

## **Sleeping in the Queen’s Bed**

{See the similarly bracketed remarks at the beginning of the previous essay. It is surely evident that I am quite open about the challenge to all the Lonergan community: it is not just a matter of silence over my central achievement of locating the heart both of future theology and of a geohistorical philosophy of philosophies of history: it is a matter of asking bluntly, How can you followers of Lonergan continue to dodge the most brilliant piece of his work, after 1969, on functional collaboration?}

I write yet again about our project of awaking the students of Lonergan from their dogmatic slumber.

Is that not a blunt implicit claim that they are sleeping on the edge of history’s invitation to bring forth religious reflection as Queen?<sup>1</sup>

How do I leave it thus simple yet have it enter our effort to effect an awakening?

That is the problem of our July Conference and its new focus: the focus is on a single unscientific dodging—it is not even a rejection—of a central advance in the project Lonergan cherished. That central move is my advance to a solution to his problem of finding the place in theology for a theology of the Integral Body of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> By Jove—Father, Son and Spirit—I’ve

---

<sup>1</sup> *Phenomenology and Logic*, 126-7, 130.

<sup>2</sup> A series of exchanges around this “*Æcornomics 11* in the making” nudged me towards the following piece of e-mailing which I attach here as a nudged towards focused patience. “These exchanges help me to realize how remote the developed position is. To me, alas, it is quite obvious that what has to be recycled (see Lonergan’s 1934 “Essay in Fundamental Sociology”) is the best up-to ‘level of the times’ genetic geohistorical philosophy of philosophies of history. What any suggested advance has to ‘confront’ is that best. This is true of T.V. Cooking shows, House, Project Runway, whatever. Cycling it functionally is a further advantage, especially since the forward functionality is discomfotingly futuristic. [This is going to be the Helsinki etc.—the full climate change war—challenge]. But back to our little experiment. There has to be some tense pretense, e.g., that you read, have read, *Insight* sufficiently wakefully to notice the problem on pages 763–4. Ho ho isn’t it fun to find that you did not REALLY read the four words “It may be asked” (*Insight*, 763, line 29)? It is one helluva leap to locate the “what,” the question and then the answer haunting the fifth word, “what”. Now the experiment requires a focus on those five words and on my answer as presented in decent detail in *The Road to Religious Reality* (Axial Press, 2012): the “shock value: the actual heuristic bringing together of the two topics ‘Comparison’ and ‘The Mystical Body’”(13). Follow through there, ho ho with Molly Sweeney or Harry Haller, (18–24; 28; 33–34; 37–38); “what is to emerge is a Towering control of the spacetime of meaning in its full aggreformic dynamic” (48); 49–50; so one finds “the iconic symphonic Jesus lurking lightsomely in authentic self-imaging” (55). “Clearly” (a great silly word of Lonergan), there needs to be some positioning of oneself UP TO this bump forward, and then—added or included—the push, but only as you have glimpsed it, as it has grasped, Clapsed, you. [Think of a first read of Wiles 100 pages on Fermat]. The second objectification adds the stretch to glimpse the promise {Jer 31:31–34}. A crazy business: your reading stretchfully of my statement above from page 48 of *The Road to Religious Reality*. This is a pretty unimaginable global theology reaching into the future, including the Eschaton. It is very far out stuff. It presupposes some glimpse of what I wrote in the mid-1960s in chapter 11 of *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence* { Markov, Fisher, etc }, but now oh la la natural selection (*RSE*, 232) takes on the shocking new meaning of the positive whatty-convergence of world religions (*Divyadaan*, 30/1, 2019). Nature selects: the selection is to be the sow-what achievement of the divine “evolutionary achievement of sowing what among

got it, sez I: and no one pauses from among the usual well-disguised trivial pursuers, “every fellow mousing round for his liver and his lights.”<sup>3</sup>

My footnote there indicates not the problem of the Conference but my problem in doing a first and second objectification à la *Lonergeran’s 1833 Overture*. I asked my colleagues to face that task, and have fluctuated around doing the same. Should I not back off, since my claim is the *Assembly*?

I took time out to read my way through the two series *Sofdawares* and *Quodlibets*. Heavens, there you have my positioning—a first objectification—mixed in with more than hints of the second objectification. It is a positioning that is of a younger me, in my early seventies. Take *Quodlibet 6*, “Comparison and the Integral Canons of Inquiry.” Might you detect its seeding of my present view, or are you so silly as to think I have not moved on to some shocking fulsomeness? I risk haughtily asking you to think of Einstein precisely a century ago at my two dates. Is Special Relativity an anticipation of the massive tensor complexity of the General Theory of a dozen years later?<sup>4</sup>

I might as well add three helpful pointers.

I do think that *Quodlibet 6* is worth your attention. Indeed, I would ask it to be kept in the full context of the two sets of essays on *Method* (1972) page 250. So, *Sofdaware 1*, “From Cantowers to Collaboration” is a must-read read detecting the narrative of my positioning. But let me stick with my suggestions [1] about joking [2] about contemplation and [3] about our central topic, *Comparison*.

[1] The word “joke” occurs twice in *Quodlibet 6*: page 7 line 8 and page 8 line 7. What did I mean there and then? The lead in on page 6 mentions Patrick Kavanagh’s view, “tragedy is undeveloped comedy” and refers to Lonergan’s brilliant couple of pages on satire and humor. Was my meaning of *joke* still in that ballpark as I wrote *Acornomics 6* “I Started a Joke”?<sup>5</sup>

[2] At note 30 I am talking about cataphatic contemplation, and point to *Cantower 21*, “Epilodge” as, yes, the beginnings of my struggle to identify its meaning and significance in

---

the cosmic molecules. The sown what infests the clustered molecular patterns behind and above your eyes, between your ears, lifting areas – named by humans like Brocca and Wernicke – towards patterned noise-making that in English is marked by “so what?” (Beginning of Chapter One, “Sow What,” of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*). This is the quite new self-imaging symbolized by  $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)\theta\Phi\mathbf{T}\}$ <sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> I am quoting a relevant Epilogue, that of *A Brief History of Tongue*. It is a remark of Ezra Pound talking of Joyce bringing off Flaubert’s shot, in *Bouvard et Pecuchet*, at figuring the twentieth century’s busy mental democracy. The note could be extended through years of writing, perhaps conveniently ending with the suitable title, “*Insight and the Trivialization of History*” (*Divyadaan*, 28/1, 2017). I would, however, note the ambiguity of the word *trivialization*. Apart from the usual meaning, there is the other odd meaning: a Tri-vial pursuit, a Trinitarian project that is to blossom into the *Eschaton*. (See, there, pp. 125–28.)

<sup>4</sup> The parallel is not haughty but modest. We are thinking of an advance, not in physics, but in the adult grown dynamic of a heuristics of finitude, where normatively one becomes a stranger to oneself of the previous month. The growth norm, of course, is a variable; muse over a spectrum—the growth,  $y$ , a function of age,  $x$ —between  $y = x^2$  and  $y = e^x$ .

<sup>5</sup> I might push your fantasy boggle-much by suggesting a musing about history that asks: Does the Divine start a strange Axial Joke with a Cherished Man?

human history. But are we in the same ballpark as the recent struggle to define heuristically *The Interior Lighthouse*?<sup>6</sup>

[3] Finally, there is my shot at getting the reader to puzzle over the meaning of *Comparison*: not a bad shot at all. Here you are—I print it, as I did then, in bold face:

**Comparison examines the completed assembly to seek out affinities and oppositions. The heuristic notion of comparison proposed here merges a set of sublations and transpositions. It merges the two sets of canons of inquiry; it sublates Kuhn’s historical analyses of paradigm shifts; it transposes the confusions of European hermeneutics into an empirical tradition yielding progressive explanatory results.**

At that stage I had yet to make the leap to its connection to—or should I not say identification with?—the missing geohistorical sequence of perspectives on history as the Jesus-reality climbing to the Eschaton. But was that leap just an addition to its meaning? So, we are back, or forward, to you reading the pages referred to at the end of note 2, bogged into the fantasy of note 4.

At all events, I have decided to stay out of the first and second objectifications task. Perhaps, indeed, I can sit back and see the moves into and through the third objectification that would show present Lonergan studies as a blind allay of pieties?

---

<sup>6</sup> See note 41 of the first of my articles in *Divyadaan* 30/1, 2019. Perhaps I should copy the note? *HOW* 13, “The Interior Lighthouse” (available at: <http://www.philipmcs Shane.org/how>) introduced the topic, *Interior Lighthouse*, under that title. *Disputing Quests* 12, “The Interior Lighthouse II” continued the reflection, as did *Disputing Quests* 13, “The Interior Lighthouse Zero” (available at: <http://www.philipmcs Shane.org/disputing-quests>). Those essays were followed by *Interpretation* 4, “The Interior Lighthouse III,” *Interpretation* 16, “The Interior Lighthouse IV: Twenty Seventh Lea,” and *Interpretation* 17, “The Interior Lighthouse V: Interpreting God” (available at: <http://www.philipmcs Shane.org/interpretation>). The topic, however, goes back to *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minds* (1989, available at: <http://www.philipmcs Shane.org/website-books>) and the broad challenge is made explicit in the five essays, *Prehumous* 4–8, on “Foundational Prayer” (available at: <http://www.philipmcs Shane.org/prehumous>). It is the heart of the matter in my recent book, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*. The drive of that series was towards an appreciation of the need for a contemplative ingestion of *Insight* if we are to arrive at a sub-population competent “Tower-wise” “to be a resolute and effective intervention in the historical process” (*Phenomenology and Logic* 306).