

FuSe 2

Pedagogical Struggling with the Second Canon of Hermeneutics

1 Foreword

This is a three part essay, but the first and last parts are merely short contextualizations of the central part, the title for which part bubbled out only when I had completed the text of that part and found, well, that finding is the topic of this first part. The third short part, **Afterword**, is simply a continuation of my contextualization, but it looks to the larger context to be talked of in *FuSe Zero*, talked about with an optimism regarding the collaborative possibilities of a fresh beginning to the researching of Lonergan's work.

The title that came to me for this next part as I concluding it was one that I first posed almost forty years ago, in a concluding page¹ to *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations: Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*, a book now available on this Website.² I promised the book as one that would emerge in the 1980s, and indeed I isolated myself in Oxford for nine months - September 1988 to Summer 1989, to write it. But from the get-go the book changed from the original idea of an advanced heuristic text - beginning, as I recall, with Metawords - to an introductory text. The title changed to being *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*. The words in the subtitle corresponded roughly to the contents of the six chapters, and the bracketing around the fifth chapter - largely a chapter on Christ - intimated that it could be left out by those of other persuasions. Indeed, the book began with an interest in focusing on India, and the flavor of that interest is evident throughout.

The important point for us here and now is the shift from the large ambition to

¹I add the page at the end of this Foreword.

²The book was written in 1973. It is an introductory text that I used during my twenty years of teaching introductory philosophy in Mt.St.Vincent University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

the modest effort. What became evident to me then, as I struggled with the project, was that the study of Lonergan needed a fresh start, not the sketching of a comprehensive heuristic. *Insight* was already a comprehensive heuristic. Here and now, no doubt with a degree of forgetful naivety, I slip, slipped, towards repeating the same foolish ambitiousness. What is that foolishness? What is the pedagogy of that foolishness? What is the pedagogy of the climb to the Everestview of the second canon of hermeneutics? Well, let's see how it goes for us in section two, and we can then muse further in the final section, and more fully in *FuSe Zero*, about where we are, in this conversation, and in history.

POSTLUDE: PRELUDE TO PROCESS: A PAIDEIAD¹

In the corner of a Dublin pub
This party opens—blub-a-blub—
Paddy Whiskey, Rum and Gin
Paddy Three sheets in the wind;
Paddy of the Celtic Mist,
Paddy Connemara West,
Chestertonian Paddy Frog
Croaking nightly in the bog.
All the Paddies having fun
Since Yeats handed in his gun.
Every man completely blind
To the truth about his mind.²

Aeacus: Poetry is to be weighed in the scales.

Xanthias: What? How can tragedy be weighed?

Aeacus: They will bring rulers and compasses to measure the words, and those forms which are used for molding bricks. . . .³

Maybe there is still a moment to interrupt that process of willed deafness which is nearly total already. It lies, of course, with the defenders of objectivity to rescue it from that sterility in which it labours at the moment, in the last agony of a concern for method. . . .⁴

¹The title of a work in process to emerge in the 1980s, with chapter headings: 1. "Procedural Analytiks," 2. "Instrumental Acts of Meaning," 3. "General Heuristik," 4. "Intentional Process," 5. "Eternal Process," 6. "Total Process," Paideiad is related to the meaning of Paideia in both Greek and Hebrew traditions; not unrelated to Kavanagh's "Paddiad" (See following footnote).

²Patrick Kavanagh, "The Paddiad," *Collected Poems*, Martin Brian and O'Keeffe Ltd, London, 1964, 90.

³Aristophanes, *The Frogs*.

⁴Roger Poole, *Towards Deep Subjectivity*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1972, 43.

2. *Process: A Paideiad*

I begin by quoting two paragraphs from *Bridgepoise* 11, in which essay I discussed a single paragraph of the canon of hermeneutics. So now I have two paragraphs instead of one for us to read, reflect on. Is this progress? Should I not now be down to half-a-paragraph?

These odd questions are worth brooding over: another twist on the questions with which I ended section 1. And again I consider that it seems best to save them to the end, as part of a broader reflection on foundational pedagogy and commonsense culture. To the end? You will find that we are back then, or forward, to *FuSe Zero*, ready to go round again through these three first *FuSe* essays.

So, here you are: invited into a re-reading of a piece of *Bridgepoise* 11, a tough piece of reading. Will my commentary help you re-read it further, in a way adequate to ingesting hermeneutics' canon 2? The failure of my commentary will emerge slowly, and enlighteningly, for both of us.

"But let me invite you to muse over the genetic sequence in humans, either as ontic or as phyletic. Can you push towards a control of this musing that holds to an explanatory differentiation? I am thinking of the suggestive first metaword, $f(p_i; c_j; b_k; z_l; u_m; r_n)$. One might begin with the infant, "mewling and puking in the nurse's arms,"³ or with Helen shifting to language, or with the primitive hunter who has a cluster of words. One is, then, dealing with, in, within, an explanation of a performance in bare description, the fringe of a psychozoology of the prowling cat, the leaping cougar, the mastery of the descending hawk. One simply adds a Hellenistic name.

Can you go on to envisage a beginning of explanation on some level? Is it to be on the level of physics or chemistry: the primitive control of time 20,000 years ago by

³Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, II, 6, 144.

sticks and moon-shapes, or the measuring of space by the early Egyptians, or the Chinese genesis of linguistic patterns, or the musings about atoms in Greece? Or is it to be Greek dramas' initial correlations that, although only initial, held sway, as serious ventures in explanation, in Capital letters,⁴ through much of the twentieth century? Whatever way you go, up or down, ontic or phyletic, you need the control of an elaborated first metaword, if you are to hold the sequencing in explanatory control. Furthermore, your heuristic needs the anticipatory fullness of a relatively⁵ terminal state of the genesis. Without that heuristic - and now I thinking of the full theoretic culture - the canon of complete explanation will be conveniently dodged or warped. At a "top" level, one stays with the Capital discussions of an old-style psychology. One is content to talk in philosophy of elements of meaning like questions, judgments, plans, as if they were free-floating forms, or perhaps zooming round a pineal gland. One theologizes about spirit as if we gorillas in the myst were angels in this-skies. Or one can muddle in the middle sciences, going up and down between "well-informed"⁶ chemicals and the anthropomorphic wonders of pet-behaviour. Or one can reduce chemistry to physics and learnedly brutalize progress in the simplest of sciences, physics, with persistent needs to blithely describe."

Where might I begin? Obviously, I am beginning to address you, the present reader, and you may be quite an advanced Lonergan student or just a beginner, or even just an interested party. So, I can begin by making an appeal to all these types of reader. First, I go back to quote a sentence in the first paragraph quoted from *Bridgepoise* 11. May I call these two paragraphs, **PA** and **PB?**: that saves some messing below. So, here

⁴I recall being with Lonergan as he was bedded down the night before an operation in a Boston hospital, when he waxed eloquent and wittily about the way the capital letters of German were carried into English to give solemnity to words like Ego, Id, Shadow.

⁵A full eschatological heuristic is another matter.

⁶Texts in botany and zoology tend to talk in terms borrow from the distortions of information theory, so information is carried along by macromolecules etc.

is the quote from PA:

“I am thinking of the suggestive first metaword, $f(p_i; c_j; b_k; z_1; u_m; r_n)$.”

My appeal now is that you should not be put off by this, by the symbols of the metaword. I recall, for your amusement and your education, my first use of that metaword and the response that I got from Fred Crowe. It was in a lecture, titled “Being and Loneliness” given in Cork University, Ireland, probably in 1970. I sent him the lecture to read. The title intrigued him: it was a title screaming for a book. But his reaction to my symbolism was solidly negative, “am I to learn mathematics to do philosophy?” Does this, perhaps, echo your own reaction? So: we should deal with that problem first.

The problem is to hold in one’s head, in one’s imagination, in one’s molecules, whatever is relevant to the job on hand. This is true in every area of science, art, technology. I have quoted Lonergan’s clear statement on the latter often, and only reference it here.⁷ I think now of my favorite diagram: the text of the second movement of Mozart’s *21st Piano Concerto*, which, when glued together page by page, can be held up before an audience with outstretched arms. Now -THERE’S a diagram! I recall Barenbohm conducting it from the piano: he had, of course, the diagram in his head, in his molecules.

That first word of mine, is so far as you ingest it, is a great help in reading the book *Insight*, for the second or the twenty second time. Imagine - a straining fantasy - if that metaword was nicely diagramed inside the front cover of *Insight*, just as the Periodic Table is in many chemistry text books of grade 12. As with those texts, so you might say, “so this is what this book is about”. The inside-cover line-up in either case is pretty incomprehensible to the beginner, but it does give the beginner an inspiring map to an untraveled country.

⁷See “In the Twenty Fourth place,” *CWL* vol 7, page 151, for his clear lengthy reflection on the need for sufficient isomorphic imaging.

But let us go back to that first word, **f** ($p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; r_n$), not to make it more complex, but to get an elementary run at - or should I say crawl towards? - its meaning in a less threatening symbolism. I am going to leave the diagramming to you. Sketch, then, six small squares on top of each other - like drawers in a tall filing cabinet. You can fill in the boxes from the bottom up: **p** for physics, **c** for chemistry, **b** for botany, **z** for zoology, **u** for 'uman, [or for an **U**nderstanding animal!], **r** for religiosity. Don't fret about the last one, especially if you are an atheist. What of the subscripts? They are a mention of the properties in each zone. So, think of **j** pointing you to the elementary chemical properties. What of the semi-colon? Its introduction has a long history, to which we can return later in the series. Suffice it to say that it hovers over the line between each box, each level. Also I would note that the more complex diagram I mentioned at the top of this paragraph will need and eventually have a better symbolism than just a semi-colon. And we might get to that also as we move along in our collaborative series.⁸

So, we have a simple image: six boxes on top of each other. Yet the simple image is a great start to our re-reading of *Insight*. So, we start with the title page, and re-read Aristotle: for most of us, a matter of reading the translation I add here to the Greek given there:

"The faculty of thinking then thinks the forms in the images."⁹

Now, what do we make of this statement, in the light of our six boxes? Well, first of all you have to think of yourself as represented by the six boxes [or, for the atheist, five]. This is true even if you are a reductionist, and you are convinced that there is nothing there - or **here** - but physical things, even if the epiphenomena above the first box have names. You talk not only of having weight [the aggregate mass of the physics

⁸The need for the collaborative effort is hinted at in *FuSe* 1, and is a central topic in *FuSe Zero*.

⁹I quote the translation of the Barnes Edition, from volume 1 of *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, Princeton University Press, 686.

bits, multiplied by g], but also of smelling of fear [a chemical business], etc all the way up to the thinking that Aristotle talked about. The pile of boxes suit the way we talk about ourselves, and Aristotle - and perhaps you - have little doubt that you are, so to speak, such a pile. The pile is nicely meshed together: that is the lead of the semi-colon that we are not yet following up. Indeed, all I want you to follow up at present is how you can freshen - may indeed already have freshened up - your reading of the word *image*.

"... thinks the forms in the images". For instance, you hear a good joke, and by thinking along its noised narrative, you put it "in form", "form it" and then, by "getting it" move to getting the giggles?

Getting the giggles, you surely admit, is not just in the **u** box.¹⁰ Indeed, it may be rattling through all your boxes, in line with the remark of Lonergan, "when the baby laughs, the whole baby laughs." The laugh is a response to the fresh cherished "forms in the images". But does this not shake up your view of images? You may, indeed, have had no serious view of images, beyond their being there, diagrams or dreams, movies or melodies. But, as we think about them now, is it not reasonably obvious that these images stretch down through our boxes? Photons are in there, and a chemicality that has "Glasgow going round and round"¹¹ after a few drinks.

Did Aristotle think about this? This is not our question here, but note that it is a question of *Insight* chapter 17, and of that key paragraph on which we spent *Bridgepoise* 11. Our question here is, do you think this seriously of yourself? Do you think it inquisitively and pragmatically? And if you do, then you are already on page 755 of *Insight*, so in your fresh reading of *Insight* you are not "arriving on the scene a little

¹⁰Koestler has a nice reflection on the psychodynamics of the joke in the early pages of *The Act of Creation*.

¹¹An old Scots song, a memory from my childhood of Harry Lauder singing it in kilts. For my contemporary readers, the drug scene might better hit the mark.

breathless and a little late.”¹² You are quite at home with the idea that images are chemical, and that some people are interested in that chemistry. But I would like you to be even more “at home in transcendental method”¹³ in that you become solidly pragmatic about your six-box reality that embraces e.g. the words you speak about the imaged things of which you speak. That speaking of imaged things is descriptive in its initial phases. On that initial meaning we lean here, comfortably. But what precisely is description? Well, an initial meaning of it is that it is not everything, no more than knowing Beethoven’s name and appearance is everything about, or of, or in, Beethoven. You think immediately here, perhaps, of Beethoven’s music. But I am thinking, oddly for you, of Beethoven’s chemistry. Not that we can separate his chemistry from his music: and that leads us to a fresh viewing of our own pragmatism. Has chemistry really much to do either with Beethoven or with his music?

What do you **prag**?¹⁴

I point here to a difficult cultural transition, a leap into the third stage of meaning through a reverence for the first stage of meaning, a lift out of mythmaking into the mystery of us gorillas in the myst, a re-tuning of the six-box you and me.¹⁵ At this stage, even from a reading of the short series of *Bridgepoise* essays, there should be a

¹²*Insight*, 755.

¹³*Method in Theology*, 14.

¹⁴I rather fancy this odd new word, though I doubt if it will “take”. Still, it refers to a massive shift in perspective - recall perspectivism in *Method in Theology* - of the dynamics of the feebleness of human thinking. It points to quite a different world from that of, say, “interest in theory”.

¹⁵Mystery and math-making are the topic of the first section of *Method in Theology*, chapter 17. The section was one of two zones of Lonergan’s thinking seriously debated at the Florida Conference of 1970, the other being *Insight*, chapter 19. The philosophic myth-makers around did not realize that the topic was more their own myth-making than the goings-on of primitives.

simmering suspicion that “we are not there yet.”¹⁶ “What is lacking is a knowledge of all that is lacking”¹⁷ and the genesis of that knowledge requires a six-box tuning. Note, then, now - a little startled perhaps - the deliberate exaggeration of the statement made a paragraph ago: “You are quite at home with the idea that images are chemical, and that some people are interested in that chemistry.” Your six-box is far from really providing a home for the idea. But perhaps the simmering suspicion can grow into a pragmatics of you slowly moving to get, bone up on, that idea about idea-ingesting?¹⁸ So that you really begin to **prag** as a seed of this new being, a **character** of the future, **elite** and lonely?¹⁹

And did you miss this invitation in all its bluntness in an earlier reading of *Insight*, disguised as it was as a rule of metaphysical equivalence? The relevant paragraph is worth producing here in full for a re-reading now during this beginagain pause over the Frontispiece from Aristotle.

“It is a rule of extreme importance, for the failure to observe it results in the substitution of a pseudometaphysical mythmaking for scientific inquiry. One takes the descriptive conception of sensible contexts, and without any effort to understanding them one asks for their metaphysical equivalents. One bypasses the scientific theory of color or sound, for after all it is merely a theory and, at least, probable, one insists on the evidence of red, green and blue, of sharp and flat; and one leaps to a set of objective forms without realizing that the meaning of form is what will be known when the

¹⁶*For A New Political Economy*, 20. The statement begins a long and powerful paragraph on our axial problem of serious thinking.

¹⁷*Insight*, 559.

¹⁸The pragmatics of you becoming thus is contextualized by *Bridgepoises* 3 and 10, “Liberal Arts: The Core of Future Science”, Parts One and Two.

¹⁹I have written in various places of character, in the context of *Method in Theology*, chapter 14 section 1. The character of that context is “elite” in the sense described *Ibid*, 350-1.

informed object is understood.”²⁰

“The faculty of thinking then thinks the forms in the images.” But what is this thinking that the faculty of thinking does? That, of course, is the topic, the place, the psychic skin, that is, or should be - so to speak! - on your mind herenow, herenew. That is the topic of “the little book *Insight*,”²¹ so written in a classical style that you can slip along comfortably without meeting the self of the psychic skin. The thinking we are to reach for initially here is more primitive than the thinking of “the primitive hunter who has a cluster of words”.

And might both of us now read freshly the end of **PA**? “One is, then, dealing with, in, within, an explanation of a performance in bare description, the fringe of a psychozoology of the prowling cat, the leaping cougar, the mastery of the descending hawk. One simply adds a Hellenistic name.” But prior to that addition there is the inarticulate primitive or child adding the skin of forms to forms that ground the leap of the cougar or the dive of “The Windhover”.²² That skin of forms is the edging beyond animal that ferments into description: but first there is the needed bridge of the Hellenistic name. Have you traversed that bridge?²³

And now we may face again the question that begins **PB**: “Can you go on to envisage a beginning of explanation on some level?”

²⁰*Insight*, 528.

²¹A phrase used by Lonergan occasionally. How little is that book? : like the little nut of Julian of Norwich in the hand of God, or a little prelude of Chopin, with “all we know somehow with us” (*Insight*, 303)? Is there something there of Samuel Beckett’s last little poem: “go end there / where never till then / till as much as to say / no matter where / no matter when “? (See the beginning of *Cantower* 5, “Metaphysics THEN.”)

²²I refer to Hopkins’ Poem, recalling the pointing of note 15. “The achieve of, the mastery of, the thing” (line 8) has to take on that character, become of the character, in a reduplicative luminous sense.

²³The tackling of the bridge, living through those five strange weeks of Helen Keller, is spelled out in *A Brief History of Tongue*, 31-36.

So I have brought us, you and me, brutally, to the possibility of a poise in our sick culture. “Can you go on?” Four words, begging your question and a blossoming form²⁴ on your psychic skin that can be named **NO**. I bring you now, indeed, to the crisis point of Lonergan’s work and life, expressed in the simple madness of his typing fingering, four words forward towards completing *Method in Theology*, “one can go on.”²⁵ The one that had gone on was alone, making that sad point about the one who could go on. In that paragraph he exposed the trickery of his pedagogy, a desperate lightweight surfing of initial meanings accepted all too quickly in “the substitution of a pseudometaphysical mythmaking for scientific inquiry” that is now, largely, in control of Lonergan studies. Twenty five years previous to that typing he typed, in the eighth paragraph of the Preface to *Insight*, “meaning seems to be a relation of sign to signified.”²⁶ He was “at home” in the world discovered by the primitive, by the infant, by Helen Keller.²⁷ He was at home in a massively discontinuous way, an evolutionary

²⁴This is a cheerfully teasing use of the word *form*. In my teaching of *Insight* I have often led readers to chapter nine, “The Notion of Judgment” as a gentle beginning. Of course serious reading reveals that it is not. Try again, now, the paragraph beginning three lines from the end of page 300. What? is this “borrowed content” of judgment, oyster of the pearl of Is? Is! Is. I recall a conversation with Lonergan in the summer of 1971 - one of a dozen delightful evening chats - when I asked him when he “got” the meaning of “is”. His reply: “When I got that far in *Insight*.” One might add the context of Mark Morelli’s work on Stewart (*At The Threshold of the Half-way House*) and Hegel. See, for example, “Lonergan’s Debt to Hegel and the Appropriation of Critical Realism,” *Meaning and History on Systematic Theology. Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran SJ*, edited by John D. Dadosky, Marquette University Press, 2009. “I think it is fair to say that the last twenty-three-and-one-half years of his twenty-eight year search - from his discovery of insight in the summer of 1930 while reading Stewart until the completion of *Insight* in 1953 - were spent in the half-way house of idealism, engaged in the terrific epistemological struggle required to move beyond it”(ibid., 420).

²⁵*Method in Theology*, 287.

²⁶*Insight*, 4-5.

²⁷He had already written the compact incomprehensible sentence quoted below at note 33. Fifteen years later he would give the gentler pedagogical hint, hoping eventually that the striking illustration would strike each of his followers, with burning hearts, as a matter of “understanding

sport beyond present fantasy. He might well have written, as Eric Voegelin did at the beginning of his last book, “Where does the beginning begin”?²⁸ But he had begun with Archimedes. Might he have begun at the different beginning, the arrival of Annie Sullivan with her five fingered exercise **handed** to Helen?

And should we not begin there, if we are to genuinely climb to a luminous personal meaning of description and the control of the genesis of explanatory skin-bursts of the psyche from pre-descriptive forms?

3. Afterwords

I ended there with a broad blunt question, gripped by the general reader with a luminosity that is only nominal. We could expect no more, you and I herenow.²⁹

What of the informed reader, the reader who has re-read the book *Insight* “inside,” and inside the **Position** in the strange extreme **Poise** that is skin-held yet not already-in-there-now.³⁰ Indeed, the pedagogy that would be realistic would be to the

oneself” (Method in Theology, 161-2). “The moment of language is most strikingly illustrated by the story of Helen Keller’s discovery that the successive touches made on her hand by her teacher conveyed names of objects.” (*Ibid*, 70). And perhaps my successive touches here of your psychic skin will help you to re-name *Method in Theology*?

²⁸Eric Voegelin, *In Search of Order*, Vol. 5 of *Order and History*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1987, 13.

²⁹Expectations: that, indeed, is to be the central topic of FuSe Zero. But perhaps two helpful questions can be entertained by both of us in the meantime. [1] Have I note failed to help you to read either the paragraph that was the focus of Bridgepoise 11, or the two paragraphs with which I started section 2? [2] Is this essay not really a rambling researching regarding - guarding - the meaning of pedagogy, the pedagogy of process as *paideiad*, whether ontic or phyletic, pilgrim or eschatologic? See further note 37 below.

³⁰Helpful here is my *Cantower 9*, “Position, Poosition, Proto-possession.” My struggle for a decent heuristic meaning of Proto-possession continued through the Cantowers, reaching increasingly for an eschatological heuristics (see *Field Nocturne CanTower 16*, which is the second last Cantower; the last Cantower was indeed on the present topic). See note 32 below.

reader who has climbed to a grip on, to being gripped by, *The Sketch* of chapter 17.³¹ So, for that reader the **comeabout** would have become a comfortable home, indeed, by some post-post-modern miracle, it could have become a home shared.³² Then the statement of *Insight* to follow would have become a chemical comment about skinstory and history: “Prior to the explanatory conjugates, defined by their relations to one another, there are the experiential conjugates that involve a triple correlation of classified experiences, classified contexts of experience, and corresponding names.”³³ So, the triple correlating is of three types of chemical aggregate skin-held in the form-flight that is the achievement of naming.³⁴ Further, it is thus held in an elaborated version of the image of the six-box that would put “in one’s intellectual paws,”³⁵ “without tears,”³⁶ a sophisticated meaning for description and its control, a sophisticated integration of the two canons of completeness, and this in the context of a chemical heuristic of wondersearch and history.

That sophisticated grip on the meaning of description is no easy climb. Nominally, of course, it can be described like one describes the climb from base camp

³¹In chapter 9, “Interpretation” of my Website book (2006), *ChrISt in History*, there is an lengthy exercise which throws light on the relation of *The Sketch* to the Canons of Hermeneutics.

³²Hold to the context of note 30. *Cantower* 21, “Epilodge”, which parallels the Epilogue of *Insight*, is a further help. But think simply of Jack and Jill (see *Collection*, 215-17) speaking to each other and genitalizing within a poise of critical realism. Then there is the question of the UltiMate homesharing, a state of “Infinite Surprize”(the concluding words of the Epilogue, “Being and Loneliness”, of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, already mentioned at note 2 above.)

³³*Insight*, 578.

³⁴One should think here, as best as possible, of degrees of classification .e.g. through the cranial location of the particular neurochemicalities of sensibilities and of namings in different languages.

³⁵Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 357.

³⁶Lonergan, *CWL* 7, 151.

up to the peak of Everest.³⁷

The **described** at any level from physics “up” suffers from the frailty of description in so far as the lower levels are not in explanatory control. So, to be human is to be chemical, nor is the understood chemicality just a matter of knowing the chemical elements and compounds. But now I am being tempted to turn compact pedagogue, when what is needed is a spread of words and of story and of cultures and of history.³⁸ What can I do but claim that the six boxes need filling, and the filling is a slow and sloppy genetic achievement of the history of focused interest in human emotions, in the cactus and the cougar, all the way to the simple motions of galaxies and gluons. Might you turn towards envisaging the heuristic diagraming of that enterprise, a set of metawords that would point to the skin-bump of an inner word for our time, and, someday, for the future of humanity? Might you even think of doing that, **Prag** a little through this decade and so help towards the global pragmatics of these next millennia? But it is time now to go back, or forward, to *FuSe Zero*.

³⁷Always there is the pressure, especially in these axial millennia, of fancying that one is near the peak, has a fair essential view. There is a deep issue here of adult growth and the normativity of its acceleration so that you can become increasingly a stranger to yourself of last week. This, certainly, is a topic for later collaborative struggles, and it is, of course, a core problem when it comes to a pedagogy which involves an older climber speaking to one eager to follow. The old zen chestnut is worth brooding over. “Master, when will I reach enlightenment?” “Perhaps in ten years.” “But if I try harder.” “Perhaps, then, in twenty.” See the concluding pages of *Lack in The Beingstalk*. (Axial Publishing, 2007).

³⁸The primary challenge here now, to you, is the challenge of story, your story. *Quodlibet* 8, “The Dialectic of My Town, Ma Vlast” might be both a help and a consolation. The result of the story has to become a *per se* explicitly operative component in the poise of dialecticians, that subgroup of the cycle of collaboration that claim a sufficient degree of elderhood and operate within that refined differentiation of consciousness.