

*Quodlibet 11.**Method in Theology, Page 250: The Six Italicized Words.*

There are three sections in this short essay. If you wish just a rough working idea of the six words, go directly to section 3. Section 1 raises larger discomfoting issues. Section 2 focuses these issues on the reach for the meaning of the six words. But I emphasize that the *Completion* of the meaning of those words is the fundamental issue: the discomfoting communal self-revelations marked by the second half of that page 250 that open up our wounded loneliness towards the future and the Ultimate.

**11.1 What are We Reaching For?**

Already I have devoted 8 SOFDAWAREs and 10 Quodlibets to the topic of dialectic, indeed to that single page, page 250, of *Method in Theology*. Two recent conversations encourage me forward here. The first recalls the nudge that got me into *Quodlibet 7*: the question from the Toronto Conference of August 2004: can I move into dialectic with just a particular focus? The answer was Yes - and this is the stand of mine on trying dialectic that I developed in *Quodlibet's 7, 8 and 9*. A second conversation related to the study of responses throughout history to a particular work of Plato: yes, that too could be an *assembled*. So, why not page 250 of *Method in Theology* as an assembled?! How crazy can I get? How about the word *Assembly* as an assembled?

Behind this eccentricity there is, I think, a profundity. Recall our struggle in SOFDAWARE 3, "Reading **Care** into Method 250". Of course, you may not: and as I peruse that effort again, I sense the problem of common meaning<sup>1</sup> that I hope may be

---

<sup>1</sup>The problem of common meaning and its genesis is raised explicitly on pp.253-57 of *Method of Theology*, but it is the dominant problem of emergent differentiations neatly describe on the few pages (97-99) at the end of chapter three there. A central feature of the problem is named in the final sentence: "Never has the need to speak effectively to undifferentiated consciousness been greater". Some attempt will be made to open up that issue of effective address, of popularization as opposed to *haute vulgarization*, in *Quodlibet 12*. See the following

solved in the third stage of meaning, when integral neurochemicals like you and I can tower takenforgrantedly, *ethos-wise*,<sup>2</sup> in a refined *Praxis weltanschauung*. THEN<sup>3</sup> there will be, at least on what I call the Indigo Track of collaboration<sup>4</sup>, a shared uncommon meaning of the six italicized words of *Method 250*. But more immediately, there would be a recall of the perspective of SOFDAWARE 3 that would simply be the luminous recall of that shared perspective.<sup>5</sup> And in the absence of that recall, that *ethos*, might it not be better to put forth here some of those previous relevant words?

So, instead of turning round the same topic in other reaching words, I simply invite you to some digestion of the beginning of the first section of SOFDAWARE 3, titled “Here-Now Care.”<sup>6</sup> I end the quotation in mid-section, where I began to ramble through oriental languages in order to intimate the genesis of dense word-symbols of care relevant to the profundity I write about, but: you may follow my trail there, or here-there elsewheres in any way that helps the intussusception of the strange zen-like

---

note. Chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, titled “*Haute Vulgarization*”, gives a context.

<sup>2</sup>I commented on the genesis of a wise cultural *ethos* in the previous *Quodlibet*. Its fostering is helped by such symbolisms as the three-dimensional Cantower diagram described below (see note 43) . That symbolism also gives effective meaning to the words *plain* and *plane* in the title of section 3.

<sup>3</sup>The title of Cantower 5 is “Metaphysics THEN”, relating to the forward orientation of *Praxis* that is to dominate the future of metaphysics and functional specialization.

<sup>4</sup>*Quodlibet 3* introduced the relevant track diagram, where the successful track of a spectrum of tracks is the Indigo specialist in a collaborative track of the optimal contemporary heuristic. On collaboration, see note 49 below..

<sup>5</sup>“A group memory is essential to any group”(Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 235). This problem, another slant on the problem of note 1 above, haunts this final chapter of that book. One must hope for a massive functional transposition of Lonergan’s searching in that volume.

<sup>6</sup>I cannot resist quoting one of two short final (unpublished) poems by Samuel Beckett: it gives a mood for the extract from SOFDAWARE 3: “go where never before / no sooner there than there always / no matter where never before / no sooner there than there always”. [The poems and their source are give in Cantower 5].

fact of human reachings.<sup>7</sup> So, I quote my former lesser self's text and footnotes:

"Where does the beginning begin?

I am interested in the care that turns to page 250 of *Method* on the word *assembly* and finds .... Finds? Finds a greeting by an old guy in his mid-sixties. What is that care, you-caring thus to turn the page to **read**, to be **impressed** by that greeting?<sup>8</sup> For it is not something familiar called *care* but the molecular oddity named you that reaches an appendage out to swing a thin slice of being through 180 degrees to begin again and again and again, word-openings to your future.

We are not in a hurry. You could well poise, hold the page-slice vertical, the door half open. A monkey might do the same, but are you thus monkey-poised?

I am interested in the final step of the end of the last paragraph. You caring to **read** "?".

This old guy, at 72, writes to you a "?". You care; you cannot but care, even enough to be annoyed at, What? Me monkeying around? My monkeying round with "?" or with you: or is the annoyance due to the fact that somehow **you** and **?** are identical? Or with the non-fact that **you** and **?** are obviously identical?

I am beginning again on a road I took, with Lonergan's help, 48 years ago. On a road I took with Chopin 60 years ago. Perhaps with Hopkins, 54 years ago. But now, 54 years later, the **I** that I inscape is not "Immortal Diamond"<sup>9</sup> but a massively complex chemical unity with an attitude.

---

<sup>7</sup>I think of a verse by the Zen master Dogen( 1200-1253): "To what indeed shall I liken / The world and human life? / Ah, the shadow of the moon, / When it touches in the dewdrop / The beak of the waterfowl" [Yo no naka wa / nani ni tatoen / mizutori no / hashi furu tsuyu ni / yadoru tsukikage ]

<sup>8</sup>The boldface print merely alerts you to the neurochemical oddities that one normally does not think of: where the reading resides and what Thomas would call the **species impressa**.

<sup>9</sup>The last two words of G.M.Hopkins' poem, "That nature is a heraclitean fire and of the comfort of the Resurrection".

I can play with a friend's puppy, catch the cosmos reaching forward in each its eyes, chemical unit to chemical unit, eye to eye. And we can both turn our eyes to the half-turned page. We can both register, among the marks, the word, *Assembly*. But be alert to my turning of the page. Were I alone I catch, am caught by, eye-catching, the marks *include* spaced out in its little top corner. The puppy is not so caught: a chemical complexity without my attitude? Attitude?

I am the **assembler**.

And the assembler that I am **includes** ....

It is to include, enclose in patterned neurochemistry<sup>10</sup>, that patterned page that surrounds *include* with varying cloudiness - are you a speed-reader? The page, an object patterned physiochemically, has a foreign dignity, is a foreign (aggregate) dignitary, wending its way through the cosmos, unreached<sup>11</sup> by my patterned neurochemistry: no fixed address. Yet it is the dark address of an elderly Canadian, its assembler.

You and he are both assemblers. Here now, in the excitement of a page-turning, his typing fingers poke you in the eye, in a peculiar psychochemical meshing that parallels poking puppy-eye, leaves the puppy in its habitat, unbemused. But are you nowhere bemused, by this page and that page, by this word or that, twisted round your cranial chemistry? Have you met the old man's or this old man's fingers, prying? The turned page corners you with the marks *include*. Corners you? Are you somehow included in the *include*? What could that *somehow* mean? "All we know is *somehow* with

---

<sup>10</sup>I suspect, whether you are a Lonergan student or not, that you are not used to this nudging. You might pause and puzzle about what, after all, is a phantasm: does it include chemistry? It would be no harm to pick up and read Rita Carter's little book, *Mapping the Mind*, Phoenix paperback, 2000.

<sup>11</sup>I do not wish to enter into the strange topic of position and poission. It is a life-climb story, but if you are odd enough you might try Cantower 9: "Position, Poission, Proto-possession".

us, it is present and operative within our knowing; it lurks behind the scenes.”<sup>12</sup> A muddle of mysteries here, herenow, nowhere.<sup>13</sup>

## 11.2 The Six Words in distant view

Let us take this gently, with helpful analogies that I have been using regularly. I have before me detailed notes on page 250 related to a presentation I gave in a professorial seminar in Concordia University 25 years ago. There is a single page, with lots of symbols and arrows: perhaps I should just reproduce it, scan it into the *Quodlibet*? Certainly I can make it available to anyone interested, though sometimes such imaging fails to click without it being the product of personal messing. The key to the answer to the question, What do these words mean?, is indeed the centrepiece-diagram of the page, yes, it is my old W1, the heuristic diagram of the layered reality of the human subject. I suppose I should put it in here:

$$f ( p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; q_n )$$

Why is it the key? Because it could help the operator to “seek out,”<sup>14</sup> “pick out”<sup>15</sup> the grounds, “the underlying root,”<sup>16</sup> of affinities and oppositions, and to sift out dialectic from cultural, neurochemical, etc oppositions, through the processes named *Comparison, Reduction, Classification, Selection*. “Could help”: but it is not an *ethos* of this

---

<sup>12</sup>The concluding paragraph of chapter 9 of *Insight*.

<sup>13</sup>There is a deep set of problems here of the peculiar non-dispersedness of the non-pup events that Lonergan hides under his swift introduction of the word *spiritual* in *Insight*.

<sup>14</sup>*Method in Theology*, 250, line 7,

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, lines 12-13.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, line 10.

culture. It belongs to the “broadened basis”<sup>17</sup> from which “one can go on”<sup>18</sup> to dealing with human reality in a manner that illuminates and self-illuminates so that that human reality “paves the way for us to recreate ourselves mentally in a way that has previously been described only in science fiction”<sup>19</sup> - or in foundational fantasy. And, sadly, this broadened basis is increasingly unavoidable in facing the up-dating of e.g. Aquinas lengthy reflection on the human good, on virtues and vices.<sup>20</sup> A new level of detecting is upon us where it becomes more than convenient “to detect the physical signs of complex qualities of mind like kindness, humour, heartlessness, gregariousness, altruism, mother-love and self-awareness.”<sup>21</sup>

This, of course, is very disheartening to contemporary cultures of philosophy. But that is my stand. Is it Lonergan’s stand?<sup>22</sup> I regularly quote the terrible paragraph on page 287 of *Method in Theology*, but that is really only a repetition of his stand in *Insight*<sup>23</sup> and in *De Deo Trino*.<sup>24</sup> There is a desperate need in this late<sup>25</sup> part of the second

---

<sup>17</sup>*Method in Theology*, 287, line 19.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup>Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind*, Phoenix paperback, 2002, 1. The book, referred to already in note 10, is a first-class introduction to this context.

<sup>20</sup>See *Quodlibet* 3.

<sup>21</sup>Rita Carter, *op. cit.*, 1.

<sup>22</sup>This, of course, is grist for the second functional specialty. My “yes-claim” here would need to be backed up by the strategies of that specialty. Part of my own personal stand is a stand on my non-specialist interpretations of Lonergan’s meaning. The only shot I have taken at specialist interpretation of Lonergan is on his meaning of *complete* in the canon of complete explanation. See my article in *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* 4(2004).

<sup>23</sup>See the brief statement referred to below, at note 50. A dominant thesis of the entire book is, of course, the mediation of humanity through the emergence of serious understanding. See note 26.

<sup>24</sup>I refer to a massively central piece of Lonergan’s heuristic perspective that focuses bluntly the problem of scientific beginnings in a way that makes concretely probably the “one

stage of meaning to take seriously the demand for serious understanding.<sup>26</sup>

But one takes it at the level of one's talent and times. The analogy with chemistry helps here. In many school texts there is reproduced, inside the hard cover [which keeps the cost up!] a copy of the periodic table. It makes little sense to the school teen, even after grading, but it is taken for granted - a component of an *ethos*. Sharing that ethos may be quite beyond a parent: but acknowledging it is important to the progress of the next generation, especially if the acknowledgment is meshed with an adequate culture of education, but that is another story.<sup>27</sup> All I am asking of the present generation of people interested in Lonergan is an acknowledgment that is meshed with a commitment to efficiency.

Well, no: that is not all. I am asking, as I did in the previous *Quodlibet*, that some serious attention be given to the data pointed to the questions 7-17 of the *Secunda Secundae* of Thomas' *Summa*.

Surely this cannot be seen as unfair? You wish to understand the activities named by the six words: but these words refer to activities in this zone of

---

can go on" of that paragraph of *Method* 287. It is the conclusion of question 36 of *De Deo Trino Pars Systematica* (Gregorian Press, 1964), which will appear shortly in English. Roughly, it claims that it is just not good strategy to hang with description even in the early stages of a science. It is the point of having a contextualizing symbolization such as that 'word' W1 above, one of a set of necessary 'metaphysical words'.

<sup>25</sup>How late is it to be in the Axial Period? That is in the empire of our choice, our *imperium* (see note 44 below). My stand is for the probability shift from products to sums (see *Insight* section 4.2.3, "The Probability of Schemes") through the recurrence-scheming (the context is *Insight* section 7.8.4, "Reversal of the Longer Cycle") incarnatable through the cycling of functional specialization. The shift from products to sums is supported by various substructures of the cycling that are too complex to consider in this short note.

<sup>26</sup>We are back, of course, with the slogan if *Insight*, about understanding what it is to understand. That understanding requires the mediation of the serious effort to understand that is the discomfort of those early chapters of *Insight*. The later normative view of generalized emergent probability (*A Third Collection*, 141, top lines) lifts the probabilities of success.

<sup>27</sup>See note 5 above.

consciousness.<sup>28</sup> Perhaps you already sensed the hidden complexity when I wrote of *Completion* earlier?<sup>29</sup> Are you sensing the larger, distant, possibility that I wrote of when I fantasized about some medieval writing of the scientific revolution in a gloriously heuristic yet contemporarily incomprehensible fashion?<sup>30</sup> The distant horizon is one of an *ethos* in which discernment takes on a meaningful repetitiveness. The Tower of Able then spins on an axis of being luminous about the shared task of discerning the discernments of discernments.

### 11.3 A Plain, Plane, Meaning of the Six Words

*Assembly?* You have noticed, from the previous *Quodlibets*, how this can be so taken at present that it is possible to tackle it in small doses. What philosophers and theologians will think of is an assembly of something like the historical sequence of views, and this will do for a start. But gradually the praxis mind-set will begin to sift off views that are neither implemented nor implementable and to sift in other disciplines and their operable and operating views. So, for instance, I have just finished reading several works that relate to assembly in medicine, in philosophy and medicine: works like this are to emerge in all areas of culture, and there will be a convergence towards a more concrete dialectic of progress and so, gradually, an opening of the traditional assembly of philosophy and theology. This, of course, is already present in some meshings e.g. of sociology and ecclesiology, and in various special zones of philosophy.

---

<sup>28</sup>The previous *Quodlibet* raised this question, and the topic deserves a book, a thesis. It involves the exercises referred to there and in the conclusion of the present essay: but the hints occur throughout here. A useful beginning exercise is to attempt a link-up between the activities described on page 250 with the steps described by Thomas in those questions 7-17. You might begin by considering broadly the *assembly* of the *circumstances* (question 7) of participating in the group-action that is dialectic within functional specialization.

<sup>29</sup>See SOFDAWARE 5 “**Care** reaching for *Completeness*”.

<sup>30</sup>This invites you to a simple yet illuminating exercise: paralleling page 250's reach into the future with a medieval anticipating in a page the heuristics of the scientific revolution.

*Completion?* I have already pointed to fuller meanings of this operation, so let us stay lightweight in this paragraph. Completion is ‘you and I reacting in character,’<sup>31</sup> consenting or dissenting in existential fullness.<sup>32</sup> There are enormous problems here relating to axial fragmentation which we do have to slip over, but still worth noting in passing.<sup>33</sup> Some immediately helpful points are worth making. First, we can react in character in any of the first four specialties: “I don’t like the manuscript I found”; “I am mightily pleased with that bit of history”; whatever. But the reaction is not, need not be, thematized in the first three specialties. What, you may ask, about the forward specialties? These are existential, actions, not reactions. There is - normatively - an incarnate speaking to the future: “the one that means”<sup>34</sup>, the character, is weaving forward meaning and common meaning, poised in the groaning of finality.<sup>35</sup>

*Comparison?* We have been into that topic before, and if the recommended exercise was followed, the complexity of the effort has emerged in consciousness and

---

<sup>31</sup>I am thinking here of those two short sections in *Method*, 3.6 and 14.1 ( the word *character* ends the central sentence there) which point to incarnate meaning. Combine this with the Aristotelean political meaning of **character** expressed at the beginning of the *Magna Moralia*.

<sup>32</sup>One should think here in terms of Thomas’ meaning of consent, (question 13 of the *Secunda Secundae*) and figure out its relation to possibilities, to choice, to fruition, etc. One would benefit here from ingesting the existential context of chapter 13 of *Phenomenology and Logic*.

<sup>33</sup>The entire axial tradition of science is disoriented from completeness. Cantower 2 and chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk* try to capture the mood of an integral science that would be contemplative of its object in a full sense. It is generations away at present.

<sup>34</sup>*Method in Theology*, 356.

<sup>35</sup>There is the elementary context of Romans 8: 19-23; there is Lonergan’s reflections in “Mission and Spirit”, *A Third Collection*. The fuller metaphysical context reaches into origins and the fundamental dynamics of material finitude. See note 50 below.

discomforted us.<sup>36</sup> But it seems best here to point to what *comparison* is **not**, since there is a tendency among Lonergan students - and thesis directors! - to think of comparison in terms e.g. of comparing X and Lonergan. Lonergan's meaning of *Comparison* - towards which the afore-mentioned exercise pushes you - puts the effort of comparison into a context, a Kontext, that is, normatively, you the adequate dialectician.<sup>37</sup> If you **are** that Kontext, then comparing Lonergan and X is adequately located in what I call a TUV,<sup>38</sup> and you are operating within the strictures of the first two canons of hermeneutics.<sup>39</sup> But if you are not thus operating, what are you doing? And who are you that is doing it? If you are in a state of reasonable sharing Lonergan's view of you, then are you not just interpreting X? And if you don't really share Lonergan's view of you, then are you not comparing an unknown to X?

Thus I "point to" but do not solve or elucidate the puzzle of the standard meaning of comparison. I am much more interested, half way in my popular<sup>40</sup> account of the six words, in drawing your attention - **impressing** you, to recall my quotation from SOFDAWARE 3 - with your presence as what I might call *Completion-Exigence*.<sup>41</sup> But what follows immediately, we might agree, are three deviant paragraphs, flights of fantasy slipped into my introductory hints. So, skip them if you please this time round,

---

<sup>36</sup>The exercise is given in *Quodlibet* 6. It points back to Cantower 14, where the two sets of canons are considered integrally.

<sup>37</sup>One's normativity is to live thus: but the thematic of it is conveniently distributed through the specialties.

<sup>38</sup>"Tentative Universal Viewpoint": you may recall from previous *Quodlibets* and *Cantowers* the parallel with GUTs in physics and with "Tentative Unification Theories".

<sup>39</sup>*Insight*, 586-8[609-10].

<sup>40</sup>See notes 1 and 2 above. The title of the present section points to the difficulty of inter-planer dialogue and "plain meaning".

<sup>41</sup>See notes 32 and 33 above. The full metaphysical context would sublimate Lonergan's reflections in "*De Ente Supernaturale*".

page-turning.

Earlier I wrote of the cosmos reaching forward in each eye.<sup>42</sup> It reaches forward in each "I", in you and me, in each assembler. *Completion*, as designated in the process of on-going dialectic, is not a fresh start: it is a recycling of that generation's Tower of Able.<sup>43</sup> The collaborative group that constitutes that Ability in any future age is to move in a scientific *ethos* or tradition or plane of a common imperious heart-warming *imperium*.<sup>44</sup> The fresh tinges of the never-in-this-life-complete<sup>45</sup> *Completion* lifts the fringes of loneliness to new richness of loneliness's expression in mysteries.

Added here, you may notice, is the component of the THEN-self-luminous exigence that can speak in an enlightened fashion of energy negentropically enfolded in sets of  $10^{10}$  neurons, spirit's empire: the population of exigences is no longer "a little late"<sup>46</sup> and breathless but up-to-date and "one that can go on to a developed account of the human good, values, beliefs, to the carriers of, elements, functions, realms, and stages of meaning, to the question of God, of religious experience, is expression, its

---

<sup>42</sup>Above, page 3.

<sup>43</sup>I am thinking here of a central heuristic image, gained from the diagram that I call W3 presented in various places in the Cantowers (e.g. Cantower 24), in chapter 4 of *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minds*, and on page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue*. One reaches the Tower image by an obvious cutting and joining of the section that gives the eight specialties, so that the cycles of collaboration round the specialties are represented by mounting spirals in a history of meaning. Then there emerges a hierarchy of planes, and with it the problems of ex-planing that were noted in note 2 above.

<sup>44</sup>*Imperium* as an act of intelligence is discussed in question 17 of the *Secunda Secundae*. In this context one may think it up to the level of an empire, a strange democratic queen of inquiry. On the problems of the queen of sciences see *Phenomenology and Logic*, 126-7, 130.

<sup>45</sup>"What then is needed is a qualitative change in me, a shift in the centre of my existing from the concerns manifested in the *bavardage quotidien* towards the participated yet never in this life completely established eternity that is tasted in aesthetic apprehension...." (Lonergan, in a book review, *Gregorianum*, 1955).

<sup>46</sup>*Insight*, 733[755].

dialectic development.”<sup>47</sup>

So, I conclude my three-paragraph pointing-fantasy: I am in a new reading, beyond my reading of yesterday morning, of my regularly quoted text “study [self-study] of the organism begins....”<sup>48</sup>: one’s eyes, axons, dendrites, **read** the cosmos reaching forward within a common imperial noosphere of a creative minority, a collaborative cosmopolis,<sup>49</sup> an infolding of primal energy<sup>50</sup> that Can Tower providentially over decline. We think THEN *of* the form, and *within* the form, heartheld, of the emergent probability of the third stage of meaning. Within that, an ever-fresh generation, generating, community moves cosmic molecules forward through a dynamics of *Reduction, Classification, Selection* towards creative foundational fantasy.

*Reduction?* It is to be haunted, in some later millennium if not this, by the glow of the realization of the fantasy of those three last paragraphs. But what for starters? Well, for starters one should try to hang on to elements in the naming of that glow.<sup>51</sup> That

---

<sup>47</sup>*Method in Theology*, 287.

<sup>48</sup>*Insight*, 464[489]. Cantower 9 “Position, Poosition, Protopossession” describes the very slow growth towards an incarnate break with naive realism. But there is the increasingly fuller break that comes from developing the explanatory heuristic described on this page of *Insight*. It seems to me that fuller control over naive realism demands that one come to grips with the phylogenetics and ontogenetics of fish, reptilian and mammalian brain, the genesis of amygdala, hippocampus, hypothalamus, cortex, etc, the genesis of bi-sexuality. Without that shift of self into imagery of patterned chemicals, one’s thinking and talking of objectivity and being are liable to be haunted by described eyes.

<sup>49</sup>I have previously drawn attention to the 29 recurrences of the word collaboration in the second last section of chapter 20 of *Insight*. I associate this with the functional specialist solution to the problem of cosmopolis as posed at the conclusion of chapter 7. I think it is vital not to associate the supernatural dimension of cosmopolis in any simple manner with the Catholic branch of the Christian Church.

<sup>50</sup>See *Insight* 15, sections 4 and 5, on energy’s finality. I gave detailed hints on the move towards understanding Lonergan’s view of energy in *Cantower* 28. Recall note 35 above.

<sup>51</sup>By the naming I mean the relevant metaphysical words or symbols that keep the discourse within the bounds of an explanatory heuristic. See above, the end of note 24.

naming of layers and sub-structures helps one lift the reductions, classifications and equivalences suggested in chapters sixteen and seventeen of *Insight* to new refinements, and it also helps towards cultural sophistications in the search for “underlying roots.”<sup>52</sup>

*Classification?* The same is true here. One has initial classifications from advertence to the elements and levels of meaning as suggested in that seventeenth chapter of *Insight* and enlarged on elsewhere. One is searching for classes of sources, but the search is to be increasingly explanatory within the dynamic of those three paragraphs of fantasy. Might you find it useful, in this context, to think of the replacing of the Myers-Briggs stuff<sup>53</sup> with an explanatory classification based on a mesh of *The Mapping of Mind* with a fuller mapping of the elements of meaning that would add to what I call the usual listing or diagraming<sup>54</sup> a fuller topology of the elements of meaning that are the refinements of care, the up-dating of the relevant questions in the second part of the *Summa*?

*Selection?* What is important to note here, in our preliminary commonsense fashion, is the bifurcation. Reduction and Classification reveal various non-invariant roots and “other grounds.”<sup>55</sup> The invariant grounds are perhaps familiar to commonsense Lonergan students as rooted in common<sup>56</sup> possibilities of differentiations. But there is an immediate need to envisage, even in commonsense

---

<sup>52</sup>*Method in Theology*, 250, line 10.

<sup>53</sup>I raised this question already in *Quodlibet* 3.

<sup>54</sup>The usual listing/diagraming is available in Appendix A of *Phenomenology and Logic*. It is quite a challenge to produce accurate and helpful imagings, e.g. of the answering of the question, What-to-do?, that would complexify in an integral fashion these diagrams. Development in zones of sensibility will complexify the heuristic imaging further. See note 48 above.

<sup>55</sup>*Method in Theology*, 250, line 12.

<sup>56</sup>There are difficult questions to be answered only *a posteriori* about the non-common of the male and female. It is a massive topic for future feminism: notes 48 and 57 give pointers.

fashion, sophistications of these, as well as orders of displacement and transformation in sub-differentiations. Think, for instance of aesthetic differentiations across 10 or so genera of aesthetic capacities-for-performance.<sup>57</sup> Think, too, of the variably-conceived border between aesthetic species: is western music really western? Are the tones and rhythms of South India not shareable by a Beatle tuned to Ravi Shankar? But there are the “other grounds”, varying vibrantly, locally, historically: a village strangeness. *Selection* dismisses these? Rather, it is just a Nunc dismissal, in the Now of the swing from dialectic to foundations. The dismissal is to be a positive missal, missile, mission,<sup>58</sup> one that is to have a layered blossoming through the forward specialties of thematized proverbs, genetically-controlled systems, remote yet proximate executive reflections and concrete realizations.<sup>59</sup> But that raises sad questions about the feeble state of such forward specialties, best positively dismissed for the moment.

Do my few pages, half- page per word, help? In the next generation there are books and classes to be focused on these tasks, but perhaps I have done something to make you suspect that this is to be true: texts and teachings that are to be an efficient emergence of the end of the second stage of meaning. I cannot expect many present readers to battle up towards the odd neurochemical heuristic named by my symbolic word  $f(p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; q_n)$ , but I hope that there emerge sufficient readers who note and care for the meshing of Thomas’ struggle with the meaning of prudent care with their care of these six words to care efficiently about that care that lurks behind the scenes in their reading of page 250?

---

<sup>57</sup>I speak loosely of the usual divisions of the aesthetic, but it requires the future work indicated by Lonergan around *Insight* 464[489] to pin down with some accuracy the metaphysical realities. See note 48 above.

<sup>58</sup>I am thinking here of various facets of chapter 6, “De Divinis Missionibus”, of Lonergan, *De Deo Trino II: Pars Systematica*, Gregorian Press, Rome, 1964.

<sup>59</sup>Helpful here is the essay “Systematics, Communications, Actual Contexts”, *Lonergan Workshop 7(1987)*, edited by F.Lawrence, 143-174.