

## OUR JOURNALING LONELINESSES: A RESPONSE

PHILIP MCSHANE

### 1. Spirant

O winged lady,  
Like a bird  
You scavenge the land.

.....

Your feet are continually restless,  
Carrying your harp of sighs,  
You breath out the music of mourning.<sup>1</sup>

I delight in sharing Cathleen Going's cloistered imaging, "singer at the heart of the universe," an image teeming with reachings: who is the singer, the sung, the song, what is the heart of the universe? So I am led to weave into my response a

---

<sup>1</sup> Extract from *The Hymn to Inanna* by Enheduanna (Daughter of the Sumerian King, Sargon, about 2300 B.C.), quoted on p. 5 of Jane Hirshfield, ed., *Women in Praise of the Sacred: 43 Centuries of Spiritual Poetry by Women* (New York: Harper Collins, 1994), herein referred to as Hirshfield. It seems worthwhile to plunge you immediately into the context of W3 – soon mentioned in the text – by connecting the three quotes reversedly to my comment on Hopkin's *Windhover*: "One glimpses afresh the *Beingstalk*, the hold of all that is holdall understanding; and one may distinguish then *Beings-talk*, the speaking within that understanding that is a twosome resonance; and finally, there is the *Beingst-hawk*, joysticking response to the twotalk." Philip McShane, *Music That Is Soundless: A Fine Way for the Lonely Bud* (Halifax: Axial Press, 2003), 131. The creative subtlety is a shift in processions-minding to intussusceptions, a scavenging (Indoeuropean base: *skeu*, to heed).

context for such reachings, three poems out of 43 centuries of feminine<sup>2</sup> reaching that divide the reply, that subtly call us to tune into the dark womb of being that is history's unfinished symphony. There is the scavenging Spirit, there is the Jasmine Lord, there is the Singer axially named the Father, breathing all inward.

My delight, of course, would be mightily larger if the sharing was with all the contributors and readers but reaching further into the larger inclusive image that I have called W3, the image that editor Michael Shute providentially chose as frontispiece of this volume. Do we share that image? Let me invite you into the middle of page 250 of *Method in Theology*. "Here I stand" with my W3. Do you, as some even of those writing here have indicated on occasion, find this complex imaging business distasteful, unnecessary? Well, at least I have Lonergan on my side, who claims that you really cannot hold together a complex view without complex imaging.<sup>3</sup> The singer at the heart of the universe is imaged within a dynamic of history, within a structure that images a present word, an *imitatio theologica Christi*, that gives unity, beauty, efficiency, to metaphysics.

Sister Mary of the Savior moves gently back and forward

---

<sup>2</sup> I have already included reflections on the feminist dynamic towards the third stage of meaning in "Business Ethics, Feminism and Functional Specialization," *JMDA* 2 (2003). See also Cantower IV, "Molecules of Description and Explanation," which has to do with the searchings of Candace Pert: section 3, "Will you go, lassie, go?" For a broader sweep that moves from feminine biorhythms to issues of post-axial interiority see Sandy Gillis-Drage, ? *Woman What Gives* (Halifax: Axial Press, 2004).

<sup>3</sup> It is as well to quote from Lonergan here, since it is a key to a present Lonerganesque crisis, to the problem of flunking history's puzzle. "The comprehension of everything in a unified whole can be either formal of virtual ... Formal comprehension cannot take place without a construct of some sort. In this life we are able to understand something only by turning to phantasm; but in larger and more complex questions it is impossible to have a suitable phantasm unless the imagination is aided by some sort of diagram. Thus, if we want to have a comprehensive grasp of everything in a unified whole, we shall have to construct a diagram in which are symbolically represented all the various elements of the question along with all the connections between them." Lonergan, *CWL* 7, 151. Note that the reference to the Latin version of this quotation (p. 80) is internal, self-referential, to the diagram W3. See notes 35 and 62 below.

in a dialogue begun by us at the Florida Conference in Holy Week of 1970, and you must accept that I cannot do justice to that movement of the scavenging spirit here, in regard to her or others' contributions to this volume. But, yes, I look to a distant hearty global grouping to breath out redemptively the music of mourning and morning. Aristotle's finest way will reach new plausibility, bred in the axial wilderness by our daily contemplative focus on the "Epilodge."<sup>4</sup> That reference to Cantower XXI perhaps sets a tone for my response: that response, really, is the million-word project to which O'Donovan and McCallion refer.<sup>5</sup> I shall appeal regularly to it and its image to bring us hopefilledly closer to the meeting in image and goal of Cathleen's conclusion.

Conn O'Donovan's reminiscing swings me Proust-wise through "Memories, Screams, Deflections." I was not really the sixth of six children: the second brother, Hugh, died before I was born, in 1927 at age 2, literally masticated by a tram in Glasgow. Who was to blame: my brother John, present there, at age 5? So, parents divide and bring forth a strange daft family. At 16, music enveloped me, but I paced the streets in a

---

<sup>4</sup> The title of Cantower XXI, which corresponds to the Epilogue of *Insight*. The mood of this Cantower and the mood and notes of my Response point to the need for a new kataphatic stance of contemplation that is normative for both science and prayer. "Theoretic understanding seeks ... to embrace the universe." *CWL 3*, 440. I take a stand against specialization, whether in science or in anaphatic contemplation. There is the further issue of thinking out "the gift" as a differentiated realm (see *Method*, 266).

<sup>5</sup> Two large books, published the year I began this new search, serve to give context and mood. They are Stephen Jay Gould, *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2002), 1339 pages, and Stephen Wolfram, *A New Kind of Science* (Champaign, IL: Wolfram Media, 2002), 1260 pages. Stephen Wolfram writes of his half-million words: "It has been a great challenge for me to capture the things I have discovered over the past twenty years in a book of manageable size." *A New Kind of Science*, xi. My challenge is not to capture my past but to free, in creative fantasy, the heuristic structures of a future global collaboration. Gould, too, writes of a life of searching, and I devote Cantower XV to a consideration of his work. Wolfram's sadly truncated efforts do not merit such attention. Occasional insights (e.g., regarding spacetime discontinuities: 472) are crippled by gross oversights (e.g., regarding the entities of physics: 1197).

poetic daze and still possess a “Sonnet to Insanity” that fermented in my walk. There is the mystery of vocation, but I recognise ever-better the reach in me for what I might call explanatory enlightenment, an odd mix, at a much slower pace, of Dogen (1200-1253) and Aquinas (1225-1274). I found alcohol at age 33, while writing my doctorate in Oxford: it sustained me in the next three decades – carbonated water seems to hit the spot best in the accelerating climb of these latter years – but at the time battered the rhythms of friendship and living. Still, it helped me out of the Jesuits, where I had long been a displaced person. I still remember my discontent, that first evening in the novitiate, September 7th 1950, when my “angelus” (a second year novice, Percy Winder, who, as it happens, passed onwards this very weekend) gave points for meditation on the rich young man. They were not at all “thinking points.” O’Donovan records my cheeky comment to the novice-master, who generously tolerated and encouraged me. I was a wreck when I began university studies, pacing the grounds for the first months while others studied, but I recall vividly an enlightening talk by Fr Jack Kelly SJ in those early months, from whom I first heard of “antimind” as an *ethos*. I now appreciate it as an axial ethos, magnificently disguised in its various forms of technical competence and nominalist Platonism, be they oriental or occidental.

Pat Brown, in his very welcome and astute reflections, recognises the Jeremiah in me.<sup>6</sup> But it reaches well beyond Lonerganism, each day’s pre-dawn contemplation bringing fresh intussusception of the “disease,”<sup>7</sup> the psychothymia, that tentacles axial neurodynamics. It was in Pat’s company, I think, that I first spelled out my view that “great ugliness is as elusive as great beauty.” It is a massive character-achievement of fantasy to hear with any adequacy Lonergan’s words “... makes life unlivable.”<sup>8</sup> Like the self-taste of Proust or Hopkins

---

<sup>6</sup> Brown, 232. Notes 35 and 55 below locate the grounds of my attitude of short-term pessimism and long-term optimism.

<sup>7</sup> See Brown, 232, 241, and 248, n. 79. Candace Pert, *Molecules of Emotion* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), adds a context. She quotes a panel remark of David Lee: “What we need is a larger biomedical science to reintegrate what was taken out three hundred years ago” (304).

<sup>8</sup> Lonergan, *CWL 10*, 232. There is a similar beneficial meditation that

it must become a searching “polyphony with different themes at different intensities sung simultaneously.”<sup>9</sup> You and I are massively, molecularly, sick, spirit-skinned. Adult growth requires an endless repentant<sup>10</sup> reaching for luminosity, for “the music of mourning.”

Adult growth has intrigued me thematically since I first began seriously to ponder on Aquinas’ meaning of *crescentia* in 1958.<sup>11</sup> I finished the Website book *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway* in 2001 startled by the simplicity of a core answer, expressing that simplicity in the concluding Bacchus-page. In so far as I grow, intussuscept into my “dear silence”<sup>12</sup> fresh leaps of meaning, I become a stranger to myself of yesterday. So, for instance, I could not tell the Phil of last week the meanings gained this week.<sup>13</sup>

The climb, then, continues, described in its central expression by Tom McCallion in a critical, balanced, enlightening fashion. Here, obviously, I must appeal to the mountain-map that is the list of 117 Cantowers, available on [www.philipmcshane.ca](http://www.philipmcshane.ca). The first 23 Cantowers are now available: one per month beginning on Easter Monday, April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002. I already referred to Cantower XXI, which corresponds to *Insight’s* Epilogue, backed up by Cantowers XIV-XX which correspond to *Insight* chapters 14-20. What is the drive reaching for? The question will be answered better by Cantower XXXVI, dealing with “the Function of the Cantowers,” but the short answer is that it seeks to promote the tower-climb represented by W3.<sup>14</sup> A broader answer lurks in

---

seeks to read adequately the phrase “the social situation deteriorates cumulatively” (CWL 3, 254).

<sup>9</sup> *A Third Collection*, 132.

<sup>10</sup> CWL 3, 722, line 3.

<sup>11</sup> See *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian ) Minders*, the beginning of chapter 2. The book, written in 1988-89, is available on [www.philipmcshane.ca](http://www.philipmcshane.ca).

<sup>12</sup> See the concluding poem, at note 65.

<sup>13</sup> This is most evident if one is working in mathematics or physics. It tends to be excluded as one moves up through the more difficult sciences. It is a massively important existential issue, a lift of the discomfort of the Proustian challenge into everyday conversation.

<sup>14</sup> I would note that the representation can be enhanced by taking W3 and making suitable cuts on the page so that a tower can be erected in the

the named enterprise of the final years, 2010-11:<sup>15</sup> where are we, “each member, each group, indeed our whole host and its great pilgrimage,”<sup>16</sup> the 14 billion year-old haunt<sup>17</sup> of the scavenging spirit, going? The question belongs within an explanatory heuristik who reaches, like Thomas, through the best available opinions of the day for light on “destiny.”<sup>18</sup> The question takes on bite when one asks, What are the GUTS<sup>19</sup> of the neurodynamics of the end of the beginning? It resonates with the simpler answers of Therese of Liseaux, “God will sip you up like a little drop of dew”<sup>20</sup> and of Pericles’ sea-seized hearing of “The music of the spheres,”<sup>21</sup> but seeks to elevate

---

plane of commonsense meaning. There is then the climb of those called to *theoria* in each and all zones (see note 4 above) leading to planes of meaning beyond common sense; there emerges the increasingly refined task of ex-planing, making resonances available in common sense. See *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 3, conclusion, for notions of ex-planing that relate to the redemption of *haute vulgarisation* (CWL 6, 121, 155; CWL 10, 145), and further, Cantower LIV, “Quantumelectrodynamics, Pedagogy, Popularization.”

<sup>15</sup> I comment on the role of Cantowers LXVI-LXXXI below, in note 35. The Cantowers following, of the year 2009, are to deal with Astronomy, Anthropic Principles, Trinitarian Cosmology: see note 27 below.

<sup>16</sup> Herman Hesse, *The Journey to the East*, trans. Hilda Rosner (London: Panther Books, 1970), 12.

<sup>17</sup> Previously I wrote of a sublation of the *hauntology* of Derrida (*Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism*, 65). A deeper sublation is involved here, dealing with a full heuristic of the aggregate capacities-for-performance in history (related to *potentia activa* of *Verbum*: see the index there, and, further, the references to *obediential potency*).

<sup>18</sup> *Method*, 292. I recall a conversation with Lonergan in Easter 1961; as we walked Dublin’s streets he remarked that one could get a quite coherent cosmology out of Thomas. I was not thinking then of a full cosmology, but was Lonergan?

<sup>19</sup> GUTS, short for Grand Unification Theories in physics. In the Cantowers, especially Cantower XVII, section 3, “The Problem of Interpretation,” I regularly draw a parallel between GUTS and UVs (universal viewpoints considered empirically and sequentially) in order to bring reflections on the *a priori* of interpretation out of a prevalent vagueness.

<sup>20</sup> Therese, speaking to her elder sister Pauline, Mother Agnes of Jesus, of her death, *St. Teresa of Liseaux: Her Last Conversations*, translated from the original manuscripts by John Clarke, OCD (Washington: DC: ICS Publications, 1977), 37.

<sup>21</sup> Shakespeare’s *Pericles*, v.ii.231. In the concluding section of

them to a subtler “love of the invisible.”<sup>22</sup>

Why is such a question not at the heart of our intellectual loving? So I step back, or forward, to my Jeremiah mate, Hugo Meynell, who writes of “a small and embattled segment of the learned Catholic ghetto.”<sup>23</sup> Still, we also share an “enthusiasm”<sup>24</sup> and an “optimism”<sup>25</sup> that foresees “the full global need and scope of functional specialization.”<sup>26</sup> The push of Meynell meshes nicely with that of Garrett Barden, whose contribution calls for attention in the third part. But I would like to pause in the conclusion of this section over the problem of the ghetto, and the grounds for a counter-optimism.

The pause is over a presently-favourite quotation from *Method in Theology*, p. 299. “Doctrines that are embarrassing should not be mentioned in polite company.” A doctrine of ghettoism is embarrassing, and it brings to mind a dinner remark of Lonergan in Dublin, Easter 1961, about “big frogs in little ponds” in Christian theology after Trent. But there is a more optimistic doctrine of the residues in which the spirit scavenges: the potencies of fragmentation and sin-states that are a ferment not just in analytic, phenomenological, post-modern poses, but in a global fragmentation and inefficiency and ugliness of minding. This comes into focus in my doctrine of axiality, which is rarely mentioned in any company. There is the chaos of sophisticated fragmentation and sin within which the spirit broods, mourns, groans. There is the twilight of the slow adolescent ending of the first time of temporal subjectivity.<sup>27</sup> In the fullness of such time the million-year

---

chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk* I reproduce (the typescript was supplied by my good friend Nicholas Graham) a magnificent talk by Patrick Kavanagh on the significance of this play and of being seized by the sea. See also note 64, below.

<sup>22</sup> I am recalling a Christmas Mass Preface, “... ut ad invisibilium amorem rapiamur.” The Nativity and the particles of physics conspire to rapture us to the love of the invisible.

<sup>23</sup> Meynell, 167.

<sup>24</sup> Meynell, 168.

<sup>25</sup> Meynell, 178.

<sup>26</sup> Meynell, 180.

<sup>27</sup> See Lonergan, *De Deo Trino. Pars Systematica*, Gregorian Press, Rome, 1964, 199. The consideration of the two times of temporal subjectivity apply both ontogenetically and phylogenetically. The

African diaspora learns not only to write and count but also to image within the complexity of a Jasmine flowering of self-noticing and feeble differentiations. The differentiations, already in cycling disease,<sup>28</sup> ferment ideas, idea, a blessed lengthy stumbling-bumbling longing for the second time of temporal subjectivity. This is our axial period, pretending enlightenment.

## 2. Word

“It was like a stream  
running into the dry bed  
of a lake.

like rain  
pouring on plants  
parched to sticks.

It was like this world’s pleasure  
and the way to the other,  
both  
walking toward me.

Seeing the feet of the master,  
O lord white as jasmine  
I was made  
worthwhile.”<sup>29</sup>

Part one of my response curled round searchings, scavengings, screamings. Now the focus is on Word, on W3 and its related symbolizations, on the pleasuring feet-marks

---

phylogenetic consideration leads one to the tripartite division indicated in W3, obviously related to the divisions of my response and to my axial period. A word of warning, however. Reaching the Trinitarian reality of our history is doubly complexified by considerations both of integral divine efficiency and of each individual’s complex Trinitarian growth. The latter is a topic relating to the strongest Anthropic Principle (see *Lack in the Beingstalk*, the conclusion of section 3.5).

<sup>28</sup> See Brown 234, n. 16.

<sup>29</sup> Hirshfield, 82. A poem by Mahadeviyakka (a 12<sup>th</sup> century Indian lady, born in the Indian village of Udatadi; she wrote in the Kannada dialect).

that are the way to the other. Indeed, it is on the word of story and system that concerns Mathews and Doran in different ways; but we shall come to that gently.<sup>30</sup> First I would draw attention to the lower ground of loneliness as envisaged by Professors Byrne, Heelan, and Quinn.<sup>31</sup> But even here I maintain a biographic weave: it is to be part of the new hodic ethos.

Pat Byrne's high praise for *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence* is, of course, welcome if embarrassing: I was merely trying to read some pages of *Insight*. But one twist in the book helps us to break forward into the significance and power of the complexification of internal and external words.<sup>32</sup> What was my focal effort in chapter 8 of that book? It was to bring to more precise conception and expression what Lonergan was brooding over in the changing of a paragraph on probability for the second edition of *Insight*. The issue is the looseness of convergence of concrete probability sequences: a million tails can be followed by millions more, messing up your mind and minding. "A common solution to this antimony is to say that very small probabilities are to be neglected and this, I believe, can be defended by granting mathematical but denying empirical existence to the assumed infinity of occasions."<sup>33</sup> Tchebichev lends a hand: pushing for a word

---

<sup>30</sup> My reference in the next sentence to the topic "the lower ground of loneliness" brings to mind the article in which I introduced the mesh of biography and history clearly stated in the title, "Authentic Subjectivity and International Growth: Foundations." It provides a context for my reflections here as they mount towards suggestions of symbolic and systematic complexifications. It was written in the mid-1970s, when I had not yet come seriously to grips with the relevance of genetic systematics to either biography or history. It is available on [www.philipmchane.ca](http://www.philipmchane.ca) as an Epilogue in *The Shaping of the Foundations*.

<sup>31</sup> See the previous footnote. The upper ground of loneliness is brooding graceful trinitarian presence. The lower ground of loneliness is a central focus of the simplest areas of inquiry, mathematics and physics. In Cantower XXXII (November, 2004) it is attended to as "The Empirical Residence."

<sup>32</sup> Recall Augustine's subtle discovery (see *CWL* 2, 6) which can be so easily and destructively mimed. One needs here a post-Goedelian control of self-reference. See notes 35 and 62 below.

<sup>33</sup> *CWL* 3, 89.

about ‘measure zero’ is a gain in control, a step in the righteous way.<sup>34</sup>

Heelan’s article points towards the need for many more such steps. There is, in general, the increasing need for the control of meaning to be had by sophisticated development of symbolizations at all levels, from mathematical logic to trinitarian theology.<sup>35</sup> Heelan brings out that need in the topic of a hermeneutics of measurement. As with Byrne’s essay, so with Heelan’s: detailed follow-up is warranted. Here, again, I can only indulge in vignetting. Heelan’s work evidences needs for refinements of both theories of measurement and measures of hermeneutics. The calculus of variation, home both of Husserl’s doctorate work under Weirstrass<sup>36</sup> and of the

---

<sup>34</sup> Again, I draw attention by this phrase to an integral contemplative attitude (see note 4 above), the reach for precisions in the cosmic word that echo the creative content of the Word.

<sup>35</sup> I introduced the symbolic complication W3 already, and other Ws are introduced throughout the Cantowers, following the initial effort of chapter 4 of *A Brief History of Tongue*. This intrusion of symbolism into the accepted prose of philosophy and theology is not in general welcome. But it is a reality in other disciplines: how can an integral heuristic dodge it? Indeed, a massive development of symbolisation is needed to control meaning, to exclude the descriptive arrogance of general bias, to handle the aggregiformic and genetic structures of our empirical residence. That development will be the focus of Cantowers LXVI - LXXXI. The full list of Cantowers is available at the beginning of the Cantower Project in [www.philipmshane.ca](http://www.philipmshane.ca) and also in Cantower XXIV, “Infesting History with Hodology.” Distinct titles cease in the present list after Cantower LXV, so Cantowers LXVI-LXXXI have the single title, “Explanatory Heuristic Fantasy and the General Logic of Expression.” I would note, in particular, that the twist of self-reference, raised in note 63 below, must be rendered relatively luminous through pointing and pointed symbolisations. But the symbolisations have to be contextualised within broader and startling transformations of linguistic reference rooted in Lonergan’s suggestion regarding linguistic feedback. This will involve a new grammar and grammatology, with parts of speech identified incarnately and the interrogative adjectives and adverbs heart-centred. Note 56 below indicates a more proximate related task.

<sup>36</sup> Husserl’s 1882 thesis is not readily available in Canada. My copy is a French translation: *Contribution à la théorie du calcul des variations*, ed. J. Vauthier (Kingston: Queen’s U, 1983). Chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, “The Calculus of Variation,” deals with it, and draws an analogy with the calculus of variation that is functional specialization.

Principle of Least Action,<sup>37</sup> needs creative revisiting to lift the burden of Copenhagen's hermeneutics of measurement. We are back with Bell and forward with Mead "Does Quantum Mechanics carry the seeds of its own destruction?"<sup>38</sup> I would say so, but would wish us to cut deeper into self-taste than my fellow-Ulsterman Bell, with nudges from Feynman.<sup>39</sup> Mead sets a mood both of historical sensitivity and of empirical work. "Statistical quantum mechanics has never helped us understand how nature works; in fact, it actively impedes our understanding by hiding the coherent wave aspects of physical processes. It has forced us to wander seventy years in the bewilderment of 'principles' – complementarity, correspondence, and uncertainty."<sup>40</sup> "To most non-specialists, quantum mechanics is a baffling mixture of waves, statistics, and arbitrary rules, ossified in a matrix of impenetrable formalism. By using a superconductor, we can avoid the statistics, the

---

<sup>37</sup> A context here is Cornelius Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Toronto: U of Toronto Press, 1970). The principle of least action is central to the thinking of Feynman, and it hovers over his path integral approach: see his (in collaboration with A.R. Hibbs) *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965). However, he shares a common confusion regarding the objectivity of statistical correlations.

<sup>38</sup> The title of a relevant article – it is a quote from John Bell – by Kurt Gottfried, *Quantum Reflections*, ed. John Ellis and Daniele Amati (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 165-85. I would draw attention in particular to the note (168) recalling Maxwell's late reflections on the unsolved problem of the aether. One needs to lift this reflection into the context of a self-tasting of the empirical residue, lifted into an up-to-date perspective on energy and entropy. See also the references to Maxwell's work in the book by Mead referred to in the footnote after the next.

<sup>39</sup> I recommend here J. S. Bell, *Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics: Collected Papers on Quantum Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987) and R. Feynman's various writings on the Principle of Least Action and the path integral approach to quantum phenomena (see note 37 above). In particular I would recall Bell's refusal to settle for a distinction between the macromasurer and the measured: this refusal calls for a nuanced development of heuristics and heuristic expressions, a topic of Cantowers LXVI-LXXXI. See note 35 above.

<sup>40</sup> Carver A. Mead, *Collective Electrodynamics: Quantum Foundations of Electromagnetism* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000), 123.

rules, and the formalism, and work directly with the waves.”<sup>41</sup> But the deeper, self-tasting, cutting is the circular sawing spelled out for mathematics by Quinn: so we edge back, and forward, to deeper biography, better history, richer system.

I first tackled the question of biography and history in the 1970s, in “Authentic Subjectivity and International Growth,” but it recently took on for me the complexity of a positional narrative expression belonging in the discomfiting exercise described on page 250 of *Method in Theology*.<sup>42</sup> It lifts the question of one’s orientations into a “here I stand” that is not just a catalogue of conversions but a clash of persons in history. I have used occasionally what seems a helpful image of the tennis player that self-searches, generating a sequence of systematic orientation that mediate the seasons and the clashing and colluding with colleagues.<sup>43</sup>

The question of biography has preoccupied Mathews for decades. He is obviously driven by his searching of Lonergan’s life, but no doubt also by his own self-searching. He modestly suggests that “it is a question which I believe students of Lonergan need to address”<sup>44</sup> and goes on to draw attention to genetic method.<sup>45</sup> And it is genetic method that occupies center stage when we enlarge our interest into history.

So I move from the issue of biography to history and to the fuller context that concerns Fr Doran, history and system. Doran’s key point is “that there is at hand an adequate unified

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>42</sup> For some details of the discomfiting challenge see Cantower VIII, “Slopes: An Encounter,”; Cantower XI, “Lonergan: Interpretation and History” Cantower XXII, “Lonergan and the Ministry of Mayhem”; and Cantower XXV, “Redoubt Method 250.”

<sup>43</sup> The issue is placed in a fuller context in Cantower VII: “Systematics and General Systems Theory.”

<sup>44</sup> Mathews, 206. See also Mathews, 218, that students of Lonergan need to do what Arendt and MacIntyre suggest regarding life design and story. My pause over Mathews’ contribution pushes against the necessary brevity of my response, because he is raising a vital issue. We have to get beyond simple identifications of conversions to clashing genetic systems of systems and their concomitant narratives. This adds layers of complexities to the questions raised by Doran, quite definitely beyond brief comment.

<sup>45</sup> Mathews, 207ff.

field structure for the functional specialty Systematics.”<sup>46</sup> Here I would pause on the word “for.” The functional specialty systematics, if we follow the clues from biography, is a higher genetic unity of a sequence of unified (integrative-operative) field-structurings.<sup>47</sup> Any one structure is “for” the genetic sequence, poising it for the next.<sup>48</sup> The unified structure that Doran selects – very soundly I would claim – is Lonergan’s 4-point integral perspective on trinitarian participations.<sup>49</sup> Rightly, Doran wishes this to mesh with the special categorical suggestions of *Method in Theology*, and here he runs into difficulties. His unified field structure seeks to subsume systematics; mine locates it within systematics, “for” systematics. An integral theology is a system within genetic

---

<sup>46</sup> Doran, 264.

<sup>47</sup> I think that Lonergan’s efforts to give a fundamental meaning to the word “field” is significant. See my comment at the conclusion to the “Index-Introduction” of *CWL 18* (382), and the index there under “Field.” It helps to lift us out of a Scotist or “Aristotelianist” tendency to misconceive real relations – in opposition to the heuristic of chapter 16 of *Insight*. For instance, in the present case of the four graces, those graces have internal to them the rich reality of a netting of the total cosmic word: here we again come up against the problem of generating a symbolisation that would keep us humble and honest. Paradoxically, such an effort, lifting considerations of Divine Incarnation and revelation out of naivete and into the full heuristic of emergent probability, would lift the dialogue advocated by *Theological Studies* 64 (June, 2003) (the topic in this issue is “The Catholic Church and Other Living Faiths in Comparative Perspective”) to a richer level, perhaps, recalling Whitson’s title, to a *Coming Convergence of World Religions*.

<sup>48</sup> One must continue to think out the tennis analogue. The player in the field-of-being is concrete history (with its minders) in a mediation of the poise towards and achievement of the probable actual performances. The player is to “know” this in the third stage of meaning through the shared upper context of W3. An earlier useful struggle with this is “Systematics, Communications, Actual Contexts,” *Lonergan Workshop 7*, ed. Frederick G. Lawrence (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 143-74.

<sup>49</sup> Obviously W3 brings out one aspect of the new slice of systematic theology, with the processions considered in reverse, a stress on Calling instead of Speaking, and on a presence of the Spirant (not unrelated to the Joycean symbolism of the ant and the gracehoper) scavenging, testing, “testifying of me” (John 15: 26). For a fuller context of the challenge to contemplation here, especially in relation to the central grace of the Incarnation, see *The Redress of Poise*, chapter 7: “Grace: The Final Frontier” (available on [www.philipmcschane.ca](http://www.philipmcschane.ca)).

systematics, with ancestors and descendants. So, Lonergan's 4-point perspective has antecedents in previous attempts to correlate such realities and, hopefully, will have rich descendants.<sup>50</sup>

But that richness is to have its heuristic psyche-filling privacy: "proceeding by our imagination we arrive at the Palestine of two thousand years ago"<sup>51</sup> and reach an ever more haunting Birdflight, an ever-richer homeward of the Word.<sup>52</sup> And the psyche-filled privacy must be cajoled, pummelled, supported, by a public control of meaning that is luminous in regarding, self-tasting, the psyche as neurodynamic. The narrative flowering of genetic systematics is less than a bud, and the bud is neurochemical.<sup>53</sup>

### 3. Caller

We were enclosed,  
O eternal Father,  
Within the garden of your breast.  
You drew us out of your holy mind

---

<sup>50</sup> The richer heuristic shuffles the five sets of special categories into a new layered dynamic: but that, as Fr Doran would agree, is matter for a book, not a footnote. The shuffle would draw on the riches of Thomas' *Summa*, especially qq. 26-43 of the First Part and the beginning of the Third Part, and of Lonergan's Latin treatises, and spiral them into a new context.

<sup>51</sup> *CWL* 7, 31. The reach is not to be piously abstractive but wholesomely concrete, within the total word of history, integrally-heuristically structured, a wordway filled with the human journey into theoria. What is needed here is an enrichment of our grip on the universal operative reach of the human God, "in the stars the glory of his eyes," where the stars are soaked in GUTS. Merge this reflection with the comment at the conclusion of note 47, above, and with the direction of note 27.

<sup>52</sup> I am translating quite loosely (and reversing conventional processional order) from Lonergan, *De Deo Trino: Pars Systematica*, 256 (top). Add the context of note 27 above.

<sup>53</sup> The final section will draw attention to aspects of this problematic. But it is as well to point here to two key texts. There is the text of *CWL* 3 (489), which reminds us that "the study of the organism begins ..." (and the self-study of the human organism begins ...). There is the text of *Method* (287) that asks us to rethink and rewrite the first half of *Method*: "one can go on ..." All this calls for the massive development of heuristics and symbolisms already mentioned in note 35 above.

Like a flower.<sup>54</sup>

The drawing out is our tuned collaboration with history and the heart of the tuning is to be luminous education. My readers may find it strange that I will gather so many of the contributions to the volume under this final heading that relates to drawing, education, hope. At least it intimates that remembering the future is a desperate present need, and most of that remembering is a matter of fresh fantasies of education, all, I would say, demanding the context of functional specialization.

The contributions of Novak, Martin, and Anderson all relate to the challenge of economic education to which Lonergan devoted twenty years of his life. However, while Novak simply reminisces, Martin and Anderson struggle with the deep cultural task, one that merges Lonergan's two great achievements. There is no point in focusing further on this, and at all event what is said below, meshed with the suggestions of Anderson and Martin, places the task in a larger context.

Melchin's article helps to sense a direction here: if one is to teach about evolution one must talk about rabbits and buttercups. If one is to talk about property one cannot talk educatively without the property being on streets, minded by people with banks and documents. Melchin edges nicely round a whole new ballpark of pitching gently upwards to rise to a level of complex democratic control of meaning. It is a distant goal – the mixing of metaphors cries out for new talk – but it starts in the local yard.

And the cry for new talk is lurking in all three of the contributions by Barden, Dunne, and Zanardi. Barden and I lost a naivete at the Lonergan Florida Conference of 1970: whatever that conference was about, it did not pivot on the challenge Barden handles so neatly in the present article. Nor was it a fermenting forward in the mood of the contributions of Zanardi and Dunne. And the discomfiting doctrine that I dare mention in this polite company is that the mood of Lonergan

---

<sup>54</sup> Hirshfield, 117, from Prayer 20 of Catherine of Sienna (1347-1380), translated by Suzanne Noffke O.P. Note that the imaging I suggest in W3 (see note 1 above) is a scavenging drawing of seed to word-petaled adopted flowering.

studies is closer at present to Florida than to fermentation. One can forgive Florida for not tuning into self-tasting functional specialization, Lonergan's fundamental discovery: but present dodging of the global and the textual nudging in that direction is unforgivable – invincible ignorance is out as an excuse.

So I come to the last but not the least of the contributors: Fr Fred Crowe. As we shall see, he manages to home in nicely on the key topic.<sup>55</sup> But first, a preliminary point regarding the puzzle, MTWTFSS. The puzzle was never used by me, as the editor pointed out to Fr Crowe. Fred quite understandably decided to leave the article stand: how many of us, at his grand age, would even write an article? And oddly, providentially, his twist on McShane's puzzle opens up issues of the dynamic of hope that help me think through – efficiently, unifyingly – our present efforts and my response.

The puzzle that I think Fred is referring to is the challenge of continuing OTTFSS ...

Its presentation requires the good-humoured addition of terms, sometimes up to more than 50 of them. The slow addition echoes the deeper problem of starting in, and staying

---

<sup>55</sup> Fr Crowe rightly and regularly (Crowe, 188) appeals to the *Cogitativa*, and it nudges me to a comment on our communal failing especially in the decades since *Method*. It just happened that I was forced to face the problem of an explanatory heuristic of the *Cogitativa* through work on an estimative sense in such diverse authors as Seamus Heaney (see note 48 of Cantower VIII) and V. S. Ramachandran (the same place: also the first half of Cantower IX; see also at note 23 of Cantower XVII). The same point may be made about our entire vocabulary of "elements of meaning," moving up through "phantasm," "feelings," "what-question," etc. This is a huge task, the challenge of being more than "a little breathless and a little late" (*CWL* 3, 755) fifty years after those words were typed by Lonergan. One might get a sense of the challenge by the adventure of such a book as Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind* (Berkeley: U of California Press, 1998). Fr Crowe expresses our common fault when he remarks (Crowe, 192, n. 9), "From our point of view the trick is to find empirical scientists who are open to interiority and cognitional philosophy." This simply does not jibe with the later definition of generalized empirical method (*A Third Collection*, 141, top lines), which requires cognitional philosophy to become empirical. For the push of another philosophic tradition see *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 53 (2002): Dylan Evans, "The Search Hypothesis of Emotions," 497-509; Louis C. Charland "The Natural Kinds States of Emotions," 511-537.

with, the context of biography and history, of staying with and fostering a human pace. It is an axial problem.<sup>56</sup> Crowe recalls Archimedes from the first page of *Insight*. In the past two months I have made “weighing the crown in water” the centrepiece of a presentation in Ireland, Manhattan, and Mexico.<sup>57</sup> I avoided the “understandable chagrin of the audience”<sup>58</sup> by keeping a focus of fun.<sup>59</sup> No one really solved the problem: most were culturally impatient for an answer. How did *you* fare, at the bottom of that first page of *Insight*? Did you flunk it? Are you flunking the puzzle of history: an invitation to *theoria*, to idea, to the love of the invisible?

Archimedes’ presentation does not help: it is what I call axial talk: over-optimistic deductive doctrinal stuff.<sup>60</sup> Is

---

<sup>56</sup> This relates to an optimism regarding reasoning which my Archimedean reflections, mentioned shortly, seek to undermine. Is Thomas part of that optimistic stream? A substantial specialist problem. In *Summa Theologica*, q. 79, a. 8, he describes reasoning thus: “rationcinari est procedere do uno intellecto ad aliud.” He doesn’t like the view of de Spiritu et Anima, a book he considers of slim authority (ad 1m): my Marietti *Summa* shows him attributing it to an anonymous Cistercian, but this edition mentions Alcherum (died 1169) in a note to q.77 a.8. I rather like the division of ratio from intellectus in that odd work, without denying the identity of ratio (aa. 8, 9 in Thomas): human reasoning is a messing along in the neuromolecular.

<sup>57</sup> To be published in *Divyadaan: Journal of Education and Philosophy* 15 (2004), under the title “The Wonders of Water: The Future of Lonergan’s Thought.”

<sup>58</sup> Crowe, 186.

<sup>59</sup> I travelled to the lecture with a coat-hanger, two bananas for symmetrical suspending, and a glass for a one-banana dip.

<sup>60</sup> Part of my presentation was the provision beforehand of the first Postulate of Archimedes’ “On Floating Bodies,” which I reproduce here for your perusal. It is a brilliant compact expression of what for Archimedes must have been months of musing. “Let it be supposed that a fluid is of such a character that, its parts lying evenly and being continuous, that part which is thrust the less is driven along by that which is thrust the more; and that each of its parts is thrust by the fluid which is above it in a perpendicular direction if the fluid be sunk in anything and compressed by anything else.” (I am quoting from T. L. Heath’s translation, *The Works of Archimedes* (New York: Dover, 1987), 253.) Would you get that meaning by pondering over rivers and spherical-surfaced ponds? There follows in Archimedes’ work seven considerations, propositions, that build up to the crown-weighing possibility.

Loneragan's talk in *Insight* axial? Was Aristotle's and Aquinas'? If so, then there is need for a rescue by a new culture, a new scavenging of the spirit for internal and external words that take the heartseed gently forward within global rhythms. "Yes, we know that all nature has gone on groaning in agony together till the present moment. Not only that, but this too, we ourselves who enjoy the Spirit as a foretaste of the future, even we ourselves, keep up our inner groanings while we wait to enter upon our adoption."<sup>61</sup> The puzzle is there, in these early days of creation: how many divine dots and days need be added? Foretaste must be oh so slowly elevated to hodic self-taste for adult tracking and tuning of the cosmic word.<sup>62</sup>

So I return in conclusion to an end-remark of Sister Mary of the Savior: "**We meet in a goal:** to shift the probability-schedules of hope."<sup>63</sup> Some few surely now meet. But hope points to a distant third stage of meaning, the second time of temporal subjectivity, when a globe of theologians will remember the future as hodik that make beautifully adequate and darkly luminous the absence from the womb of history of both the Singer and the Everlasting Song ... efficiently poisoning us all towards home. "Ho hang! Hang ho! And the clash of our cries till we spring to be free."<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Romans 8: 22-23. I am using here the translation (1936) by Charles B. Williams in *The New Testament in the Language of the People* (Chicago: Moody, 1963). I am indebted here – and of course elsewhere! – to my wife Reverend Sally, who made this translation available to me. The book by Jane Hirshfield, referred to in the first note, which provided the context of women's poetry, was drawn to my attention recently by our good friend Fiona, my former wife (well, not really 'wife' in that the marriage was annulled! There's a tricky piece of Catholic theology).

<sup>62</sup> This is a challenge that carries the problem of linguistic feedback (*Method*, 88, note 34) over "The Bridge of Oxen" (see McShane, "Features of Generalized Empirical Method: A Bridge Too Far?" *Creativity and Method*, ed. Mathew Lamb (Milwaukee: Marquette UP, 1980). The section of Joyce's *Ulysses* referred to, "Oxen of the Sun," attends to a babel and a birth.

<sup>63</sup> Going, 230.

<sup>64</sup> James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, 627, at the end that is a beginning. "So soft this morning, ours. Carry me along, taddy ..." (628). But there is an evident need to move beyond patriarchal symbols (Taddy, Abba; Dad in Welsh). There are symbolisms of madre, mare, sea (see, sea, seize note 21

In mounting higher,  
The angels would press on us and aspire  
to drop some golden orb of perfect song  
Into our deep, dear silence.<sup>65</sup>

Philip McShane should be well known to you by this point in the text.

Comments on this article can be sent to  
jmnda@mun.ca.

---

above). “Skin-within are molecules of cosmic all, cauled, calling. The rill of her mouth can become the thrill, the trill, of a life-time, the word made fresh. Might we inspire and expire with the lungs of history? But the hole story is you and I, with and within global humanity, upsetting Love’s Sweet Mystery into a new mouthing, an anastomotic spiral way of birthing better the buds of mother” (the conclusion of chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*).

<sup>65</sup> Elizabeth Barrett Browning (1806-1861), extract from *Sonnets from the Portuguese*, XXII.