

Field Nocturne 30 Onwords

I concluded Field Nocturne 29 with expressions of intention and hope. Yet it is evident to me, but not tellable to you, that that hope needs a context to be effective. The hope that is you needs a context. You need a context which *de facto* is unavailable to you. Yet some of you need to battle out of that mortmain¹ to do the almost impossible.

I suspect that I am writing to some who are sixty years younger than I am. Certainly I am reaching out towards those: people stuck in the death-trap of conventional education: “go to the adolescent who are smothered in family go also to the nerve-racked, go to the enslaved-by-convention.”² Yet that reach is only remotely mine here and now. The message of self-appreciation is eventually to spread into the schools and the universities, into physics and politics, into bedrooms and banks? But not, do far, in our axial trail. The paradox of the book *Insight* - does it not remind you of the class of classes that is a member of itself? - is that it classified itself as outclassed by the culture that produced it against all odds.

Let me, however, repeat in this new context the seemingly optimistic conclusion of the previous *Field Nocturne*. “But I really am, now, getting round to a fresh and difficult - yet so obvious - beginning of our study of the study of the organism, plant or peon or pervert. The psychoanalyst converses with the pervert: it would be as well, and towards larger wellness, if the psychoanalyst were luminous about what conversation and talk is. And slowly it will be discovered that talk is normally **whattalk**, and that the deeper wish of the organism is not a death-wish but a life-wish.³ The discovery is to

¹There is an implicit reference here to the poem by Ezra Pound , “Commission”, quoted substantially before the first chapter of my *Music That Is Soundless*, Axial Publishing, 2007: “Be against all sorts of mortmain”.

²*Ibid.*

³What is this life-wish? The question echos the mood of note 3 above. And it also points to a massive task of reversion in psychology and sociology. One might begin modestly by

lead, in later millennia, to a cure beyond present fantasy for the perversions of language, of talk, of the study of the language and the reality of science, of sex, and of love.”

What is the new context? **What** is the new context. But I would have you note that the new context is that of the invitation of the next *Field Nocturne*, “Opwords” and of the pointers of *Field Nocturne 35*, “Helen’s Halting Hands”. I am turning you forward and around to turn you on to turn you in.⁴ And I repeat things written in the next essay that were originally jottings here but placed there and now replaced here. “the issue is the incast of the iris and the idea.” That, now, is to be the issue of the final ten *Field Nocturnes*. How am I / to try / to cast / a cast / into your I? Does that qualify as a limerick?

And in another note to myself I thought of the effort in terms of dehiscence, scribbling to myself that “dehiscence is perhaps an unfamiliar word meaning **a bursting or splitting open, as of a pod discharging its contents**. In *Field Nocturne 30*, we shall follow up the twists of this quotation towards a **whathere** glimpse that is not

reconsidering the references to Freud and Jung in the book *Insight* and lifting them (cyclically and over millennia) into [a] the full aggreformic context hinted at here; [2] the context of a larger wishing within the cosmos reaching from Big Bang to Big Clasp; [3]; the apex within the pilgrim state as being the seed of a larger eschatological enterprise. Such a lifting would identify the death-wish in all its interpretations as a perversion of finitude’s meaning. All this would give a much larger concrete meaning to Lonergan’s heuristic of indeterminate cosmic dynamics: “The unconscious neural base neither means nor wishes in the proper sense of these terms, for both meaning and wishing are conscious activities. But the unconscious neural basis is an upwardly directed dynamism seeking fuller realization, first, on the proximate sensitive level and, secondly, beyond its limitations on higher artistic, dramatic, philosophic, cultural and religious levels.”*Insight*, 457[482]

⁴These two *Field Nocturnes*, 30 and 31, twirl around the question of future meanings of Operational Positioning. The twirl is also the twirl of the question in the title of Chapter 2 of *A Brief History of Tongue*: “How-Language: Works?”. It has taken me a decade to reach an initial heuristic answer to that question, to find that the howhum, how-home, of words is to be a radiance of their neurodynamics as **Home Of Wonder**. The suggestion reaches forwards into the heuristics and the reality of an eschatological dynamics.

posed on the visible but poised in the invisible.”

The words of **The Visible and the Invisible** were not, are not, successful. We need opwords. But initially they have to be recognizable words contextualized by **OP**, by **Operational Positioning**. A vicious or virtuous circle here, and it is virtuous in so far as we manage to get the point, the pointing, the word, this word that word, **the**.⁵ Linguistic feedback then is simply - but not at all simply - the not-leaving of the word from the flesh: fingertips, synchrolips. The inner word, poised in the invisible, radiates through time and eternity: more than a 13.7 billion years background radiation.

How is one begin to glimpse this? One need to climb within an Operational Positioning and to climb within that positioning. Then the words become twists of flesh towards, friendly towards, the glimpse, the glimpse of the labials and the *lilies* in the **Field**.

Can I add to the many struggles with this, in me and towards others, in the past fifty years? “Try again; fail better”. It seems to me now that the message lurking in *Insight* about physics can be picked up in a fresh message round and about the iris in the Field, round and about the neurochemistry of seeing. Round and about? Round and (about)³? The issue in its fullness is both phylogenetic and ontogenetic. Its fruits are to be a phylopresence in a later stage of meaning, but prior to that they are to be a Tower presence, and prior to that still there need be evolutionary sports, odd people who comeabout to appreciate, positionally and poitionally and perhaps proto-possesionally,⁶ that seeing is a wonderous neuro-organic achievement of 13.7 billion years of the infolding of energy, just as touching is.

Why do I not follow up the struggles of either Helen Keller or Maurice Merleau-

⁵Think of the context of that final word of *Finnegans Wake* given to it by the book.

⁶The words recall the title of Cantower 9, “Position, Poision, Protopossession”, written in 2002, when I was struggling towards a meaning for Protopossession, as I still am but “failing better”. But the beginning of that essay is a help to glimpse the slow scramblings that go with, bone up with, the climb.

Ponty, each in their own relevant-to-us way, with the meaning of touching? We turn ourselves towards sight and seeing. Yes we do stay in touch with these two in so far as we have grown in sensitivity towards the time-eating darkness in their struggle. Might you come with me for five weeks and fifty pages, fingertipping you as Annie Sullivan did Helen? That, you must admit, is not the normal mood of reading print.

But we also turn ourselves towards sight and seeing because it is, in a certain manner, the most successful of the senses and, because of that, the most misleading when we ask about minding, about the whathere. But getting some leading lights on that is the objective of the final ten essays of this series.

Finally, we turn to sight and seeing because we wish to catch ourselves in the act of beginning the study of the organism: we do so herenow, reading the phrase “study of the organism begins”. If we are to do so now luminously, then we should be luminous - within the limitations of our times luminously grasped⁷ - about the organism that reads. But now means then, and THEN, and I must halt myself here. The grasping of the limitations of our times is to change as we share the climb of these essays.

I would be remiss if I did not bring you to think here of the decision-problems that haunt our efforts or lack of efforts. So, there is the decision problem posed - but not much noticed - on page 388[413] of *Insight*. A Basic position is proposed: if you decide for it, that you enter a battle with yourself that turns you into a cultural oddity. You will, and will it is, the climb to some extent measured by your capacity and obligation. The climb should carry some few towards being **comeabouts** for the next century. Most of my readers may only **comealong**, so not ever, in this life, **comeabout**. Still, the **comealongs** lift the loneliness of those who comeabout to face up into the dark Field.

⁷A key context here is section 1.2 of *Insight* chapter 17, “The Genesis of Adequate Self-Knowledge”. The decision mentioned in the final paragraph above should lead one to decide to read that section seriously. Read seriously: we are going round in cycles!