

Yesterday, October 5th 2011, someone I spoke to was surprised when I mentioned that I was brooding over the second set of seminars and contemplating the content of the seminars and this essay. Why this early start on the back-up to the ninth seminar? Because it becomes increasingly evident to me that we need now to cultivate the contemplative mood of that seminar and the seminars to follow: I can't just spring it on the seminar participants in January 2013. Not that the mood is foreign to our struggling group. But it is as well both to air its dynamic at this stage in our first cycle of seminars, and also to give a glimpse of the second cycle.¹

The focus of seminars 9-16, of course, is on Trinitarian theology, and it is a contemplative focus, which for me is equivalent to intellectualism. Later, in 2012, and in the seminars 9-16, we can muse together more precisely over that equivalence, but for the moment I must juggle with the task of sorting out some contexts, not logically, but pedagogically and indeed attractively. I have gathered abundant notes for this beginning and feel now the pressure of "the inception of a far larger work."² I am obviously quoting the beginning of the Epilogue of *Insight* and in this way getting some control of that pressure, in

¹I anticipate that I will go into more detail regarding the seminar topics in a following FuSe 31A. My seminar members can expect that I will not be following the path taken in the first seminar, of suggesting anomalies to be investigated, where most of these anomalies were neglected pointers in *Insight*. The sweep of interest will be much broader there, but always cherishing the core – and developable! – **W₃**, the missing *acquis* that is my topic in this essay. Some other preliminary pointers seem in order. First, **W₃** is quite evidently both functional specialist and Christian. What, then, of Crowe's point, echoing comments of Lonergan, regarding the non-need of faith in the first four specialties? (Crowe's point is made in *Christ in History*, St. Paul's University Press, Ottawa, 2005, page 27). My considerations are of a mature theistic science, possibly of a later millennium. Secular functional work, such as Sean McNellis' excellent doctorate, *Cyclic Functional Collaboration: A Scientific Application to Housing*, becomes data for functional research and a source of positive anomalies. What might claim to be luminously-positioned atheism, though a source for anomalies, will have no place in the cyclic science. A second point, from that same page 27 in Crowe's work, regards Christian affectivity, where Crowe mentions in particular Lonergan's efforts in "Finality, Love Marriage" (CWL 4). There is much more collaborative work to be done here to make Lonergan's stand coherent by rescuing his final pages there from ancient disorientations. Another large disorientation of affectivity is considered in note 29 below.

² *Insight*, 754. It is too early to be raising any subtle questions about this larger work. Lonergan wrote of it in that sad letter of July 23, 1952 (see Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publications, 2010, 156, for a copy of the letter to Eric O'Connor) as *Insight and Faith*. My effort here is to draw attention to the existential demands of that delicate balance for those who seek serious understanding in any zone (See *Insight*, 442. Line 7-8): the challenge is to be met contemplatively.

that you and I already have common printed contexts which we hold dear at various personal levels and can come to cherish further contemplatively in these seminars.

And that cherishing will be the seed, sown by Lonergan, breaking its way into sunlight. I looked back bemusedly at his optimism expressed at the end of the *Verbum* articles. “If that is correct, I have reached my objective.”³ If **what** is correct? “It seems to me that intellectualism, if once it gains a foothold, never will be dislodged from the interpretation of Thomist Trinitarian theory.”⁴ For Lonergan, that “intellectualism of St. Thomas shines as unmistakably as the sun on the noonday summer hills of Italy.”⁵ It is my positional stand, as we putter forward in the present 4th seminar on dialectic, that there is as yet no communal shining.⁶

I see no point in enlarging on that at present. It is, after all, the claim of the final three chapters of *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*:⁷ the Epilogue there homes in on the topic of the far larger work, the Afterward of the Preface gives glimpses of the distant vision of Lonergan’s hope,⁸ and the conclusion to Part Two gives a metagram “W₃ : A Heuristic of Lonergan’s Perspective”⁹ that invites us to “fuse all into a single explanation.”¹⁰ It seems to me best, rather, to recall the integral **Mantra** that blossomed out of that metagram during the third seminar and that captures my invitation and my intellectualism. So I quote a work completed at the beginning of this October.

“W₃ is the third of my series of Metawords that are necessary to hold the Standard Model together. On this necessity see *CWL* 7, 151: “if we want a comprehensive grasp of

³ *Verbum*, *CWL* 2, 226.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ As I write this my colleagues in the seminar, following the invitation of FuSe 17A, are venturing into an expression of their own positionings. The key issue is the absence of the **acquis** that goes with what I call **theoretic conversion**, a seriousness regarding **whattng**. More about this as we go along here, and in seminars 5ff.

⁷ Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, Axial Publications, 2010, 166-204. To be referred to later simply by boldfaced title.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 11-15.

⁹ The title over the metagram on paged 161. Page 163 presents the tower image derived from **W₃**. That page is titled “The Tower of Able: Lonergan’s Dream”

¹⁰ *Insight*, 610, line 9.

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.” In the text you notice that I am pushing for a fuller effective symbolism of the integral quest.¹¹ W_3 can be found in many places, e.g. in **Prehumous 2** on the website. The Mantra is to be central to seminars 9-16, whose focus is the special categories of Christian thinking. But is it valid for seminars 1-8 and 17-24 with **3** replaced by **n** ($n=0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$). The Final Seminar 25 will face the task of an integral eschatological perspective. At all events, I am trying to handle the pilgrim need expressed in the **Upanishads**: “Make thy body the fire-matrix, and **Om** the fire-stick, practice the drill of meditation [dhyana], then wilt thou see God, like hidden (fire)” (I quote from a De Smet translation given on pg. 249 of *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education* 22(2011), R. De Smet, “The Upanishad of Grace and Love.” The pilgrim issue is a preparatory contemplative chemicalization of a fuller post-mortem presence, meshed with a gracefully controlling inner word.”¹²

Yes, I know that the paragraph is impossibly compact: it points to the heuristic reach of 25 seminars, a reach that would hopefully be the seeding of a seven-millennia climb.¹³ Lonergan talked optimistically of an intellectualism that would not be dislodged. But now I am realistic in placing that optimism in the sadder long-term context of a much later communal shining.

¹¹The next footnote of the text referred to (see note 12 below) talks of the topic “eo magis unum”, which is treated in that magnificent chapter 11 of *Contra Gentiles* 4. So I continue here with that note to further the mood. A separate essay would be necessary to show how the slogan applies to the core contemplative enterprise about which I write in this essay. Here, then, is the note: ‘ The “eo magis unum” recalls the context of the fifth chapter of *Verbum. Word and Idea in Aquinas*, but the lift of W_3 is into the context of creation in the Word, thus a profoundly larger meaning of the phrase “fuse into a single explanation” (*Insight*, 610, line 9). The dominant first line of W_3 is “ $3P + H S f (p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; r_n)$ ” pointing to the “addition” to being - “Double You” - of the dynamics of neurochemical reality. The previous note points to the loosening of W_3 , in the Mystery of that dynamic, by replacing 3P by NP. ‘

¹² I am quoting from an essay of September 2011 titled “Ways into Functional Collaboration” which is available on my Website, in the Archives. The quotation is footnote 6.

¹³ I spelled out that long climb in “Arriving in Cosmopolis”, A paper delivered in Puebla Mexico in the Summer of 2011, pointing to 9011 A.D. as a decent suspicion of arrival date. The paper is available, in English and Spanish, on my website, under **Archives**.

Am I being realistic? Not a few of my readers may incline to think of this claim, indeed of my whole enterprise, as an exaggeration. Well, let us get it **out into the open**. That, indeed, is the *per se* purpose of seminars 4, 12 and 20: all of them centering on the second half of *Method* page 250. That is an effort of seminar members, but I would be quite pleased if, by the time we get to this ninth seminar, in January, 2013, there were present in the Lonergan community **a seriously articulate public rejection both of my functional enterprise and my positional identification** of what I now call the core of communal shining in the second cycle of seminars. I would be altogether more pleased if, by the end of 2012, there were signs in the Lonergan community of taking functional collaboration seriously, even if the core of which I speak was still regarded as, well, far out. And this brings me to my problem of a realistic focus here, something that I can talk of, and engage you in, “not logically, but pedagogically and indeed attractively”.

So I go back to my strange emphasis and focus on **W₃**, but now simply on the odd Mantra expression. “Double You Three.”¹⁴ I mean it as a hopefilled prayer of course, and in its fullness it is spoken and Spoken in the God-written context of the hope regarding hope expressed in the concluding pages of *Insight*. Is it not a wonderful coincidence that is not a coincidence to have a quotation from the “31st place”¹⁵ in this 31st **FuSe**, pushing for a “fuse into a single explanation,”¹⁶ indeed pushing for an alignment with the Push of these billions of years linking the Big Bang with the Big Clasp, the push to “Fuse into a Single Explanation”? So, as we twist round into the focus of this essay I nudge you – surely it is attractive to some, to you? – to pause over Lonergan’s lonely advance of 1965, strangely anticipated in his appeal of 1953. “The antecedent willingness of hope has to advance from a generic reinforcement of the pure desire

¹⁴People have been curious about this “recently-invented” Mantra, **W₃** turned into a prayer, “Double You Three”, that is connected genetically with *Romans* 8. The inventive insight was altogether accidental on my part, with **W₃** a creation of thirty years ago, named **W₃** more recently. The genetic connection should become increasingly luminous in the quiet thinking associated with its kataphatic use. Perhaps odd hints in the footnotes here can help the rich climb to personal processional identity with the Divine Doubling Ambition.

¹⁵*Insight*, 747.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 610, line 9.

to know to an adapted and specialized auxiliary ever ready to offset every interference with intellect's unrestricted finality."¹⁷

But now we come more shockingly¹⁸ to the focus, and the problem of humanity's building that Tower of Able that will indeed, in probability-schemes, bring that Tower community into Focus, a shining dervish, a geohistorical Hurry Cain.

The problem of focus happens to coincide sweetly with the problem of this 9th seminar, which is the task of identifying elements of the new data involved in this new cycle. And there it is, compactly announced in our text of focal interest: "Faith adds further data."¹⁹

Where do we, did we, go with that data?

The data is a core insert, an insert into the core. Should I say into the **cor**, and shift my attention and yours back from **Romans 8** to **Romans 5: 5**, that favorite text of Lonergan? I prefer to stick with **Romans 8**, and even pausing to reminding you of a previous twist of mine, bringing up – do you find it irreverent? – the flooding not of the heart, but of the amygdala.²⁰ So I stick with **Romans 8**, and indeed within the conclusion of verse 5, "the spiritual are interested in spiritual things."²¹ And I point discomfortingly - certainly it discomforts me – to Lonergan's compact pointing to it in *Insight*: "the spiritual is neither constituted nor intrinsically

¹⁷ *Insight*, 747.

¹⁸ The central shock in the decision to stand with the position of *Insight* 413. Note 35 below points to an earlier indication of the climb to the Position and beyond it. Here I am trying to lift the self-digestion to a full kataphatic Tower-prayer. A context for all this is the set of five essays on "Foundational Prayer", Prehumous 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. The full issue brings in the problem of a much larger axiomatization of "The Position" to include axioms of intentionality, of infinity, of pilgrim and eschatological incompleteness, etc.

¹⁹ *Verbum*, 215.

²⁰ For an entry into this zone – my own entry, since I was working with some of these patients -there is Ashok Gupta, "Unconscious Amygdalar Fear Conditioning in a Subset of Chronique Fatigue Synfdrome Patients," *Medical Hypotheses*, Vol 59, Issue 6, November 2002, 727-735. The article is available on www.guptaprogramme.com, which deals with ME/CFS and Fibromyalgia recover programmes. My suspicion is that amygdalic reorientation is of wider significance in these axial times, especially when it is coupled with fuller linguistic and aesthetic feedback.

²¹ I am quoting the first edition of *The Jerusalem Bible*, which I have to hand.

conditioned by the empirical residue.”²² That compact pointing is, of course, only a flash in the plane plain prose of the book, a book that will scream in later centuries for the deeper reasoning reaches of linguistic feedback in a How-Language.²³ Deeper reasoning? I would ask you to pause with me, startled by the word made fresh, over the beginning of the last paragraph of Lonergan’s discussion of “Experiential Objectivity’ and of the **given**. It begins with the short revised sentence, “there is a still deeper reason.”²⁴ Indeed, I would ask you to take time to read slowly through the entire paragraph and puzzle – *per se* this is the role of foundational fantasy, a grim task – over the anticipated transposed paragraph of the how-language of a later century. And muse thus over the concluding words of the paragraph: “the pure desire regarding the flow of empirical consciousness”.

The pure desire guarding the flow of empirical consciousness, clamoring for attention in its New Jerusalem of “collaboration”²⁵ “that sweeps living human bodies, linked in charity, to the joyful, courageous, whole-hearted yet intelligently controlled performance, of the tasks set by a world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended,”²⁶ in which Cain is hurried into the whirlwind of the Tower of Able.²⁷ But I am myself whirling here in the

²² *Insight*, 541. My *Sane Economics and Fusionism* (Axial Publications, 2010) has two discomfiting chapters on the issue: chapter 7, “Towards Researching the Dynamics of Desire”, and chapter 8, “Spirit’s Appetite and Lonerganism”. The title of chapter 7 could well have been the title of this essay, and chapter 8 looks to the centuries ahead in the cyclic enterprise.

²³ Problems of the development of How-language haunt section 1 of *Insight*, chapter 17. Some aspects of these problems turned up in “How-Language: Works?”, chapter 2 of my *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes* (Axial Publishing, 1998). Only slowly did the ramblings there blossom into a complex chemistry and aesthetics of linguistic and non-linguistic feedback. The searchings mentioned in notes 17 and 34 are related to that. **HOW**-language, **Home Of Wonder**- language, reaches internally for an asymptotics of address – ourselves and others – that would echo the reality of our infinite mystery and luminously, if darkly, anticipate, the neurodynamics of everlasting wording. So, for example, in the search we must reach for the reality and the thematics of the integral chemicalisation of the “triple correlation” (*Insight*, 578, lines 30-31), through which the word is to be made fresh, pilgrimwise and everlastingly.

²⁴ *Insight*, 407. On the revision, see note c of *Insight* 798.

²⁵ I regularly draw attention to the fact that **collaboration** is a word that occurs over thirty times in these final pages of *Insight*.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 745.

²⁷ Hurry Cain? I am not in any way competent in the field of scriptures, and use images as useful. So, in a recent article, relevant to the present topic of the “Tower Solution” to “the problem of general history which is the real catch” (CWL 10, 236), I suggested that what Lonergan was at was putting **I Corinthians 13** back between chapters **12** and **13**. Not profound scripture scholarship, but I quote the passage here because it adds important features to our Mantra-prayer, “Double You Three”. “In Christian terms one might see him as bracketing Paul’s hymn to charity of *First Corinthians*, chapter 13, within a sublation of the two bracketing chapters 12 and 14, with a

full seminar-set topic as it is to blossom from shabby seed to “a speaking within the community of kataphatic contemplatives that is vibrantly aware that the ‘study of the organism begins with the thing-for-us,’²⁸ when the organism is Jesus, and so so slowly climbs into the obscurity of an understanding worthy of that organism’s status as The Explanation, The Practical Theory of God.”²⁹ So let me now seemingly halt my whirling to have you and me homing in on the data, the given, the Gift. You and I herenow, now-here, nowhere, asking in and with that Gift, within

refinement of interpretation, a maturing of thinking: ‘All do not interpret, do they?’ (12 : 30), and, ‘in your thinking be mature’ (14 : 20). But to that lightweight reading of a parallel in scripture there is to be added the deeper perspective of the effective unity of the mission of Jesus as it seeds the efficient unity of a human science. Lonergan argues, ‘it is quite legitimate to seek in the efficient cause of the science, that is the scientist, the reason why a science forms a unified whole’ (*Topics in Education*, 160, line 16). And that efficiency places the global solution to Plato’s ancient problem of the control of urban meaning in Lonergan’s final identification of the human component of Cosmopolis. Functional collaboration is to replace eventually the long muddled haphazard effort of thinking effectively forwards in history. (“*Insight within a New Global Culture*”, **Fifty Years of Insight**, edited by Neil Ormerod, Robin Koning and David Braithwaite, Adelaide Press, 2011, p.154). This raises profound issues regarding the efficiency of Jesus in his detailed participation in Divine Maternity (See “Grace: The Final Frontier”, Chapter 7 of my Website book, *The Redress of Poise*.) “Double You Three”: the **You** is the Three, but also You Jesus, and indeed all ye, interpreting and acting in your mature thinking.

For the road into our topic from Scripture see CWL 11, the Scholion, 638-685.

²⁸ *Insight*, 489. The note in the biography recalls here the 300 page commentary of my 41 **Field Nocturnes** on that single page of *Insight*.

²⁹ **Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas**, 13. Note 1 above raised some issues of Christian affectivity, but here I may well be raising others: Where, you might ask, is the Sacred Heart of Jesus, or the eloquence of that sturdy lady, Theresa of Liseaux, in all this talk of the Organism that is Jesus? Let me risk broadening the problem by recalling Karl Rahner’s article “Kritische Bemerkungen zu B.J.F.Lonergan’s Aufsatz ‘Functional Specialties in Theology’”, *Gregorianum* (51)1971. He was astute enough to see that Lonergan’s suggestion met needs of human studies in general (537), but he bemoaned a certain cutting off of the mystery of Christ (538). I would meet his problem by appealing to Lonergan’s brilliance (Thesis 5 of CWL 11) in focusing the mystery, a clear dark point in our most fruitful understanding. But I would wish you to notice the power of that brilliance for existential spirituality. Let me put it in terms of a precise theory of analogy as a complex integral triple affirmation of affirmation, negation and eminence. Jesus is my friend: an affirmation. Not a friend in any comprehensible fashion: but more in an astonishing sense that is to remain astonishing in the everlasting friendship. **W₃** points us to a thinking out of that friendship and our pragmatic response, but the thinking is within my chemical dance of words and affects. The friendship is homely, and theoretical understanding – it is the only serious understanding – seeks “to embrace the universe in a single view” (*Insight*, 442), and Jesus is the heart and the amygdala of that universe. It is for the theoreticians of the Tower to rescue common sense from the shallowing of feelings and to free “the many Teresas” (George Eliot, Preface to *Middlemarch*) to sing their own **Canticle of Canticles**. But what I would wish all to envisage and cherish existentially is that the affirmation component of analogy frees one psychologically to treat the friendship – a deep mystery of the caring of Jesus – as a “very ordinary” fully private reality. Think of the pilgrim version of Revelations 2 : 17: “*I will give you a white stone, and on the white stone is written a new name that is known only to him who gets it.*” [I am using the Beck translation, and the italics are his. On the translation see note 48 below.]

that given, asking each in core, What is this noonday sun, what is this deeper reason, “what is this dynamic presence?”³⁰

The question of dynamic presence occurs at the beginning of Lonergan’s consideration of that wonderful chapter 19 of *Contra Gentiles*, book 4. Does it bring to mind that other wonderfilled 19th chapter of *Insight*? I certainly hope so, for they weave together astonishingly as we climb towards contemplating within us the jump from “the 26th place” of chapter 19 in Lonergan to the 27th question of Thomas’ *Prima Pars*. But I am not inviting us into the final system of Thomas, but into the prior system of *Contra Gentiles*.³¹ It is an easier entry point into our ninth seminar, our ninth haven, mansion, Epilogue.³²

It? Point? Easier? Entry? “What is this dynamic presence?” And is it the pineal pinning point where we – you and God – find, sniff, taste, that “God is not an object”?³³ And have you four been long enough together on the kataphatic road to get to that resonance of your psychic skin? And even if you are young in this – even a beginner of 80 years – perhaps you might find that entry in the first word of Thomas dense essay on the Holy Spirit, a word made fresh in the pilgrimsailor’s anchor-heave-ho of this paragraph and its odd generosity of surrounding

³⁰ *Verbum*, top line of 210.

³¹ I have a complex of reasons for focusing on *Contra Gentiles* rather than the *Summa Theologica*. The simplest reason is that it reminds you of the aspiration within the seventh specialty of generating a continuously better geohistorical system of global theological systems. Here we have two systems from the same thinker: are they related genetically, or is there a question of some reversing? Note that I use the word *geohistorical*: genetic systematics is a concrete heuristics that seeks to give an integral control of ongoing, overlapping, merging, etc contexts and systems. Think of Antioch and Alexandria, or of Lainez and Luther. Secondly, there is an illustration of suitable pedagogy here. The last paragraph of this essay, and the entire mood here, is that of chapter 19 of *Contra Gentiles* book 4. Thirdly, I wish to avoid the tricky and controverted topic (See *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): Charles Hefling, “On the (Economic) Trinity: An Argument in Conversation with Robert Doran”, 642-660; Neil J.Ormerod, “Two Points or Four?- Rahner and Lonergan on Trinity, Incarnation, Grace and Beatific Vision”, 661-673; RobertM.Doran, “Addressing the Four-Point Hypothesis”,674-682.) of “The Hypothesis of a Non-accidental Participation in the Divine Active Spiration” [a contribution of mine to the topic, available in my Website Archives] that relates to the discussion of four relations and three processions. [I note that I did a follow-up contribution to the debate of *Theological Studies* 2007, “Lack of Systems-Talk” in a manner that connects with my first reason above: a rejected contribution, as I point out in note 42 below]. Finally, I would note that I published a simple account of the *Summa*’s System in *Theological Studies* 1962, fifty years ago: “The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God.”

³² I refer here to the title of **Cantower 21**, “Epilogue”, a relevant context here. I note in passing that **Cantowers 14-21** correspond to the chapters in *Insight*, 14 to the Epilogue.

³³ *Method in Theology*, 342.

footnotes. *Quomodo*?³⁴ “What then is needed is a qualitative change in me, a shift in the centre of my existing from the concerns manifested in the *bavardage quotidien* towards the participated yet never in this life completely established eternity that is tasted in aesthetic apprehension, in the inner utterance of truth, in the partial success of moral struggle.”³⁵ Or even the partial success of thinking you can dance, thinking your dancing.³⁶ But it is the inner utterance of truth that interests Lonergan when he invites: “Let us now see how Aquinas accounted for the procession of the Holy Spirit. In the *Contra Gentiles* 4, c.19, he inquired: ‘Quomodo intelligenda sunt quae de Spiritu sancto dicuntur?’” “The real issue, then, is truth.”³⁷ Might you position, poosition, protopossess³⁸ yourself there, pining, and slowly slowly ever-freshly re-issuing yourself at “the point of intersection of the timeless with time”?

Curiously, *quodammodo*, my paragraph-effort discourages me from going on. Lonergan’s few pages there are themselves like a table of contents of Thomas’ climb, and Thomas paragraph climb brings to my mind the paragraph climb of Lonergan in the ninth section of *Insight* chapter 19 and so brings to my baffled mind my few years of teaching that section of *Insight* in a course that lasted for a 26 weeks at five hours a week. That, certainly, was a different type of “going on”. Each paragraph of Lonergan’s 26-point deductive expansion could be gone-on-about for at least a class and a private student day. But does that not bring to your mind the kataphatic challenge? Then, yes, “let us see now how Aquinas accounted”, could become the shadow of a shared road. But our culture is against you, and alas even the classes that should aid the kataphatic turn, the “qualitative change in me, a shift in the centre of my existing”. Unlike good science classes, where a teacher nudges students to grapple with the **what**, and invites a continuation of the grappling in the time between classes, classes in, say,

³⁴Thomas’ question is, “Quomodo intelligenda sunt quae de Spiritu Sancto dicuntur?”; “What way are the things said about the Holy Spirit to be understood?”

³⁵ Lonergan, *Shorter Papers*, CWL 20, 209. I quote from a short review of Jules Chaix-Ruy’s book, *Les Dimensions de l’être et du temps*.

³⁶ The relevant reference here is **Bridgepoise 10**, “The Liberal Arts as the Core of Future Science: Part Two,” with its companion essay **Bridgepoise 3**, “Liberal Arts: The Core of Future Science”. [both Articles are available on my Website] Connect this with note 23 above.

³⁷ *Insight*, 572.

³⁸I am recalling **Cantower 9**, “Position, Poosition, Protopossession”, an essay of 2002 in which I was grappling with the slow climb involved here. A decade later I am a great deal wiser regarding the protopossession involved, especially in the People of the Tower.

trinitarian theology can be litanies of references and opinions. I am thinking now, sadly, of reports that reach me about the teaching styles of those seemingly in what I might call the Lonergan Ballpark, and find it worthwhile to recall Thomas's similar reporting of seven centuries ago: "... if the teacher settles the question simply by appeal to authority, the students will have their certitude that indeed the facts are indeed as stated, but they will acquire no knowledge or understanding, and they will go away empty."³⁹ In the contemporary messy teaching the emphasis is not on certitude but on a spread of opinions that is characteristic of prescientific cover-up. Perhaps, in these bad axial times, you had best keep your grappling to your Mantra selves, "Double You Three"?

And perhaps I can shock you forward into the ninth seminar by claiming that an essential part of the data of seminars 9-16 is **W₃**?⁴⁰ Yet I am simply bringing you back to the **quomodo** reading the **quomodo** of five paragraphs of the beginning of *Method* so that you may now find evident direction.⁴¹ Chemistry has its data of smells and colours, but what grounds its "cumulative and progressive results" is its piece of **W₃**, the periodic table. And I am bringing you – far less simply and far more shockingly – forward to read five paragraphs later in *Method*, to find the appearance of misdirection. The misdirection is right there, first-lined, not in the typeface of the author, but in our rich and seemingly spiritual general bias, reading "subject" and "subjects" in the paradoxical comfort of a simple stable view. This is not the world of an inner word from which e.g., "an article on Christ will be a speaking within the community of kataphatic contemplatives that is vibrantly aware that the 'study of the organism begins with the thing-for-us,'⁴² when the organism is Jesus, and so so slowly climbs into the obscurity of an understanding worthy of that organism's status as The Explanation, The Practical Theory, of God."⁴³

³⁹ *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, 4, q.9, a.3.

⁴⁰ **W₃** here is ambiguous. In the ordinary sense of data or datum it obviously means the metagram as written: think of the display of the periodic table as often posted inside the cover of a grad 12 chemistry textbook: it is a given. But there is the less obvious sense of **W₃** as inner word, a standard model.

⁴¹ The five paragraphs are the first five paragraphs of *Method*, Chapter 1, section 1, 4-5.

⁴² *Insight*, 489.

⁴³ **Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas**, 13.

Many of my seminar members are perhaps not at all shocked by my claim, but, I would claim that it is a shock to most readers of *Method in Theology*. Indeed, the occurrence of the word *article* in the quotation just given nudged into my memory an experience I had in submitting an article on Christ to *Theological Studies* in recent times.⁴⁴ The rejection of one of the readers of the article contained the claim that it was above the heads of the audience.⁴⁵ Wow! Now if I had been writing something equivalent to a physics journal it would have been rejected if it were not above the heads of the audience. And this last odd recollection of mine is very much to the point. The issue – that word again – of theology is “cumulative and progressive results” within an established *acquis*.⁴⁶ The issue is a progressive grip on truth, in this case truth within Faith: and I risk twisting forward the molecules of your fantasy by identifying the issue as a chemically-sustained processional grip on processional truth and its necessary enlargement – is not the full issue *Praxis?* - into a processional grip on that processional Clinging to Plan?⁴⁷

I sense, as I type, that this is all too crazily heuristic. What to do? “Nature is waiting on tiptoe to see the unveiling of God’s family.”⁴⁸ That pilgrim unveiling, when it occurs in a millennium or ten, will be “as unmistakable as the sun on the noonday summer hills of Italy”,

⁴⁴ The article was titled, “The Reach for Jesus”, and dealt with a decade of articles (1995-2005) on Christ in *Theological Studies* in a way that pointed to the advantage of functional collaboration. It is available on my Website as part of **Prehumous 10**.

⁴⁵ Curiously, the previous **Prehumous 9**, “Lack in Systems-Talk”, mentioned earlier (note 31 above) was also a reject of *Theological Studies*. And I have various other rejected articles and books, but also – a significant observation - rejected by editors of what is called Lonerganism. This of course raises questions, specifically the question raised above in paragraph seven, bold-faced: I would **appreciate a seriously articulate public rejection both of my functional enterprise and of my positional identification** from those in the Lonergan community who find that I am off-track.

I am, of course, trying to get these people onto the second half of *Method in Theology*, 250.

⁴⁶ *Acquis?* The next note is a winding down on the topic, but perhaps a recalling of another “context” (line 9 and line 10 of *Verbum*, 238) would be a helpful preliminary: the climb through Thomas *Prima Secundae*, qq.1- 17 that would poise one in an appeti of the “appeti” (line 5 and line 6 of *Verbum*, 210). An ongoing **W₃** shared by Tower People among themselves and, in daily descriptive dance, with the street people. I am talking of a hearty standard model, cherished daily “like a flower in the crannied wall” (*CWL* 21, 31, line 1).

⁴⁷ I am winding down – or up! – the appeal of this essay, and carry it forwards a bit in the notes below. I recall musing over a statement about the *Verbum* Articles attributed to Lonergan, “Well, its five year’s work for anyone who disagrees with me” and thinking to myself amusedly, “yes, and 25 years work for those who agree with you!”

⁴⁸ I am quoting Romans 8 : 19, as translated by William Beck. My useful source is *The Four Translation New Testament*, World Wide Publications, New York, 1966, 435.

but meantime we must battle the molecular patterns of the axial super-ego.⁴⁹ Should I talk more about the slow contemplative climb from the diagram **W₃** to its spiraling Tower-presence in a hundred years or so?⁵⁰ Or should I just pause over a single paragraph of chapter 19 either of *Insight* or of *Contra Gentiles* book 4?⁵¹

What to do? There you have on your plate that question of Lonergan to me in the summer of 1966,⁵² repeated now forty five years later by me. His answer has, as yet, not been a success. Certainly, he twisted, in *Method* 286-7, into the bluntness of his mindfilled imagining of general categories: a large chunk of **W₃** but without the tower.⁵³ He nudged desperately for the fuller heuristic in his odd pause of mid-287,⁵⁴ but then he slumped into that noteless page 291 that does not explicitly nudge us towards the climb that is our topic here, a climb that sublates the “3P +”⁵⁵ as conceived by Thomas or himself.

“In the twenty sixth place, God is personal.”⁵⁶ We need a twenty seventh place now, and I have been suggesting that we climb within, within a single chapter of *Contra Gentiles*. What is

⁴⁹I draw attention to the essay on this subject by William Zanardi, “Preconceptual Apprehension and the Evaluation of Objects.” It appears as Appendix D (pp. 19-65) to **FuSe 12**, “Interpretation’s Future and the End of Lonerganism.”

⁵⁰“A hundred years or so” is a regular refrain of Patrick Kavanagh’s Poem, “If ever you go to Dublin Town / In a hundred years or so”, and it is a haunting presence in my Website book (2008), *Lonergan’s Standard Model and Effective Global Inquiry*.

⁵¹I puzzled over various possibilities here. Eventually it seemed wisest to simply, earnestly, invite you to home in on – **HOW**-eyes Poised! – the single paragraph of *Verbum* 210 that begins, “Paragraph 5 to 12 of 4, c.19, apply the foregoing analysis. First it is shown” Have I given you pause over that beginning (**analysis?** **shown?** ...) through the nudgings of this brief essay? Need I recall the blunt words of Lonergan’s Epilogue that followed, or the hints of note 45 above? **HOW** long does it take to read the final paragraph of this short essay of mine, moving HOME everlastingly? And how, **HOW**, will the journey differ for non-Christians, a question for seminars 17-25? And should I also ask you earnestly, “Double You Three”, to read the final seven lines of CWL 12, The Triune God: Systematics (518-521), with my twisted revision of the translation given in the first line of p. 521: “that by believing the Word we might speak true inner words and understand”? It is a question of the ongoing genetics of a “terminal value” (*Method*, 48), “a system” (*Verbum*, 238, line 6), that would dominate, be **dominus** of our doings, our “joyful, courageous, whole-hearted, yet intelligently controlled performance” (*Insight*, 745).

⁵²The question regarded his tackling the writing of the book *Method*. I recall freshly his agitated pacing round his sixth-floor room in the Bayview Regis College, Toronto.

⁵³I regularly note the need to add a (10) to his list that ends in the middle of page 287 of *Method*. (10) would point to the foundational status of functional collaboration.

⁵⁴I would draw attention to David Oyler’s reflections on this paragraph in his essay, “Interpreting the mid-paragraph of *Method* 287”. It is Appendix B (pp. 22-26) of **FuSe 11**, “Lonerganism’s Crippling Difficulties with Interpretation”.

⁵⁵I refer to the top line of **W₃**. But think of a reference to the larger image of **CWL 7, 8, 9, 11, 12**.

⁵⁶*Insight*, 691.

this insight-ground of Word but the essence of God? What is this active spiration but that same essence? There is neither a before nor after of the essential Three who spin together the neurochemicals of our finitude into circumincessional intimacy, the ultimate cosmic mystery of a double you.