two *Cantowers*, broadly-determined orderings of the possessions that are related to stages of meaning and the two historical times of subjectivity. What is important in this short section on such sequencing is to draw attention firstly to randomness and complexity of contexts and achievements, secondly to the possibilities and probabilities of the mutual mediation of fantasy and optimism that relates to a global genetic stabilization of richer contexts and achievements.

Above I noted a few conditioning contexts of the displacements that move a person to some position-level or some position-level. The book *Insight* is haunted by the relevance of one context: “the prior development of science,”⁴⁴ and it is best to read the word *man* in Lonergan’s “man can contemplate his own nature in precise and difficult concepts” as this woman or that man who has actually done the developing, grown in serious understanding, even if **Tomega** is a principle alien to them. The self that reads *Insight* may reach the position, but it is not reached in that haunting way without the prior development: it is reached randomly, perhaps by the abuse of drugs, or by Socratic abuse. One shifts from the randomness and its related statistics⁴⁵ to some Bell-curve culture in so far as there occurs a massive transformation in education from global *haute vulgarization*, catalogue-memorization and technological indoctrination to patterns of consciousness-differentiation with a central focus on **Tomega** orientation. I have already written on one elementary doctrine of such a shift: “when teaching children geometry, one is teaching children children”.⁴⁶ Thus one moves culture to more optimistic sets of probabilities of reading such a book as *Insight* in a seriously fruitful fashion: “One has not only to read *Insight* but also to discover oneself in oneself”⁴⁷ but now, or rather THEN, the self to be discovered is not just the twentieth century victim of a sophisticated education in literacy and

⁴⁴*Insight*, 17.1.2, “The Genesis of Adequate Self-Knowledge”, paragraph 1.

⁴⁵I think here of the Poisson distribution that, if I recall rightly, was originally associated with the random deaths by mule-kicks in the German army.

⁴⁶The second half of *Cantower VI*.

⁴⁷*Method in Theology*, 260.

technique, but a self that has grown up in a seriously theoretic style.

There is the deeper difficulty relating to toxic neuro-dynamics - primarily Western, but increasingly global. Candace Pert notes “that the establishment mocks the concept of detoxification,”⁴⁸ but she is talking to the general establishment about chemical levels of toxicity. What I have in mind is the philosophical and theological establishment and its comfort with deeper layers of toxic disorientation: the warps of sensibility’s capacities-for-performance that were all too skimpily touched on in section 5 of *Cantower IIX*. Lonergan Studies adverts to the area when it turns to various forms of psychic and aesthetic and vital conversions, but the axial problem goes much deeper, into the molecular rhythms of what Voegelin would call a global paranoia. I am talking about an immense moral evil that we gloss along in, gloss over: a cultured cranial and neural disorder that underpins the dress and stress, the talk and walk, the aggressions and non-leisure, the face and pace of our academic and non-academic “slum”⁴⁹, estimatively blunted to the fact that “the social situation deteriorates cumulative” at a new sick rate in our new millennium. Surely this might give, in focused contemplation, an ever-fresh and pain-filled tolerant impatient sense to Lonergan’s claims regarding “unlivable life”⁵⁰, regarding an un-meetable need “to speak effectively”.⁵¹ So, there must emerge an integral systematics that is a language of the heart.⁵² But grounding it there must emerge, from the sufferings of a dialectic community, foundations persons who draw together, incarnately, the randomness and the complexity of discerned progressive orientations of the strange units of patterned molecules that live not in a habitat but in the universe.

⁴⁸*Molecules of Emotion*, 283.

⁴⁹*Method in Theology*, 101.

⁵⁰*Topics in Education*, 232.

⁵¹*Method in Theology*, 101.

⁵²“Systematics: A Language of the Heart” is the title and topic of the fifth chapter of *The Redress of Poise*, available on the Website.

So I am once again turning to, turning round, turning towards, turning in, the fantasy land that is foundational doctrine, and there is no point in repeating or trying to enlarge on the more prosaic doctrinal presentation of section 3 of *Cantower VII*. Outsiders and evolutionary sports point us towards ranges of aesthetic differentiations, the extraordinary ordinariness of soil-folk encourage us to suck seed, and local leisured colour stands quietly beyond the busy ecumenic pale. Such intimations of a compact integral richness axially lost and found must find their way into a towering whirl: they and their toxic Wasteland must become heart-held topics of a negentropic molecular minority, so that a discerning up-spiralling and up-sloping would spin the liberation and integration of the **Tomega** principle around soiled humanity into the lift of a new established gentleness of schooling. Is there distantly possible some new estimative mesh of gentleness and aggression, perhaps to be a feminist achievement, that would give Friedrich Schiller's apparently naive hopes for beauty and play a decent schedule of probabilities? It seems worthwhile quoting, for misreading in our context, from the concluding letter *On The Aesthetic Education of Man*:

“For this loftier prize he can contend through form alone, not through matter. He must cease to approach feeling as force, and to confront the intellect as phenomenon: in order to please liberty he must concede it. And just as Beauty resolves the conflicts of natures in its simplest and purest example, in the eternal opposition of the sexes, so does she resolve it - or at least aims at resolving it - in the intricate totality of society, and reconciles everything gentle and violent in the moral world after the pattern of the free union which she there contrives between masculine strength and feminine gentleness. Weakness now becomes sacred, and unbridled strength disgraceful; the injustice of Nature is rectified by the generosity of the chivalric code. The man whom no force may confound is disarmed by the tender blush of modesty, and tears stifle a revenge which no blood can slake. Even hatred pays heed to the gentle voice of honour, the victim's sword spares the disarmed foe, and a hospitable hearth smokes for the fugitive on the dreaded shore where of old only murder awaited him.”⁵³

⁵³ Friedrich Schiller, *On The Aesthetic Education of Man*, Translated by Reginald Snell, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1965, 137

I have been writing here of distant probabilities⁵⁴ of what we can call real processions: of daily goings-on, of “meeting persons and dealing with things that are ‘really out there’”⁵⁵ But there are the real processions that are the hidden haunting of this section: the processions within our minds of these processions and possessions. The foundations person must cease confronting intellect as a phenomenon and instead caress it as a numenon; to please liberty in the hodic round he and she must not just concede it but circuminness it. For this loftier prize he or she must contend through form alone, through a cultivation of the form of inference⁵⁶ that is committed to gentle - but too regularly aggressed by speculative gnostic and practical magician - “detachment and the living of foundations.”⁵⁷ There may never be realized, on our pilgrim way, a proto-possessive community, gently reaching each other and all else in the darkness of being. But such a community is thinkable and lovable as so thought: that seems a worthwhile component for Aristotle’s finest way. And the thinking and loving, processionally luminous, can reach out darkly but exigently⁵⁸ to a reaching of all in the brightness of being, a reaching that would be a Procession Possession.

⁵⁴I so writing and struggling I give myself, and perhaps you, fresh meaning for the essay “Distant Probabilities of Persons Presently Going Home Together in Transcendental Process”. The essay was the preface to McShane (ed), *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, University Press of America, 1984.

⁵⁵*Insight*, 485[411].

⁵⁶I am recalling here that powerful, neglected, invitation to self-discovery in Lonergan, *Collection*: “The Form of Inference”.

⁵⁷This emerged as a topic in chapter 6 of McShane, *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*, available on the Website.

⁵⁸See the index of *Phenomenology and Logic*, under *Exigence*. See also *Verbum*, 149, 219. The fuller context is Lonergan’s unpublished Latin writing, *De Ente Supernaturale*. Useful too would be a full metaphysics of capacity-for-performance as nature. “We may ask whether the neglect of natural potency has not some bearing on unsatisfactory conceptions of obediential potency” (*Verbum*, 149).

1.6.1 Pro-Positions

Have I ended the previous section on an unacceptably leap to a strange high note? But fantasy must reach out, “through form alone, not through matter”, or at least through present patterns of matter. And even if we do not reach out through the form that is a procession of the form and finality of emergent probability, emergent probability and matter’s finality groan beyond axial fragmentation, beyond descriptive stagnation, beyond *Realpolitik*. Beyond the primitive melody maker are the patterns of Mozart’s 26 piano concertos, but they were not beyond emergent probability, and we organisms can now bathe in them and other products of the Ms of Western music like Mendelson and Mahler. And do not East and West and other fresh patterns of beats and notes edge forward in Messien?

But this section 9.6 is a section of scheming; there is a world cup to be won, how might we point up the plays? I take a peculiar turn here, as I end this series of nine *Cantowers* and turn, in twelve *Cantowers*, towards the lowly and simple realities that give us spacetime geometry’s basic events.⁵⁹ I turn to some reflection on *Lonergan’s Hermeneutics* in the context of the contributions of Ben Meyer and Charles Hefling to that volume.⁶⁰

My initial notion of this section was to push forward the question of axiomatics and positional heuristics: a sort of follow up on section 7.3. The first item on the agenda was a completion of the feeble axiomatics of The Position as it was presented in terms of three pro-positions regarding The Basic Position. But what I obviously think of as, for the moment,⁶¹ a more valuable set of pro-positions emerged from my reflection on Ben Meyer’s peculiar way of presenting his view: “in theses form for the sake of succinctness,”⁶² in numbered pro-positions that present 95 theses. Further, there is Hefling’s equivalent strategy, though he restricted himself to a modest 8 theses

⁵⁹See note 22 above.

⁶⁰*Lonergan’s Hermeneutics. Its Development and Application*, edited by Sean E. McEvenue and Ben F. Meyer, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C., 1989.

⁶¹See above, note 11.

⁶²*Lonergan’s Hermeneutics*, 81.

But let me begin by quoting Meyer's introductory sentence, changing one word: replacing the word 'text' by 'cosmos'.

"The purpose of the following theses is to outline a full rationale for the following hermeneutical proposition: the cosmos has a primary claim on the reader, namely, to be construed in accord with its intended sense."

So: I can identify this as my aim. It does not force theism on you, even with the phrase "intended sense". That phrase can be fitted into some weak form of the strong anthropic principle.⁶³ For me, and perhaps for many of you Christian readers, the strongest anthropic principle⁶⁴ is the defining principle of the cosmos: so we speak of a cosmic and Incarnate Word. But more about this in the final section.

Before brushing past my theses it is necessary to indicate my secondary intention in this section: I wish to introduce the problematic of the Hermeneutics of Lonergan, where the 'of' is to be read both ways. There are many reasons for this introduction. First of all, the focus in these first nine *Cantowers* was on molecules rather than meaning. The next dozen *Cantowers* were meant to be on mesons rather than molecules, and will still twine round them in hermeneutic fashion. I might say that these twenty one *Cantowers* are directed mainly at beginners, perhaps echoing something of the sentiment of the initial Academy: Don't enter in here without geometry. But the overall drive is towards a new hermeneutics, and I may steal a sentence from Gadamar: "Here I see the challenge to authentic integration: to join together science and man's knowledge of himself in order to achieve a new self-understanding of humanity".⁶⁵ The issue, indeed, is integration, and Lawrence's brief Introduction illustrates this need,

⁶³I dealt with the various anthropic principles in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, pp. 104-5, and repeated the sketch in *Cantower IV* at notes 50ff. Here I am thinking of some form of cognitive isomorphism.

⁶⁴The fourth form of the principle discussed in the references of the previous note. It holds for a divine incarnation.

⁶⁵Hans-Georg Gadamar, "On the Natural Inclination of Human Beings towards Philosophy", *Reason in the Age of Science*, translated with an Introduction by Frederick G. Lawrence, 10th printing, 1998, 149. I will stick with this little volume as a point of reference. Lawrence's Introduction is for beginners and gives the mood of Gadamar's debates; Gadamer's essays give another perspective on

merely by showing the inefficiency of conversations in a more convincing fashion that my own regular appeal to Lonergan's view of the unity of a science through efficiency. Lawrence surveys Gadamer's conversations with the living and the dead. How efficient have they been? The contemporary men of his conversations - and they are mostly men: Heidegger, Habermas, Strauss - seem relatively settled in their differences. There remained "the usual opposition between the hermeneutics of suspicion.... and the hermeneutics of recovery",⁶⁶ and a large variety of more subtle oppositions.

I skim here past the massive complexity of the German tradition about which Lawrence is uniquely competent to talk, and risk using a remark of Heffling to sum up the oscillations of hermeneutic debate: "all of this has been said before and probably will be said again".⁶⁷ Certainly, there are new refinements, but there is a massive persistent un-clarity. I am not crying out for clarity: indeed what clarity I seek is a focusing of darkness. I write of beginning, but the finding of that beginning is a finding of humility in the need for and character of a global effort. We will remain always as pilgrims at the beginning, and "all beginnings lie in the darkness".⁶⁸

Lawrence is recounting Habermas' view when he hits on a phrase happy for the necessary undertaking: "a properly scientific moment is a condition of the possibility for enlightened, emancipatory critique". That scientific moment, I would claim, is identified in the second half of page 250 of *Method in Theology*. Lawrence continues to give Gadamer's standpoint: "One might say that Gadamer finds Habermas lacking in practical wisdom, phronesis, the habit of deliberating well."⁶⁹ But the moment that I point to, that Lonergan suggests, is not some bubbling of axioms, but a humdrum improvement on present communal habits of deliberation and discernment. This, then, has nothing to do with Habermas'

the nature and problematic of science. Not that the title of the essay just quoted echos the **Tomega** principle introduced in *Cantower IV*.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, Lawrence, Introduction, xix-xx.

⁶⁷*Lonergan's Hermeneutics*, 294.

⁶⁸Gadamer, 140.

⁶⁹Lawrence, xxv.

optimism “about the effectiveness of a practical philosophical discourse based upon an explicitly and formally specified ideal speech situation and in anticipation of the realization of the universal communicative community”.⁷⁰ It has everything to do with trying an accurately described and problem-suggested division of labour that might be somewhat more effective than the semi-private conversations of possible giants.⁷¹

But enough skimming. The hermeneutics of Lonergan is the centrepiece of the *Cantower* enterprise, embracing the 72 *Cantowers* of the years 2003-2008. Might it be a communal effort? Hefling notes, of Lonergan’s suggestion: “the way to find out if his method is valid is not to read about it but to use it”.⁷² Hefling’s theses give precision to that task. Perhaps it is time I followed his and Meyer’s example by getting to my pro-positions.

1.6.2 Towards the Identification of Pro-positions and Iam-positions

First I must comment on my title and its hyphens. Pro-position has the obvious meaning of **proposition** where the proposition is either an answer to a what-question or an answer to a what-to-do question. You will notice that my primary meaning is on the latter mode. Next, there is the hyphen, separating off the word *pro*, which has its regular meaning of **professional**. My pro-positions then are propositions that I, edging towards the oratio recta at the end of page 250 of *Method in Theology*, would take a stand on as positions taken by professional elders, Sargawits, whatever⁷³, with regard to reading the cosmos. Moreover, I think it important to entertain the notion of professional, and avail of whatever analogies suit you in successful professions to give bite to the question, Are present giants of philosophy really professional? Which brings me to my second word, Iam-positional. Allow me a little humour here, vital when we are dealing with an infinitely mysterious cosmos, mysterious in the beat of

⁷⁰Lawrence,, xxvii-xxviii.

⁷¹This will be dealt with in some detail in *Cantower XXV*: “Redoubt *Method* 250”.

⁷²*Lonergan’s Hermeneutics*, 222.

⁷³I usually reserve the name *Sargawit* for foundations persons, but it can be used here because the focus of our attention is the transition to direct speech at the bottom of page 250 of *Method*.

every butterfly's wing. The prefix *Iam* has various meanings. Perhaps the one to note first is what is opposite to professional: amateur. Think of the position of the gifted amateur in literary criticism. My position will be, is, that there is no **per se** place for the gifted amateur in the future functional specialties dialectic and foundations. So, we touch on another shade of meaning of *iam*: it is an imposition on the enterprise that clutters up professionalism. Another meaning you may have wittily noted is "I am", which may bring to mind God's direct speech in the Old Testament. The rest of us are a very humble "we": we are neither God nor the lone ranger. I have regularly recalled the humility of Joseph Schumpeter and his claim that we constantly struggle with past suggestions.⁷⁴ Functional specialization, a global division of regularly humdrum labour, is the best we can do. That, of course, is another of my pro-positions. Indeed, I note that it is number 1 in my list, quite different from Lonergan's Eiger demands of pages 286-7 of *Method in Theology*.

Before I venture further regarding my list I would note two things, one an elementary suggestion, the other - for me - going very deeply into positional or personal analysis.

The first suggestion is that you do something parallel to what I am doing and have been doing throughout these *Cantowers*: have a shot at listing your integral position. You may only be a first year university student but it is nonetheless a worthwhile venture. You may, on the other hand be a middle-aged professor and find that this is a sobering experience if you are trying for a knower's list as opposed to a believer's list: then, for example, you may start stumbling even before you get to page 287 of Lonergan's list. This little exercise is not only personally enlightening with regard to your possible weak foundations, but it also gives a glimpse of the exposure, the nakedness, the strip-poking, involved in taking seriously the program of the conclusion of page 250 of *Method in Theology*.

My second suggestion has to do with that program as what I can consider, to recall Lawrence's remark above, "a properly scientific moment". Notice that the moment is a moment of "exposure of commitment", which normally is considered as remote from science: but it is, in fact, the heart of

⁷⁴Joseph Schumpeter, *History of Economic Analysis*, Oxford University Press, 1954, 4. This, of course, gives another twist on *iam*, past views to be sublated. And, when one considers the axial period as modern, fashionable, one can entertain Lazarian notions like *iam fetit*.

scientific advance, scientific risk.⁷⁵ Note, too, that it is a commitment with regard to the future: a fantasy, perhaps, falsifiable by the future, but with a falsification that the commitment implicitly holds to be a withdrawal from terminal value. Further, the commitment is personal but not solitary: it reaches out for a communal virtuosity of elders. Finally, I come to my main point: the properly scientific moment is the **per se** locus of the switch not only from *oratio obliqua* to *oratio recta*, but also of the switch from the pure notion of being as dominant to the dominance of a derived notion of value. Obviously, this raises complex and debated issues: they are worth bringing into focus positionally here.

First, it should be noted that a restored metaphysics of faculty psychology - in the lines of an enlargement of chapter 16 of *Insight* - lurks here. What is *notio entis*, the notion of being of chapter 12 of *Insight*? It is identifiable with a capacity-for-performance in a finite material being that is intelligent, a capacity that reaches for the intentional⁷⁶ presence of **all, being, ompa, the cosmos, the field.**⁷⁷

The reach may be named transcendent in an obvious sense of going beyond the single being, with 'going beyond' indeterminate. Most important it is to be noted that "we place transcendence, not in going beyond a known knower, but in heading for being within which there are positive differences and among such differences, the difference between object and subject."⁷⁸ The heading for being is a

⁷⁵There is an important thesis here on the role of orientation in seeking verification to be pursued through the history of scientific practice. Quantum theory is rich in illustrations, but one might think of the gallant commitment of Andrew Wiles to his lengthy proof of Fermat's Last Theorem. He had pretty well arrived.

⁷⁶A key axiom of the position within a developed metaphysics will be an axiom of identity of being and consummated knowing that will be contextualized by other theorems of intentionality.

⁷⁷I first drew attention to the problem of Lonergan using the name 'being' for the objective of the knowing-bent in "The Contemporary Thomism of Bernard Lonergan", *Philosophical Studies*, Ireland, 1962, and suggested there replacing the name by 'ompa'. In *Lack in the Beingstalk* there is a preference for Lonergan's use of 'the field' (See the index under 'Field' in *Phenomenology and Logic*).

⁷⁸*Insight*, 377[401-2].

heading for all the realities called *will*⁷⁹: the subject's will is not privileged but it eventually becomes data for the discovery of what is meant by the named *will*.⁸⁰ In that investigation there gradually emerges some explanatory grasp of the interplay of intellect, will, nerves, molecules etc that moves "from a first step of descriptive differentiation of parts", in the [self-]"study of the organism" to an account of "the flexible circle of ranges of schemes of recurrence"⁸¹ in which the capacity-for-performance that is intellect can suffer its actuation. Within that explanatory context "the good as the possible object of rational choice"⁸² takes on explanatory meaning": one can arrive at an explanatory heuristic of *value*.

It is not a venture for this penultimate section. Here I am simply drawing attention to a task that needs to be tackled within a fresh contemplative stance. Previously I emphasized a freshness that would come by importing an attitude such as Dogen's (1200-1253: Thomas' Japanese contemporary) ; now I emphasize the need for the mediation of a full metaphysics in the difficult reading of the transpose of a passage I keep referring to in *Insight*: replace "study of the organism begins...." by "self-study of the organism begins...." Reading that page thus is a major challenge to contemporary Lonergan studies: through a luminous self-identifying elaboration of the missing metaphysics of *Insight* chapters 15-17 it would lead to a sublation of Aquinas on will and leave behind lightweight discussion of values and feelings. The latter discussion is very definitely a *Iamposition*. And with that identification of a particular challenge and its related *Iam-position* it seems best to break off and into my listing of pro-positions.

1.6.3 Listing Pro-positions

"Into" is the telling word here. Think of this as my "random-style" effort to get to the end of

⁷⁹One of the most comic sentences in *Insight* is the first sentence of the section on the notion of will, "Will, then, is intellectual or spiritual appetite" (*Insight*, 18.1.2) The sentence needs another little book like *Insight*! For some additional light see *Cantower XVIII*.

⁸⁰An elementary context is *Summa Theologica*, Ia q.87.a.4.

⁸¹*Insight*, 465[490].

⁸²*Insight*, 601[624].

pages 250 of *Method in Theology*. Meyer and Hefling are now considered as part of the group of ten, and perhaps Gadamar and Bertalanffy as well as Pert and Ramachandran. You too may join in, **into**: more on that in section B below. We may suppose that I have already submitted my volume: so, we are all in the process of reading the ten volumes and getting further **into** our mediated existential response. It could be helpful for you to think of my first volume as ending with a chapter that expresses what is compressed in the diagram of page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue*, which I reproduced in *Cantower V*. Since I deal with Meyer and Hefling in section A, this gives a certain realism and balance to the exercise. The diagram of page 124, as I mentioned already, was produced on that occasion before I ‘got to’ Meyer’s and Hefling’s work: it supplemented what I had already written as a response to Robert Doran’s contribution. So, you have a realistic scenario for section A.

Section B can be kept in that context, although it is quite loose in its brief ramblings. It winds down to you, in perhaps a “scientific moment”, the invitation of these nine *Cantowers*, to involve yourself somehow in this salvific call of the cosmic word and perhaps will help you to your own version of a “Here I stand”. Unlike Luther, you are not facing a council: you are lacing into your organic self’s deeper orientations in the expectant cosmos.

A.

As I noted, all this is very random, not at all like meeting the strict requirements of Lonergan regarding dialectic. That will occupy us from February 2003: but there is value in you having a shot at it now, or doing the ‘here I stand’ thing with regard to any of the suggestions here. So, with regarding to Ben Meyer’s expression of position I make just two suggestions, one regarding language, the other regarding the push for the differentiated consciousness that goes with hodic process.

Attention, dialectic and foundational self-attention, to language has led me to what I would call the second word of metaphysics - the first word is the “H -word” reflected on in *Cantower V*. The H-word is included in that second word, but that second word is enormously more complex in its reference and content. I see no point in repeating here the complex symbolism of *A Brief History of Tongue: From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, or the commentary that goes with it.⁸³ It results from

⁸³Axial Press, Halifax, 1998, 122-5. More on this word in *Cantower XVII*, section 2.

extremely complex organic self-analysis, first in the elementary discovery of the grounding insight of language⁸⁴, secondly in the development of a relatively adequate heuristics of the relation of expression - in its entire ontology - to meaning. That heuristic would, for example, be a guide to the investigation of the organic, molecular and wave-physics dynamic underlying patterns of poetry, something quite remote from present literary studies.⁸⁵ That heuristic is part of my foundational fantasy which I do not expect to leap into popularity in the next few weeks or decades. But the elementary discovery is another matter. My suspicion is that, while I would include positional statements regarding that discovery in the final chapter of the dialectic book, others would not. There is no sign in Meyer's theses on language of such an axiom. Without facing the grim but elementary climb to the complex of insights into the complex of insights that ground linguistic meaning one obviously is not up to luminously generating a full heuristics of beings of meaning.

This last paragraph, and its references, would have been in my initial final chapter of the first round on page 250 of *Method*. What would my colleagues', or your, response, be to this positional claim? That it is quite unrealistic? The advances of linguistic sciences will eventually ground doctrinal embarrassment. So perhaps no further comment is wisest at present. We are back with one of my favourite quotations from *Method*: "doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company"(299).

My other comment on Meyer's theses brings us right down to thesis 95 or proposition 4.5.9 on page 100. "The radical and thoroughgoing solution to the theological problems besetting biblical interpreters lies in the practice of three functional specialties : dialectic, foundations, and doctrines".

My disagreement on thesis 95 can be expressed as a numbers disagreement. First, there are eight specialties involved, as well as the zone of non-theological meaning; but this is a minor

⁸⁴A *Brief History of Tongue*, 30-37 is a way in to the relevant exercises, equivalent to reading seriously the few lines on page 70 in *Method in Theology* on Helen Keller's discovery.

⁸⁵Meyer, in his Introduction to the work in question, notes that "the new critics had argued that the poem was an organic whole, all its parts and aspects functional to its form".(p.14) This is *per se* true. Would it not be wise then to have heuristic advertence to the ontological dynamics of the form-in-act?

disagreement. Secondly, the thesis should have been number 1. This latter claim is not slight. It is an apparent disagreement with Lonergan's presentation of general categories in *Method in Theology* (286-8), one that dominates my new pragmatism and these *Cantowers*. Putting this thesis as number 1 means that the other theses become re-cycling matter, driving them back strategically through the "scientific moment" mentioned above and illustrated in section 5 of *Cantower VIII*.

I would make a similar comment with regard to Hefling's theses. His seventh thesis parallels Meyer's last, but lifts it into a fuller context: "There is no direct route from exegesis to systematic or doctrinal theology" (p.274). Hefling and I would not be in disagreement in taking a stand on these theses. The difference is in the pragmatism of efficient methodological unity. Thesis seven is number 1, not in an axiomatics, but in a teaching of us by history. The division of labour is history's invitation. This gives marvellously new sense to Lonergan's words: "the method of metaphysics is primarily pedagogical ... it proceeds by cajoling or forcing attention".⁸⁶ From geometry to geopolitics, from mountaineering to musicology, history is nudging us in this direction: should we not listen to the salvific word?

B.

B. Be. Bee. Be the Queen be!⁸⁷

No offence to the young gentlemen, for whom this challenge holds, but here I pick up on the invitation associated with Candace Pert in *Cantower IV*. There are surely some few young women - heavens, if you have read this far you must be crazy enough - crazy enough to take me seriously regarding the foundational enterprise, to envisage the Portrait of an Heartist as a Young Woman? The previous *Cantower* took as symbol the boy-slopes in "An Encounter"; here the symbol is a lady-hill, Eveline Hill.

⁸⁶*Insight*, 398[423].

⁸⁷Add the context of the problem of the queen of sciences from *Phenomenology and Logic*, 126-30.

“She was about to explore another life.... She knew the air...
She stood among the swaying crowd....He was speaking to her,
saying something about the passage over and over again”⁸⁸

There is a desperate need for people as mad as Nadia Boulanger to emerge as elders in the gentle control of future meaning. I have been describing - and trying to live - the long road and now, at seventy, I can echo Cezanne in his sixties “I am making a little progress”, and like Burl Ives in his seventies, I am still practising scales. The search is for an in-veined harmony of remote meaning, an integral organic heuristic character embracing the cosmos in humbling explanatory skin-flake. You will know that you have made a little progress when the first and second words of metaphysics give you poise rather than pause, a poise that breaths words differently. So, how now do you breath such words as *phantasm* and *plasticity*?⁸⁹ Would you like to breath and breed them properly into the hodic galactic spiral, within the black tower, the lovers’ bower? If you do not, then take your stand honestly in common sense: there is great good to be done and in that sense a little Lonergan is not a dangerous thing. Tell yourself in the mirror the meaning of your so-called philosophic words, beginning with **p** and the two words above, then trying *potentia activa* and *performance-capacity*. Perhaps these last two words have some metaphysical equivalence, to be revealed as you struggle down that strange page, “study of the organism....”, self-study of the strangest of possible creatures? It is a century now since Kate Chopin’s *The Awakening* and you may find a different sea than her heroine or Miss Hill. “This queen will live! / Nature awakes.”⁹⁰ The living, doubtless, will come through darkness. “Suffering soars

⁸⁸Eveline, p.2.

⁸⁹ *Phantasm* was a topic in section 3.5.2 of *Cantower III*; on *plasticity* - a key word of *Method in Theology*, p. 48 - see note 23 of *Cantower IV*. Both are neuro-dynamic realities. The Iam-position here is that you really have the gist of things, especially human things, when you have rich description, especially if it feelingful. And now, what do you mean by *feelingful*?

⁹⁰Shakespeare, *Pericles*, III.ii.98. The context of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, section 2.5 is relevant.

on summer air/ The millstone has become a star'⁹¹, "...changing them all beyond recognition. They are all sea-changed. Marina was sea-born. Thaisa was cast up by the sea, and the sea has so battered Pericles that he is like a man cleansed, purged, salted, until his ears are clean enough to hear the divine harmony"⁹², "the music of the spheres."⁹³

"A bell clanged in her heart. She felt him seize her hand:

'Come!'

All the seas of the world tumbled about her

heart"⁹⁴

"Look lively, Miss Hill"⁹⁵

1.7 Procession Possession

This final section of the cycle of nine *Cantowers* (or more precisely, 6 + 3) brings us back, or forward, to envisaging the ultimate beginning that laces the first paragraph of *Cantower I* with the last paragraph of *Cantower II*. There is to be anticipated, with growing dark luminosity, the everlastingly-surprising meshing of organisms capable⁹⁶ of radical self-luminosity into processional UltiMates. This is the home of the kataphatic contemplative that we considered so briefly in section 9.4, but it seemed best to keep this answering of Eric Voegelin's question to the end of this first *Cantower* cycle. "Where

⁹¹Lines from Patrick Kavanagh's "Prelude", quoted in the relevant work by Brendan Kennelly, *Journey into Joy*, edited by Ake Persson, Bloodaxe Books, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1995, 209.

⁹²I am quoting from Patrick Kavanagh, "Pericles: A Personal View", considered more fully in section 2.5 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

⁹³*Pericles*, V.ii.231.

⁹⁴"Eveline, p.4. And for the Christian that strange call to *theoria* is not an anonymous cosmic call but a persons-spirating, "a hidden manna... a white stone on which a new name is written, which no one knows except the one who receives it"(Revelations, 2:17)

⁹⁵Eveline, p.2.

⁹⁶See note 55 above.

does the beginning begin?”. The question is like an earth-worm’s reach for the meaning of a sunflower seed as the sunflower vanishes into the light and the worm tunnels its way blindly round and about the fading seed under ground. But we earthwormers can reach for a positional sensAtivity that is the proposition of Aquinas in his 27th question of the first part of his *Summa* and it is the pro-position of Lonergan in the missing 27th place of chapter nineteen of *Insight*.

Or might one say that a new beginning begins, for the Christian community with the Johannine group’s “In the beginning the Word”? So, we home round and into and in, **Tomega** wise, the heart of the special categories of Christianity. Then, through the slow inner sloping of the full **Tomega** project, one is called Eveline lifelinelong to a startling sublation of that **Tomega** principle. One is called to glimpse that The Word, theoretical understanding in its utteredly mysterious ultimatey, embraces the universe in a single view, and to relish pilgrim-fully how, through the ultimatey of an incarnation “the universe can bring forth its own unity in the concentrated form of a single intelligent view”.⁹⁷

It is difficult to halt here as planned, at the edge of the heart of our heartiness, our loneliness. It would have been another way to go in the next year of *Cantowers*: pointing towards the “upper ground of loneliness” in the pilgrim Jesus and in us, instead of moving, as we will be, to spend a necessary year struggling with hermeneutics and “the lower ground of loneliness”.⁹⁸ But the pointing to the upper ground of loneliness has been done eloquently by Thomas Aquinas and Lonergan, inviting a luminosity about our Three Intimates to be gained by seeking to soak up lightsomely our word of The Word and our spired hailing in and of the Spired Hailing, *spirea*.⁹⁹

⁹⁷*Insight*, 520[542].

⁹⁸Talk of these grounds of loneliness emerged in the Epilogue to *The Shaping of the Foundations*.

⁹⁹The final reference is to the genus *Spiraea* of small pink or white roses, *meadowsweet*. It is a way of intimating compactly the transposition of *the field*, a name for the distant all introduced by Lonergan in Volume 18 of his *Complete Works: Phenomenology and Logic*. See the index-preface (conclusion) and the index under *Field*. Our *Exigence* (again, see the index) emerges as the reach for the field that is Trinitarian meadowsweet. The sentence above ending with that word is a loose translation of the conclusion of Q. XXXII of Lonergan, *De Deo Trino*, Pars Systematica, Gregorian University, 1964, 256. How does one translate *Spiratio*?

This is to be, I would claim, the heart of Christian contemplation in the third stage of meaning, and that whether the contemplative drive is anaphatic or kataphatic. I simply cannot see how a lover can choose to cultivate the presence of the Beloveds somewhat like an infant, not asking Who Are Ye? John's Gospel and Augustine set the pace: "I and the Father are One and We will send Another"; "... because if we use our understanding, we see one there that is speaking, and the word he utters, that is the Father and the Son, and proceeding (from them) the charity that is common to the two, namely, the Holy Spirit".¹⁰⁰

I would hope that the forthcoming translations (starting with English) of Lonergan's *De Deo Trino* will constitute a new invitation, though the *Verbum* articles' invitation have been round relatively unheard for over fifty years. My own efforts may help.¹⁰¹ And Fr.F.E.Crowe has provided various directives over the years. I would note that what I have suggested here, and in *Cantower II* (regarding the Son) relates to a sublation of the sixth chapter of his book, *Theology of the Christian Word*, which deals with "The Primary Word".¹⁰² For instance, it lifts de Caussade's perspective into the context of the **Tomega** principle and it places the processions in us, remarkably, within the reality of revelation.¹⁰³ But these are difficult topics, plain zones of a future spiralling of hodic theology about "Grace: The Final Frontier".¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰St.Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XV, vi, 10.

¹⁰¹Elementary pointers are in *Music That is Soundless. A Fine Way for the Lonely Bud A*, Axial Press, 2002. Chapter five of *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minds* is a more advanced treatment. "The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God" (*Theological Studies*, 1962) is a more formal presentation. The latter two are now available on the Website.

¹⁰²Paulist Press, New York, 1978.

¹⁰³It is enlightening to place this claim in the context of the first four of Hefling's theses, *Lonergan's Hermeneutics*, 265-69.

¹⁰⁴"Grace: The Final Frontier" is the final chapter of *The Redress of Poise*. A key page in Crowe's book is 115, which links de Caussade's view to the Protestant sense of "word of God for me". I make no attempt here to enlarge on the sublations I have in mind, relating to "history understood with an absolutely comprehensive sweep that embraces the universe"(Crowe, 107). It requires a thematic treatment of my previous suggestions regarding "embrace", regarding the strongest anthropic

The One*(Patrick Kavanagh)*

Green, blue, yellow and red -
God is down in the swamps and marshes
Sensational as April and almost as incredible
The flowering of our catharsis.
A humble scene in a backyard place
Where no one important ever looked
The raving flowers looked up in the face
Of the One and the Endless, the Mind that has baulked
The profoundest of mortals. A primrose, a violet,
A violent wild iris - but mostly anonymous performers
Yet an important moment as the Muse at her toilet
Prepared to inform the local farmers
That beautiful, beautiful, beautiful God
Was breathing His love by a cut-away bog.