

## FuSe 17 AA 2: A Second Anonymous Positioner

There is a sense of betrayal hanging over me as I take this risk of positioning. It certainly helps me to see why the page McShane attends to so regularly, *Method in Theology* 250, is not popular, indeed is just not mentioned in graduate school. I would not dare do this publically. I am not going to list positions here, talk convincingly about religious, moral and intellectual conversions. I find that when they are spoken of, it is in a sort of vague way. Perhaps that vague way is helped on by the way Lonergan writes, even on that page 250 of *Method in Theology*. I am more or less Catholic and more or less moral: in both cases it depends on who is calling the shots about what is Catholic and what is moral. Do I miss Sunday Mass? Yes. Do I sleep with my significant other?: there is the old joke about, dozing a little! So, those two positions are pretty hazy for me. Am I really an immoral lapsed Catholic?

What is my position on – or is it in? – intellectual conversion? I find that it is not spoken of except as something that all Lonergan disciples are assumed to have. Lonergan does talk about it as difficult but we don't seem to pay attention to the difficulties, whatever they are.

But the position that is pretty obvious to me, and of course this is the value of the seminars, is that collaboration of the type McShane writes about is very badly needed. I am tired of professors talking all over the place in their classes, avoiding the details of the book *Insight*, rambling round modern theology in courses that are supposedly about Lonergan. Or should the courses not really be about us? From the list that McShane gave to help our search for a personal position, and from recent meetings and lectures, I have been pushed to question the activities of theology. It all really gets me thinking about a stand, a negative position, on “pseudometaphysical mythmaking” (*Insight*, 528). We don't seem to respect the people on the campus who are working hard trying to find out, for examples, what are feelings?, what is imagination?, what is psychic sickness?, even what is contemplation? But, going perhaps deeper, we don't seem to be doing the self-appropriation that is talked about. Finally, I am tired of hearing professors talking about what Lonergan says, especially when that talking can turn into a mess of opinions about what Lonergan meant.

So, back to my position that I said was obvious. I don't know what can be done about the situation I described in the last paragraph, but it seems to me that the functional collaboration that is being talked about in the seminar is a way to go. The first seminar was a shock, especially when one considers the way people talk about research in theology departments. Functional research, as McShane described it, is a whole new ballpark. Which brings me to my final position. We really need to figure out what we hold in common in Lonergan studies. Well, I suppose that makes the same point, that collaboration would get us there.