

Editor's Introduction

James Duffy

This is the second volume of dialectic exercises implementing a specific three-step procedure.¹ The eleven individuals who participated in these exercises, like those who did the exercises published in volume 13, consented to doing the three objectifications as best we could, given time limitations and other commitments.

Naturally, questions have emerged regarding the procedure. Has it been tried before?² How should texts be chosen? How much time should be set aside for each of the objectifications? How many words should be set aside? Are informal exchanges via email or on a private forum germane to the procedure? Do exchanges regarding the third and final objectification effectively lead to a fourth?

I am by no means an expert on the structure of dialectic,³ and I am of the view that we will learn as we go, i.e., that it would be foolish to expect to

¹ The procedure is suggested by Bernard Lonergan in chapter 5 of *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), 250; *Method in Theology*, vol. 14, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, ed. Robert M. Doran and John D. Damosky (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 237.

² In the Editor's Preface to *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 13 (2020), 14–15, I briefly commented on three debates: one involving Fred Lawrence and Michael Baur regarding an interview Baur had with Hans-Georg Gadamer; a second involving Jeremy Wilkins and Bob Doran regarding the claim "for every [metaphysical] term and relation there will exist a corresponding element in intentional consciousness" (*Method in Theology*, 343; CWL 14, 317); and a third involving Frederick Crowe and Patrick Brown regarding how to understand the relationship between history that is written and history that is lived. None of these debates were structured along the lines of dialectic. See also Cecilia Maloney's comments about co-authored scientific papers and her concerns about the integrity of the three-step procedure in "Assembling the Meaning of Probability," *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 13 (2020), 107–111.

³ Philip McShane named these exercises *Duffy Exercises* many months ago and started referring to them by that name in writing. See *The Future: Core Precepts in Supramolecular Method and Nanochemistry* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2019), v, n.

verify the procedure without having data or to try to come up with a set of rules to follow.⁴ That being said, after various attempts trying to do the three steps and communications with others trying to do the same, I have a view, an interpretation of the procedure. At the risk of sounding repetitive, I will provide a brief description.

In a first step (objectification), I do my best to identify my horizon in order to “position” a specific text. I identify for my fellow-inquirers, as best I can,⁵ my own poise and my “intake” of the text being assembled. In a second step I address this question: Where does my position lead, both positively and by exposing ways that simply are not efficient, not yielding cumulative and progressive results?⁶ By ‘operating on the materials’ I do my best to display the heuristics of developing positions and shrinking counter-positions. Finally, the results of the first two tasks are shared electronically or in a seminar,⁷ and they are now regarded as materials to be assembled. In this

11, 17, n. 68, 36, 50, n. 36, 51, n. 39, 96, n. 73, 109, 110, n. 46 and n. 48, and 111, n. 50. I was not in on his decision, nor was I initially tickled by it. In any case, I am a messenger and coordinator; the biochemical engineering dynamics of the three objectifications, however, are a known unknown.

⁴ “Results are progressive only if there is a sustained succession of discoveries; they are cumulative only if there is effected a synthesis of each new insight with all previous, valid insights. But neither discovery nor synthesis is at the beck and call of any set of rules. Their occurrence follows statistical laws; they can be made more probable; they cannot be assured by a set of prescriptions.” Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 6; CWL 14, 10.

⁵ Gillis describes her best-as-she-can endeavor in these words: “I have to reach and stretch and sweat and work and struggle and have patience and get frustrated and annoyed and fail and be wrong again and again and again to be able to begin to grow toward our own speaking that might faintly echo Lonergan’s ‘To speak of.’” See “The Dynamic State of Being in Love,” 28.

⁶ A positive result of implementing two-circuit economics was intimated by Lonergan in 1942. See the text Anderson cites in “The More General and Difficult Fields of Speculation,” p. 136, n. 14. Allerton identifies possible progress in the heuristics of biology resulting from an assembly of chapter 8 in “The Notion of a Thing,” 104.

⁷ “There is an advantage, then, to having a seminar on the subject. It gives people a chance to talk these things out in the evening session, to talk them out with others. ... The more you talk with one another and throw things out, simply, and frankly, not holding back in fear of making mistakes, then the more quickly you arrive at the point where you the thing cleared up.” Bernard Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, vol. 5, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, ed.

third step I read the self-expressions of others in the group and then do a final assembly identifying one or two positions that merit development, and one or two that need to be filtered out. In the exchange, I take pains to "allow [my] living to be challenged at its very roots."⁸

In the preface to volume 13, I suggested that doing this exercise in print before meeting in person at a conference or workshop could ease possible discomforts represented by the letter "s" at the end of the word *horizons*.⁹ I also claimed that the procedure is better, more effective, than simply waiting for a generation or two of professors who are not interested in asking basic questions to retire.¹⁰ That preface was a solo positioning of the procedure, and the invitation stands for others to join a group of individuals attempting the three-step procedure assembling the procedure itself.

"Proto-dialectic" might be an apt description of what we are attempting in this ongoing series of dialectic exercises. First, we are strategically skipping

Elizabeth Morelli and Mark Morelli (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 18.

⁸ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 247; CWL 14, 232. For what it is worth, McShane also wrote about the three-step "swirling dervish" (see Editor's Preface to *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 13 (2020), 6–7, n. 23) in the introduction to *Interpretation from A to Z* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2020), xiv: "You are asked to brood out your position on it [a text], to brood further towards stating where that positioning leads to in practice, then to circulate the brooding among the group. The first two are two tough tasks, tasks that reveal one's position on a heuristics of progress. But the real trouble is the third objectification. The scrutinizing of the self-scrutinizing subject is pushed to be normatively communal."

⁹ In *The Trinity in History: A Theology of the Divine Missions, Volume One: Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), Robert Doran suggests "a specialty 'horizons' would occur outside the other eight [specialties] and would have as its objective the ongoing and cumulative thematization of the normative subject ... That subject would be thematized in all its concrete dimensions, no matter how many so-called 'levels' of consciousness states and operations that might eventually entail." 112–113. I see no reason to invent a ninth speciality. What Doran writes regarding the objectification of 'the mediating subject' and 'the normative subject' is the first step (objectification) for bringing a lack of unity out into the open, "an objectification of subjectivity in the style of a crucial experiment." *Method in Theology*, 253; CWL 14, 237.

¹⁰ In Zanardi's third objectification ("The Ontological Structure of the Hermeneutical Circle," 127), he writes that characters oriented towards growth choose to attempt the procedure. See also "The More General and Difficult Fields of Speculation," 150, n. 75.

over tasks that are, quite frankly, beyond us. These tasks are named *Completion, Comparison, Reduction, Classification, and Selection*.¹¹ Secondly, the word-limits imposed for publishing these exercises in a journal are somewhat arbitrary. Any of the three steps (objectifications) could easily be a long essay if not a book. Finally, to varying degrees individuals who have consented to implementing the procedure are aware that “the objectification of subjectivity in the style of the crucial experiment” is not an easy task. It is one thing to dance *with* a star; it is another to dance *as* one.

Spontaneous Performance

A few months ago I suggested to colleagues, only half-kiddingly, that we draft first objectifications in a sandbox using our nondominant hand, minimizing footnotes and name-dropping unless relevant. The idea was, still is, not to overthink the procedure but to do it as “spontaneously, simply, frankly”¹² as possible. Easier said than done, eh. Picasso once said, “It took me four years to paint like Raphael, but a lifetime to paint like a child.”

Certainly doing dialectic must be something more respectable than getting into a sandbox and writing with my nondominant hand? For those just trying to survive graduate school or tenure review, that is not an option, unless they cunningly figure out how to live a kind of double life, achieving passing marks¹³ and getting published by day, and asking “some basic

¹¹ *Comparison* has a precise technical meaning that is not practiced in most academic disciplines. What is compared is not Alfie with Betty, but the achievement of either one with “the *acquis*, what has been settled, what no one has any doubt about at the present time.” See note 34 below. I find it helpful to lean on analogies, such as the one I offer of Dr. House and his team interpreting an object that is a human subject in “‘MacIntyre and Lonergan’ Revisited,” *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*, 12 (2019), 90ff. *House* is an American television medical drama that takes place at fictional Princeton Plainsboro Teaching Hospital in New Jersey.

¹² See note 7 above. See also the references to spontaneity in this volume in McShane (pp. 21 and 24), Gillis (p. 28), and Lovett (p. 35) in “The Dynamic State of Being in Love”; Duffy (pp. 96–97) and Allerton (p. 100) in “The Notion of a Thing”; and Anderson (p. 134) in “The More General and Difficult Fields of Speculation.”

¹³ In the late fall of 1983, I wrote two end term essays for William Richardson S.J., who was among the first to write a comprehensive study of the philosophy of Martin Heidegger. I did not have a good feeling about the first essay, but I thought he might like the second, which he did—well enough to give me a passing mark for the seminar “The Early Heidegger.” In the second essay I steered clear of comparing Heidegger with other thinkers, avoided talk about “self-appropriation”

questions first, about others but eventually, even about themselves"¹⁴ by night. For those on the other side of tenure review, it paints a different picture of sabbaticals and retirement.¹⁵

Some basic questions occur to me rather spontaneously: Is it ever too late to recover squelched questions, too late to "shove in a fallen question"?¹⁶ What could, would it mean "to speak of a five-year-old child in a stage of meaning when the world of interiority has been made the explicit ground of the worlds of theory and of common sense"?¹⁷ Is a child a wonderboned *thing* that *develops*? Do I really need to implement symbolisms to answer that question?¹⁸ Is the word *wonderboned* acceptable in a scholarly journal? Says

pivoting on "apparently trifling problems" in math and science, and refrained from mentioning a set of basic analogous terms whose meaning develops insofar as I develop. See also references to Kant's expression "plaster cast of a man" in CWL 5, 34, n. 5, 47–48, and 264.

¹⁴ *Method in Theology*, 253; CWL 14, 238. Adventurous graduate students have a role to play in reversing counterpositions. See also what McShane writes about "the challenge of the jump" in "The Dynamic State of Being in Love," pp. 61–62.

¹⁵ A picture of possible development is painted in broad strokes in "General Education as Development of Assimilation," CWL 10, 205–207. So much depends on early formation. In addition, not everyone is in a position to take an extended sabbatical in a foreign country and learn a foreign tongue and dances (salsa, bachata, cumbia). That being said, I do not believe that living and dancing abroad are a *sine qua non* for noticing that you are not dancing as a star. The notion of development and genetic method are topics in chapter 15 of *Insight*. The contrast Lonergan draws at the end of that chapter between genetic method and mechanism, vitalism, organicism, and Kantianism (CWL 3, 504–507) suggests that genetic method is an anomaly, thus a text to be assembled in the crucible three-step procedure. See also note 18 below.

¹⁶ "Someone is taking out / a question from a question mark. / Question that flew like a chicken feather, / question that gave its body to the wind, / question that stripped naked, / question that painted the entire body, / question with a hidden face, / question that cried." Kim Hyesoon, "A Question Mark," in *Anxiety of Words: Contemporary Poetry by Korean Women*, translated by Don Mee Choi (Brookline MA: Zephyr Press, 2006), 83.

¹⁷ *Method in Theology*, 107; CWL 14, 103, substituting "child" for "the dynamic state of being in love with God." In the "The Dynamic State of Being in Love," four authors assemble the original text.

¹⁸ Clearly the study of organic development focuses on chemical and physical processes. Not so clearly, linking physiology with biochemistry and biophysics

who? Should I ask the five-year-old who lives next door?¹⁹ Has there been progress in the study of early child development or in other fields in the last 50 or 500 years?²⁰ How are we doing in these stumbling bumbling objectifications of subjectivity, our decision to take Lonergan seriously regarding how to deal with splinters, fractures, and cliques? Are we on task?²¹

requires the invention of “appropriate symbolic images of the relevant chemical and physical processes.” CWL, 3, 489.

¹⁹ It is by no means easy for me to come home to, home in on, the babbling child *Jamecito* (Spanish diminutive of “James”) and re-member what happened to my Helen Keller self. My inertial resistance to rescuing the child “that is the man at the basic level” (CWL 18, 286) is “fundamentally healthy and necessary in maintaining the existing situation.” Ibid, 290. One of the differences between acting in the musical “The Boyfriend” off-off-off-Broadway—one of the ways I survived the PhD at Fordham University in the 1990s—and acting in the drama of history, is that in the latter “there is no deliberation or choice about becoming stamped with some character.” CWL 3, 212. From the get-go of my daily crawl-arounds, later walk-arounds, and still later talk-arounds, “the materials that emerge in consciousness are already patterned, and the pattern is already charged emotionally and conatively.” Ibid.

²⁰ In an essay honoring Fr. Brendan Lovett, I wrote that progress is conspicuously cumulative and progressive in the contemporary healing sciences, and I wondered whether the trajectory of theological thought stretching from the close of Vatican II (December 8, 1965) right through the visit of the Pope to New York and Philadelphia (September 22–27, 2015) had been rooted in the option to develop realist views about doing theology in which theology means whatever happens to be done. James Duffy, “The Joy of Believing,” *Himig Ugnayan: A Theological Journal of the Institute of Formation and Religious Studies*, vol. 16 (2016), special edition, *Reshaping Christian Openness: A Festschrift for Fr. Brendan Lovett*, 221–223.

²¹ As is evident from the results of exercises in this volume, the third step, “the final objectification of horizon when the results of the foregoing process are themselves regarded as materials” (*Method in Theology*, 250; CWL 14, 235), is especially challenging, which is why it might be better to arrive to the seminar or workshop after having drafted third objectifications. See note 7 above, also note 21 in the Editor’s Preface to *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*, 13 (2020), 6.

Have there been failures?²² Have we been schooled?²³ What might be done to joyfully bring about “some third way”²⁴ to collaboratively give Lupita the time of her life, her mother's life, all life?²⁵

The master of method advises that basic questions be answered not haphazardly, but in a structured way following a specific procedure. Was it too much to ask? I do not believe so. Doing dialectic is the crux of the crux of the matter—whether you call the matter *telling little ones the story of everything, elegantly engineering history and her-story*, or simply *leaving the campsite tidier than you found it* (a Boy Scout imperative). If your position is that progress is out of the question, that you and the rest of humanity are floundering, just messing around between good times and bad times, and that the meaning of *tidier* is completely up for grabs, there is no good reason to risk self-exposure while doing the three-step dance. Then again, there would be no good reason to get out of bed in the morning. I cannot walk without going somewhere, even if I do not think of the end in every step I take.²⁶

²² In “The Ontological Structure of the Hermeneutic Circle,” Shoppa and Zanardi do their best to position an excerpt of a review that Jeremy Wilkins wrote of Fred Lawrence's *The Fragility of Conversation: Faith, Reason, and the Human Good*, ed. Randall Rosenberg and Kevin Vander Schel (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017). Zanardi, in his third objectification, writes about the possibility of reviewing becoming “a series of operations attuned to failures to develop and designed to reverse those failures.” “The Ontological Structure of the Hermeneutic Circle,” 127. In note 48 below I identify a notable failure.

²³ “Why is it that the original philosopher does not bring about a universal and permanent difference in the history of philosophy? Why does he merely found a school? Why does even the school that he founds splinter and become decadent and undergo renewals and revivals?” CWL 18, 285.

²⁴ In the first paragraph of *Method in Theology* (CWL 14, 8), Lonergan takes the position that neither the analogy of science—which assigns human sciences a “lower rank in the pecking order”—nor the lack of masters in the less successful subjects, is methodologically apt, i.e., an adequate “channel” for thinking about method. So, he writes, “some third way, then, must be found and, even though it is difficult and laborious, that price must be paid if the less successful subject is not to remain a mediocrity or slip into decadence and desuetude.” Ibid.

²⁵ I referred to little Lupita in “The Story of Everything,” *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*, 13 (2020), pp. 1–3.

²⁶ See *Summa theologiae* I-II, q. 1, a. 6, ad. 3.

Be Encouraged

I get out of bed each morning in hopes that in good time “good will” will will “the order of the universe, and so will with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.”²⁷ How do we get there? Is an end-run around dialectic possible? Certainly an end-run is possible, indeed actual,²⁸ but not desirable if we would like to leave the campsite cleaner than we found it, intervening effectively in unsustainable and unlivable situations at a critical moment,²⁹ an “age of dysfunction.”³⁰

What’s needed to intervene in climate crisis and others is a leap in probabilities from a product of fractions pqr to something like a sum $p+q+r$.³¹ What’s needed is an ass-kicking, horse-kicking Poisson event coupled with a slow shift from Poisson distribution to something like a normal distribution.³² The important thing is to make a humble, effective beginning instead of simply waiting for a generation of professors to retire. It is possible for those

²⁷ CWL 3, 722.

²⁸ See note 31 in the Editor’s Preface to *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*, 13 (2020), 9.

²⁹ Various intertwined crises—ecological, economic, and political—are crying out for a fundamental and momentous change in human history. As one of my sisters quipped, “The pandemic is just the tip of the iceberg.” The marches throughout the US after the brutal murder of George Floyd last May were a concerted “Enough!” Folks of different ages and ethnicities are wondering what might be done to transform structural evil.

³⁰ Professor Jeremy Wilkins spoke about “Politics and The Cross: Friendship and Responsibility in an Age of Dysfunction” at Seton Hall University on October 15, 2020. His comments about readiness to endure suffering are relevant to doing dialectic, in a pointed way in the third objectification. Obviously someone can be faithful without doing dialectic; theologians cannot, however, mediate between a cultural matrix and the significance of religious faith in that matrix (see note 43 below) without a sub-group “developing positions, reversing counterpositions, and presenting an idealized version of the past, something better than was the reality.” *Method in Theology*, 251; CWL 14, 236.

³¹ See “Assembling the Meaning of Probability,” *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*, 13 (2020), p. 5, n. 5 and p. 7, n. 8.

³² In 1898 a fellow named Ladislaus Bortkiewicz used the Poisson distribution to study the distribution of 122 men kicked to death by horses among ten Prussian army corps over 20 years. To ask “why” about the observed frequencies of deaths could mean to ask about the causes of each death or about the form of the distribution of deaths. Cf. Philip McShane, *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence* (Dublin, Gill and MacMillan, 1970), 94–95.

in the trenches of teaching high school, undergraduate, or graduate sociology, political science, linguistics, anthropology, psychology, history, philosophy or theology to implement simple heuristics to keep themselves and their students humble and honest about things great and small.³³

There is no shame in acknowledging how shabby our situation is vis-à-vis “doing a big thing”³⁴—or even a little thing—to effectively intervene in the mess, the longer cycle of decline that is squelching precious whattings and whyings,³⁵ a concrete historical process that has given rise to structural evils, chemical deficiencies, and craziness.³⁶ Doing a big thing is quite something—“one has to be familiar with what is called the *acquis*, what has been settled, what no one has any doubt about at the present time.”³⁷ It is possible to do a little thing by asking ourselves, our students, and our colleagues basic questions and ceasing with scholarly comparisons of Alfie with Betty in “highly specialized monographs.”³⁸

Efficient and beautiful words about the bones of children, dynamic states of body constituents, and the biochemistry of authentic decision-making lie in the future, somewhere over the rainbow,³⁹ when the anatomy and

³³ Quinn offers suggestive symbolism for talking about common sense in “The Heuristic Notions of Space and Time,” 83 and 84. See also “Words, Diagrams, Heuristics,” the seventh essay in the series “Lonergan Gatherings,” available at: <https://itesm.academia.edu/JamesGerardDuffy>.

³⁴ “You can have teamwork insofar, first of all, as the fact of reciprocal dependence is understood and appreciated. Not only is that understanding required; one has to be familiar with what is called the *acquis*, what has been settled, what no one has any doubt about at the present time. You’re doing a big thing when you can upset that, but you have to know where things stand at the present time, what has already been achieved, to be able to see what is new in its novelty as a consequence.” Bernard Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method 1*, vol. 22, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Robert Doran and Robert Croken (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 462.

³⁵ See also what Zanardi writes about disruptive questions in “The Ontological Structure of the Hermeneutic Circle,” 117 and 121, and what Anderson writes about innovation as the most significant destabilizing factor of an economy “The More General and Difficult Fields of Speculation,” 138.

³⁶ See note 10 in the Editor’s Preface to *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 13 (2020), 2.

³⁷ See note 34 above.

³⁸ CWL 3, 604. See also note 48 below.

³⁹ The dream of a never-never land of differentiated speaking (see last paragraph of *Method in Theology*, 99; CWL 14, 95) in a third stage of meaning is

physiology of intramembranous and endochondral ossification are integrated in total child-out childcare.⁴⁰ The humble task before one and all is to lay cards, diagrams, and heuristics on the table, face up. “Insofar as you are doing that, you are heightening the action of the dialectic that produces the unsatisfactory situations as manifestations of unsatisfactory minds.”⁴¹

Mediating Displacement

The three-step procedure is to make displacement⁴² a topic for those with the vocation to mediate “between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of” hooking up⁴³ in that matrix. Normally a displacement towards loving both nearest and next-door neighbors⁴⁴ is a slow movement away from

echoed by Gillis in her first objectification where she writes about a speaking about speaking puzzle. See “The Dynamic State of Being in Love,” 126–27.

⁴⁰ The phrase “child-out” refers both to those caring and those cared for. When teaching teenagers anatomy and physiology, I am teaching teenagers teenagers and remembering how I learned as a youngster. See the “Note to Teachers and Students” in J. Benton, A. Drage, and P. McShane, *Introducing Critical Thinking* (Nova Scotia: Axial Publishing, 2005), i, and note 16 above. On the integration of health sciences into something “higher,” see the text cited in the middle of note 24.

⁴¹ CWL 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 307–08.

⁴² The dynamic of asking basic questions “first about others but eventually, even about themselves [ourselves], will make conversion a topic and thereby promote it.” *Method in Theology*, 253; CWL 14, 238. I prefer the word *displacement* to *conversion* for a couple of reasons. First, there is an exercise involving displacement on the first page of the first chapter of *Insight* (CWL 3, 27). Taking the time to do that exercise—or others in chapter one—can displace you or me towards craving explanatory understanding and implicit definitions, as well as towards appreciating convenient symbolism. Secondly, talk about intellectual, moral, and religious conversion that is not craving explanatory understanding and does not acknowledge the significance of convenient symbols is vulnerable to general bias and misleading. When such deceit occurs and recurs for a generation or two, “the words are repeated, but the meaning is gone.” *Method in Theology*, 80; CWL 14, 78. See also note 46 below and “The More General and Difficult Fields of Speculation,” p. 150, n. 81.

⁴³ The Spanish *ligar* (from the Latin *ligare*) means to bind, to tie up, or, for most Mexican youth, to hook up. The prior quote is from *Method in Theology*, xi; CWL 14, 3.

⁴⁴ Aquinas held that one person’s love for another person is mediated by loving the person’s nearest neighbor (self-love). Cf *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 25, a. 4, c.; *Summa contra gentiles* III, 153; *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*, Bk. III, d. 29, a. 3, ad. 3.

inauthentic behavior, which is a question-begging phrase, as authenticity is in the eye of the beholder. "Everybody has de facto some mode of thinking, and if yours justifies your horizon, his justifies his equally well."⁴⁵ Self-justifying individuals cluster to form self-justifying groups, clubs, societies, and schools that meet once a year to talk to one another and publish their proceedings in one or other self-justifying journal. "The sacred name of science may still be invoked but, as Edmund Husserl has argued, all significant scientific ideals can vanish to become the convention of a clique."⁴⁶ Is it we, the fumbling bumbling individuals doing shabby self-exposures in these exercises? Should we cease with the shenanigans and let history run its course?

The dialectic exercise is a crawl forward, not silence—which does not work when couples disagree—but an openness to ask basic questions, "to move beyond dialogue to dialectic, to transpose issues from a conflict of statements to an encounter of persons,"⁴⁷ to reach for a more perfect procession, a glorious parade, a fantastic fusion, *eo magis unum*.⁴⁸ "Hello, Domino's pizza, may I take your order please?" "Yes, a large pizza to go." "And what would you like on that?" "Make me one with all, please."

The Essays in Volume 14

"Moving Towards JMDA Volume 14"

This essay was written by McShane in May of 2020 to encourage the various individuals doing the dialectic exercises published in this volume. That was his primary audience, although he hoped his message about "effective engineering" would reach others.

⁴⁵ CWL 18, 312.

⁴⁶ *Method in Theology*, 80; CWL 14, 78.

⁴⁷ "Natural Right and Historical Mindedness," *A Third Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan*, ed. F.E. Crowe. New (York: Paulist Press, 1985), 182; CWL 16, 175.

⁴⁸ In *Verbum* Lonergan cites Aquinas: "*quanto perfectius procedit, tanto magis est unum cum eo a quo procedit*" (the more perfectly it [what proceeds interiorly] proceeds, the more it will be one with that from which it proceeds), CWL 2, 206; *Summa theologiae*, I, q. 27, a. 1, ad. 2. Fusing reaches a highpoint in the second canon of methodical hermeneutics, when somehow (i) the genetic emergence of insights; (ii) the development of positions and shifting around of counterpositions; and (iii) the emergence of differentiated and specialized expressions "fuse into a single explanation." CWL 3, 610. Disregarding this reach for a highpoint is a noteworthy example of an embarrassing failure (see note 22 above) of so-called disciples of Lonergan.

The “comically obvious” point of this essay pivots on possible discussions between colleagues Dick and Mary, who share the same paradigm in one or other difficult field, and what happens when a third person, Tom, who is a curious onlooker, joins the discussion. McShane notes that the purpose of doing these exercises is for Tom to meet Tom in a new, possibly discomforting way, while discussing matters with Dick and Mary, who are also meeting themselves. McShane also notes that you will not find evidence of the three-step procedure in New Testament authors reviewing Old Testament authors, nor in Aquinas reviewing Aristotle.

The challenge in reading McShane is identifying my place at a gathering where Tom, Dick, and Mary are talking about what results from their view. Dick and Mary are able to speak about “Modular Forms, Elliptic Curves, and Galois Representation” while Tom has an impressive list of publications on postmodern architecture and literature. Obviously they have, inhabit different horizons, and what results from their dinner conversation will likely go off in different directions. The task of dialectic requires those speaking about modular forms and elliptic curves to be in “the more difficult fields of speculation.”⁴⁹

The Five Exercises

In the first exercise, four authors position a line from chapter 4 of *Method in Theology*: “To speak of the dynamic state of being in love with God pertains to the stage of meaning when the world of interiority has been made the explicit ground of the worlds of theory and of common sense.”⁵⁰ Unlike the other texts assembled in volume 14, this text is from a work on theological method. One thing to note, which the four authors touch upon in different ways, is that it is *speaking* (to speak of), not a *dynamic state* (being in love), that pertains to a stage of meaning when one world will be the explicit ground of two others. How might speaking in an earlier or later “stage of meaning” help (or hinder) those for whom “being-in-love with God sounds cool and biblical and all”?⁵¹

The second exercise focuses on a paragraph from chapter 5 “Space and Time” of *Insight*,⁵² where Lonergan makes the startling claim that directing his attention to the puzzling notions of space and time “form a natural bridge over which we may advance from our examination of science to an

⁴⁹ CWL 21, 20, line 33.

⁵⁰ *Method in Theology*, 108, CWL 14, 103.

⁵¹ Whalon, “The Dynamic State of Being in Love,” 45.

⁵² CWL 3, 163–195.

examination of common sense."⁵³ Three authors come at the text from different horizons in search of one or two good things leading to progress. One of them, Quinn, claims Lonergan got things right in the chapter, and invites us to consent to the puzzling notions.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, two of the three authors involved in the third exercise focusing on the heuristic notion of thing discussed in the eighth chapter of *Insight* had to bow out. What appears in this volume is a solo effort, followed by a third objectification by a colleague in the field. In her solo effort Allerton focuses on the "dance" of *Daphnia*—one of the several small aquatic crustaceans commonly called water fleas. As part of her research, she collected samples in watersheds of Southern Ontario and later studied them in the lab, in vitro. She invites us to accept the text being assembled in such a way that it elevates our talk about and study of things.

In the fourth exercise, two authors, Zanardi and Shoppa, assemble a book review and, in their third objectifications, ask pointed questions about the tradition of reviewing books. Their focus is a particular passage from Jeremy Wilkins' review⁵⁴ of Fred Lawrence's book *The Fragility of Consciousness*⁵⁵ where Wilkins asks Lawrence to say more about his suggestion that the functional specialties thematize "the ontological structure of the hermeneutic circle."⁵⁶ This exercise is an experiment in trying to fill out, or fill in, what was left unstated. In the third objectification the authors describe means for "reviewing" that include the strategy of self-revelatory objectifications that Lonergan prescribes in his brief description of the three steps—"a procedure for 'purging' diseased residues that interfered with the pure cycle he described in 1934."⁵⁷ In an Afterword to the fourth exercise, McShane imagines Lonergan reviewing the works of his disciples in 1984.

In the fifth exercise two authors assemble two paragraphs from *For a New Political Economy*. The two paragraphs, written in 1942, are dense and

⁵³ CWL 3, 163.

⁵⁴ "The Fragility of Conversation: Consciousness and Self-Understanding in Post/Modern Culture," *The Heythrop Journal*, volume LIX (2018), 832-847.

⁵⁵ Frederick G. Lawrence, *The Fragility of Consciousness: Faith, Reason, and the Human Good* (ed. Randall S. Rosenberg and Kevin M. Vander Schel; Toronto: University of Toronto, 2017),

⁵⁶ Lawrence, *Fragility of Consciousness*, xii.

⁵⁷ "The Ontological Structure of the Hermeneutic Circle," 126. The reference is to "human action transforming the sensible data of life" in Michael Shute, *Lonergan's Early Economic Research: Texts and Commentary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 20.

compendious. McShane positions Lonergan's meaning of "speculation" at the time, lining it up genetically with both earlier and later meanings, and notes that lining up meanings thusly is what is asked of us to reach for the genetic control of meaning implicit in the canons of hermeneutics. Anderson zeroes in on how progress begs the question "How does an economy actually work?" and identifies important functions and parts of a standard model in economics. He mentions a few aspects of the claim that the study of economics should be *locally oriented, empirically rich, and normatively focused*, a claim McShane makes at the end of his editor's introduction to *For a New Political Economy*.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ CWL 21, xxxi.

