

SGEME 1 The Cultural Invariance of LUSTY COPON

The original SGEME I is presented here as section 1, with title “Moving Forward Effectively”. It was sent out in October 2009 to the first group of members of the new society described there. October and November brought a fuller perspective on where we might be going as an effective group. That is a topic that I am leaving to Bob Henman, the General Secretary of the Group, who is taking over in SGEME 2. Who is to take on SGEME 3 and those following? I leave that topic to Bob. But I like to think that, symbolically, we are stepping forward from that end section of *Insight*, section 5 of chapter 20, in which Lonergan mentions collaboration 29 times: “Resumption of the Heuristic Structure of the Solution”.

Here, then, I offer three sections. The first, as mentioned, is the original communication to the new member of SGEME. The second section, LUSTY COPON, aims at intimating the mood of a later stage of meaning: I think of the date 3010 A.D. The third section, titled “20/20 Vision”, ponders loosely on the context of probability schedules for the years 2010-2020.

1. Moving Forward Effectively

The title of this new series comes from the name of the New Society, The **S**ociety for the **G**lobalization of **E**ffective **M**ethods of **E**volving. The new series follows from the two previous series, *SURF* 0 - 12 and *Fusion* 1-18. But, instead of looking back at length to the complexities of emergence, it is better that I, we, look forward briefly and in the simplest of fashions. Two commonsense pages, then, are my aim and achievement here.

It is, of course, common sense that changes history, and we aim in this New Society “to expand the capacities of commonsense knowledge and language.”¹ That aim includes the encouragement of the membership in **SGEME** of people of common sense who have no aspirations to theory but who can, with some degree of success,² tune into their own talk. Let me

¹*Method in Theology*, 261. The page is worth brooding over in the present context.

²We have to battle with the bent in our bones towards truncation, at its most dangerous

illustrate from two quite different zones of talk. In a recent book on Postmodernism I found the statement that “interrogation of all metanarratives is at the heart of the movement”. In a less recent work on spirituality I found the statement, “the creature is a continuous interrogation of God.”³

The word *interrogation* occurs in both statements. How do you read it now, and how might you read it with a little effort?

An unwelcome effort of postmodernists to come to terms with the meaning of **interrogation** would reveal to them the contradiction at the heart of their enterprise, an invariant lurking in the human heart these past 7 million years. A perhaps less unwelcome effort, of those who pray, to soak up the meaning of **interrogation** would reveal to them the core of prayer. Such efforts are within the realm of common sense.

Such commonsense efforts are eventually to transform education at all levels. Thirty years ago I began *Lonergan’s Challenge to the University and the Economy* with the statement, “If there is to be a massive shift in public minding and kindness and discourse in the next century, there must be a proportionate shift in the mind and heart of the academy and the arts at the end of this century, with consequent changes in operating schemes of recurrence from government to kindergarden.”⁴ **SGEME** is a gentler strategy of reaching towards that goal than that book, which aimed at the metatheoretic transformation of the academy and the economy. How the more elementary strategy is to take concrete effective shape: that is a question of

when it talks ‘objectively’ about self-appreciation. Lonergan introduced the notion **truncation** in his essay on “The Subject” (*A Second Collection*, p. 73). A truncated person is one that has been, so to speak, educated out of their mind: they are blocked from serious self-attention.

³Hans Urs von Balthazar, *Prayer*, translated by A.V.Littledale, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1951, 125.

⁴*Lonergan’s Challenge to the University and the Economy*, p.1. The book, published in 1980, is now available free of charge on the Website, www.philipmcshane.ca . Indeed, the copy there is a photocopy of Lonergan’s copy with some interesting markings by him.

SGEME's scheming in these coming years.

Have I cheated members, then, by claiming that there are no obligations? No: there are none other than a hope of an increasing membership that supports simply through the conviction that “something needs to be done”. The membership is now over 80 . One sixth of those may very well pursue the interrogation of interrogation actively, in education and economics, in prayer and politics, whatever. And if the membership grew to 60,000 we might be lucky to have one in every village of the 10,000 villages of which Gandhi spoke: one that, in the village, is “as a familiar a professional figure as the doctor, the lawyer or the engineer, who will find a new basis ...”,⁵ who will, indeed, be a Socratic nuisance but mitigate that nuisance-value by being wiser than the truncated children of axial times.⁶

So: thank you for your simple presence on the list of members. The General Secretary, Bob Henman, and I, will keep you informed of the **S**cams towards **G**eneral **E**ffective **M**ethods of **E**volving that dawn on members of the group, operative towards the pre-dawn light of the third stage of meaning.

2. LUSTY COPON

I have tried visioning the future before,⁷ and I have talked regularly of Lonergan's wonderful page 250 of *Method in Theology* in terms of visioning. Its humbly effective operation in the cycle of global collaboration is to be the key to the almost-systematic genesis of

⁵Lonergan, *For A New Political Economy*, 37.

⁶Strategies of that wisdom are a topic of this series.

⁷See, for example, “Authentic Subjectivity and International Growth: Foundations”, written more than thirty years ago as the conclusion of *The Shaping of the Foundations*. More explicit was my looking forward 1000 years in chapter 5 of *The Redress of Poise* (see note 24 below). Both the books referred to here are available free on the Website.

“cumulative and progressive results”⁸ in the fourth millennium.

I am not going to have another shot at a **new** sketching of *Method*, although my notes for these two pages already look like a book outline.⁹ Nor could I summarize what is already a sketchy pastiche, my 200 pages of pointers regarding that page 250.¹⁰ I can only indulge us in a nominal menu, whet appetites and strain trust: what might the self-taste of LUSTY COPON be like, likened-to, self-liked?

COPON might be familiar, since COP was introduced by me some years ago as **The Childout Principle**, the odd name referring to the educational institution of the grimly

⁸*Method in Theology*, 4. But what do I mean by “almost” here? The second section below point towards an answer, but mention here of analogies of science may help. Particle physics in the twentieth century has stabilized into a Standard Model which gives cumulative and progressive results in its cycle from research through theory and story to macro- and nano-technologies. Similarly, a developed operation of global functional collaboration will give undreamed of stability where at present there are just endless muddled debates. The old standard problems that clutter the book *Insight* will fade into flat-earth debates of oddbods living mentally outside functional collaboration. This is pretty unimaginable to us now, especially when we do not have a grip of the analogues from successful inquiries. In Chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2007) I drew a parallel between the partial history of the Calculus of Variation as presented by Husserl in 1882 and our present “Calculus of Variation,” of Progress and Decline. But what does the calculus of variation mean to the present audience in philosophy and theology? So, we continue to measure maxima and minima of progress with the skin of a cow.

⁹Another shot? There are two such recent shots: *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations* and Lonergan’s *Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*. But there is the larger shot of the years 2002-2007, the **Cantowers**, a ten-volume work on which I intend to comment in a later *SGEME*. **New**: a boldfaced thing ...against the likelihood that we tadpole along in these next decades, with little imagination of the frog-stroke swimming of 3010 A.D.

¹⁰I refer to the two series SOFDAWARE and *Quodlibet*, on the Website.

demanding strategy of what I call GEM 2.¹¹ COP is described in the slogan, “when teaching children geometry, one is teaching children children”. What is this to be like, **HOW** is this to be liked? It is to be, quite simply and quite obscurely, a new talking in the classroom, a past-oxen¹² finnegansawake of words, a **Howtalk**.¹³ ON? That simply points to the third millennium possibility of COP **Operating Normally** (Normatively of course!).

That settled scheduled of Bell-curve normativity is to rest and quest in a relatively stable global ecology of Lustincarnateness. What, then, is LUSTY? Perhaps I might stir elementary imaging for Lonergan students by talking of *Insight I* and *Insight II*, the two volumes Lonergan had in mind’s eye in 1952,¹⁴ adding the mind’s sigh¹⁵ of his 1965 discovery of the solution to the

¹¹ The four definitions of generalized empirical method are discussed in *Joistings 21* and *22*. The key pre-functional operative definition is that given in *A Third Collection*, at the top of page 141.

¹² In “Features of Generalized Empirical Method: A Bridge Too Far” (*Creativity and Method*, edited by Mathew Lamb, Marquette University Press, 1984) I talked of “the bridge too far” that is symbolized by Joyce’s Episode in *Ulysses*, “Oxen of the Sun”. Joyce works his way through types of writing, ending with the problem that seeds *Finnegans Wake*.

¹³ The title of *A Brief History of Tongue: From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Chapter 2, is “How-Language: Works?” The question-mark points to an initiation of the search for human talk that would be resonantly a **Home Of Wonder**, solving asymptotically - towards a refined eschatological incompleteness - the problem of mystery, raised by Lonergan in *Insight* chapter 17, section 1. The convergence is related to my convergence of the “dot and comma” series in the final image of *Fusion 18*. “Sorting Out the Second Canon of Hermeneutics”.

¹⁴ “If I can possible do it, I must try to finish and arrange for the publication of a first part of my work before my departure. It would be entitle, *Insight*, and the remainder could be named, *Faith*, or *insight and Faith*.” I quote, accurately from the old-typewriter version of Lonergan’s letter of July 23, 1952, to Eric O’Connor. No doubt there is a providence in Lonergan being

problem of implementation as dealt with in *Insight II*. The impossible dream of a reader of *Insight I* who would “come about”¹⁶ to “the cell of self-knowledge,”¹⁷ where history and God

hurried off to Rome in Autumn of 1953 - the solution to his problem of Cosmopolis was to emerge there 12 years later - but the vigorous fifty-year writer was replaced by the tired writer of 1966 described in the next note.

¹⁵Lonergan did not know how sick he was, that February of 1965, when he burst forward finally to his revolutionary insight regarding collaboration. He gallantly settled in to scribble outlines, even sketching a chapter one and typing parts of it. But from then on one can very well think of his effort's as something of a tired sigh. Pacing his room in the Regis College of Bayview Avenue in the summer of 1966, he expressed to me his stress about the task of pushing into *Method*, especially in regard to somehow including *Insight* in chapter one. When I did the index in December of 1971 his solution - pages 286-7 of the published book - delighted me. But, yes, the book is a tired descriptive sigh. It is far from the vigorous obscurity of the fifth-year-old who wrote: “The Method in Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ as n approaches infinity. For the rest: ordo universi. From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God.” (I am quoting, with typewriter accuracy, from a letter Lonergan wrote to Fred Crowe in May 1954).

¹⁶I refer to the extraordinary “poositioning” that Lonergan promises the serious kataphatic climber into “the cell of self-knowledge” (see note 17 below). “So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extensions and experiencing duration gives place to the subject orientated to the objective of the pure desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies.” The key laws of the cell and of being need a fuller axiomatic expression to lift the brief descriptive effort of Lonergan on *Insight* 413. (See note 21 below). The future frequency distributions of the incarnation of such axioms is the central issue of this essay.

¹⁷Catherine of Siena, *The Dialogue*, translated by Suzanne Noffke (New York, Paulist

and self “fuse into a single explanation,”¹⁸ spiral towards a settled probability-scheme for the creative minority through *Insight II*’s radiant presence in the Tower of Able, laced into a commonsense luminosity that is the transposition of GEM 1. But what is the Luminosity, that **L**? It is simply the reduplicative lightsomeness, “eo majis unum,”¹⁹ of the intention of being, paradoxically “specialized in the construction of the whole,”²⁰ poised,²¹ a leaning Tower. **U**? It

Press, 1980, I, 25). See Meredith Secomb, “The Role of the ‘Cell of Self-Knowledge’ in the Authority of Catherine of Siena,” *Magistra: A Journal of Women’s Spirituality in History*, 9, 2003, 41-54. Only on her final page does Secomb raise the question of Catherine’s dynamics as described by Lonergan. *The Dialogue* is a remarkably kataphatic effort, but needs a larger context of reflection regarding the tension between the anaphatic and the kataphatic. Some push towards that is in the five Website essays *Prehumous 4-8*, “Foundational Prayer: I - V”. On Catherine of Siena and the fourth stage of meaning see Philip McShane, “The Fourth Stage of Meaning”, in *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, S.J.*, edited by John Dadosky, Marquette University Press, 2009.

¹⁸*Insight*, 610. I quote from the second canon of hermeneutics, which when luminously ingested lifts the poise mentioned in note 16 above to a new control of the being of meaning, especially of linguistic meaning. See, further, note 27, where I coin the name *Fusionism* as a basic global orientation.

¹⁹I think here of the last chapter of Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, and its roots in *Contra Gentiles* 4: 11.

²⁰Jose Ortega y Gasset, *Mission of the University*, translated with in Introduction by Howards Lee Nostrand, Princeton University Press, 1944, 91. I would say that this book was powerfully influential in his envisaging the work *Insight*.

²¹Cantower 9, “Position, Poosition, Protopossession,” written in 1972, gives a sketchy introduction to the fundamental problem. There is a matter of incarnating kataphatic genuineness

is a heuristic

understanding, an incarnate reality of the kataphatic contemplative community of the Tower, where “theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view.”²²

S? Selves: the stability is be that of a self-luminous understanding, an incarnate invisibilization of neurodynamic aesthetics melding what is now the seedling flickers of molecular rhythms into dancing bones of local cultures. **T?** The transcendental layered will that is the commonality of humanities ever-incomplete spirations is to be vortex-vigored in its spiralwise cherishing of the **Y**, the yearning, that is the pulse of “the order of the universe, and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.”²³ **LUSTY?** It will have meshed Catherine and Colette²⁴ in a shedding of catholic dualism and other credal “sorts of mortmain,”²⁵ regarding

so as to generate luminous axioms of the cell of self-knowledge beyond the few descriptive pointers of *Insight* 413: required are axioms of intentionality, of infinity, of incompleteness and mystery, of molecular integrity, of eschatological circumincession. Such a requirement looks to a later stratified genetic logic of dialectic and genetic logics. “Could a philosophy so conceived be presented in an axiomatic structure? On that question, I hedge. On the one hand, I do not think that it is impossible. The thing to be attended to would be to be sure you have room for analogous terms. Analogous terms in mathematical logic hitherto have resulted in a series of strata. But if you have an explicit concept of the analogous terms at the start, it should not be impossible to develop a system that would take care of them”(Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 130-31).

²²*Insight*, 442.

²³*Ibid.*, 722.

²⁴The context here is the work of Julia Kristeva, *Colette*, translated by Jane Marie Todd, Columbia University Press, New York, 2004. I note immediately Kristeva’s frontispiece quotation from Merleau-Ponty’s powerful last effort, **The Visible and the Invisible**, centering on “that innate anonymity of Myself that we call flesh Flesh is an element of Being.”

embodiment.

3. 20/20 Vision

It is worth pausing over Lonergan title, “Resumption of the Heuristic Structure of the Solution” mentioned in the first paragraph. *Resumption* is a curious word, begging for an essay,

Some initial reflections on issues of embodiment are in *Field Nocturne 23*, “Here Hear”: they are presented in the context of the 300 pages of essays, *Field Nocturnes 1 - 41*, written about that massively challenging paragraph of *Insight*, “Study of the organism begins”(*Insight*, 489). It was part of Lonergan’s effort “to prepare our statement of the integral heuristic structure that we have named metaphysics”(*Ibid.*, 484). “Our statement” is a thing of the distant future. Did Lonergan grin when he typed, after he listed components in that task, “from such a broadened basis one can go on” (*Method in Theology*, 287) to rewrite *Method in Theology* in a manner that would do justice to the aspiration mentioned in note 14 above. And where, heavens, is the “one that can go on” to come from? I think of the possibility of an oriental lady of the year 3000 A.D., for whom I wrote, in “Systematics: A Language of the Heart” (Chapter 5 of *The Redress of Poise*, a Website book o the mid 1990s), “a dictionary extract, modified down from its self-referential density of expression out of deference for twentieth century truncation’s language.”

²⁵I quote Ezra Pound’s *Commission*, “against all sorts of mortmain”, and I think of the life- long effort that is his 117 *Cantos*. From his work I came to the notion of 117 *Cantowers*, written against the mortmain of a decaying Lonerganism. The *Cantowers* reach far and wide for redemptive images such as those of Pound. I am led to quote note 25 of chapter 10, “Reinventing History”, of the website book, *ChrISt in History*, to convey problems and possibilities of such imaging: “Cantower 4 reflects on the search of Roland for The Dark Tower in a primarily feminist context. Cantower 5 meshes that image and search with the task of building a lover’s bower that is a future metaphysics. “ upon the gilded tower in Echatan / Lay the God’s bride for ever, waiting the golden rain” (Ezra Pound, *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*, Canto IV, 16). The images are relevant to the intussusception of the invitation to the inner exile of *theoria*.”

but in my allowed few pages I slip past that begging to return implicitly to the first 15 places and weave past the 16 places that follow - with the 29 occurrences of **collaboration** pacing the music forward like that “**C... E F G G₁** “ of Bruckner’s Eighth Symphony - to a modest Prelude called, perhaps, *Assumption*.²⁶

The fundamental **Assumption** has to be that “we are not there yet.”²⁷ We are very very

²⁶I am recalling a related series of twelve two-page essays, *Humus*, begins with *Humus* 1, “Preludes”, recalling Chopin’s little works of that name. Earlier I meshed the six pages of the great *Nocturne in C Minor, op. 48, no. 1*, page by page, into the tune of *Cantowers* 1 - 6 (see *Cantower* 1 at note 69). Perhaps I could associate the present essay with the posthumous work *Fantaisie Impromptu in C[#] minor, op. 66* (Chopin, I recall, wanted it destroyed), an overlapping meshing of a waltz and a march. It symbolizes the integration of a march longer than Mao’s with a waltz quite beyond the Vienna Circle. Further, its slow middle section - is my middle section here slow? - gives rise to a further symbolism in the popular song “I’m Always Chasing Rainbows.” See, further, on the distant rainbow, notes 35 and 36 below.

²⁷The beginning of a powerful Lonergan paragraph of 1942 (*For a New Political Economy*, 20): the whole paragraph still applies, but now, sadly, to the movement associated with his name which seems to have no appetite “for “the more general and more difficult fields of speculation”(*ibid*), of heuristic fusionism. The movement has not stumbled, with Lonergan, on Hegel’s insight regarding the mirror, the speculum, in the cell of knowledge: “As the labor of introspection proceeds, one stumbles on Hegel’s insight that the full objectification of the human spirit is the history of the human race. It is in the sum of the products of common sense and common nonsense, of the sciences and the philosophies, of moralities and religions, of social orders and cultural achievements, that there is mediated, set before us in a mirror in which we can behold, the originating principle of human aspiration and human attainment and failure. Still, if that vast panorama is to be explored methodologically, there is the prior need of method.”(I am quoting from p. 14 of a Lonergan archival file labeled A697. It contains a typescript

far from there, trapped in the illusion of both Fontenelle (1657-1757) and religious powers that *haute vulgarization* is sufficient for the day and the century. Nano-technology and biomimicry have surprises for us, and secular speculation: and the quite new aesthetics that is to blossom from their meshings. We are, if present practice continues of puttering commonsense Lonergan papers and theses and books, to be left further behind. Within the fundamental **Assumption** there must grow a philotherapeutic grip of the atrocious existential gap²⁸ between Lonergan studies and present global minding.²⁹ There is the grim fact that Lonergan studies, in the main, is “lost in some no man’s land between the world of theory and the world of common sense,”³⁰ with “no real apprehension of the nature of the changes” involved in the second stage of meaning as it moves to the distant third stage. The movement has “never been bitten by theory”;³¹ its enriched common sense, its borrowed language of interiority, its indulgence in comparative³²

numbered pp. 8-23. Very plausibly it is a continuation from the sketch of a first chapter of *Method* to be found in a file named Batch V.7. That file contains also a nine-page typescript beginning of that first chapter.)

²⁸The notion of existential gap comes from Lonergan’s *Phenomenology and Logic*. See the index there, under *Existential*.

²⁹I dealt with the challenge of philotherapy in the conclusion of the two papers written for the Florida Conference of 1970. They are available as chapters 1 and 2 of *The Shaping of the Foundations*, now a website book. In more recent work I place this in the context of the overcoming of an axial super-ego.

³⁰Lonergan, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 121.

³¹*Ibid.*, 155.

³²The role of *Comparison* in functional studies is accurately defined on page 250 of *Method in Theology*. It has another role in communications: a large unworked topic. The flaw in most the comparative work done by Lonergan’s followers is that Lonergan is luminously pointing towards the third stage of meaning, the second time of the human subject. Lonergan is

complexities, “gives the illusion of knowledge, a false idea of what science is. And it clutters the mind.”³³ A clutter that, sadly, ensnares the minds of younger generations of people who sense in Lonergan a revolutionary, an evolutionary sport.

It is a spectral clutter, but, as Lonergan notes regarding economics, “I do not think that there is a need to flog a whole row of dead horses, a flick at a particularly nauseating one is enough.”³⁴ The single nauseating aspect is summed up in the present context by the claim that the Lonergan followers have “become a class closed in upon themselves effete.” And in that effeteness they have contributed to the absence of Lonergan from the story and the dictionaries of 20th century philosophy, theology, and culture.

I am being deliberately provocative, provocative of a reaction that would claim, perhaps, that all we need to escape present effeteness, is a more serious commitment to effectiveness.³⁵ But what would that serious commitment be other than the explicit operating acknowledgment of a well-defined function within Lonergan studies, the function of implementation? That would be an admission of the legitimacy of the central appeal of **SGEME**. So, after forty years in the desert, there would be a bent towards the emergence of one of Lonergan’s eight specialties.

Will the **SGEME** group be successful in the fostering of that 8th specialty? I do not think

an evolutionary sport, not seriously comparable to those who are not thus self-luminous. See, further, notes 35 and 36 below.

³³Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 145.

³⁴*For A New Political Economy*, 36.

³⁵The much deeper reason for my disturbing provocativeness emerges when Lonergan’s work is placed in the context of a prolonged axial period, a second stage meaning reality stretching perhaps into the fourth millennium - if we do not stir ourselves. On the axial period, as different and larger than that of Jaspers and deeper than the struggles with it of Toynbee and Voegelin, see “Middle Kingdom, Middle Man: T’ien-tsia, i jen“, the first essay in *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, edited by P.McShane, University Press of America, 1984. This relates to the problem of *Comparison* raised in note 32, and to the topic of the following note, 36, here.

so.³⁶ But I see the effort as backfiring into a need for the 7th specialty, and so on round to the need for a massive shift out of present fumbblings in hermeneutics, in interpretation.³⁷ At its most

³⁶*SGEME 2*, on which Robert Henman is working at present, is a first effort to fill large gaps in the theoretics of communications. So far, his work grounds a solid pessimism. It is a pessimism associated with the long axial abuse, in many languages, of words like *idea* and *intuition*. So it comes about, in these latter days, that intuition can be lauded by philosophers, loved by teachers, located by sociologists, rejoiced in with such a locating that contextualizes it as insight in a book of that name. Yet it can remain, for axially truncated subjects of that book, a still-named, still-born, felt object: not, then, a self-explained core of meaning and being, the blossom of an integral quest for the **Field** beyond all horizons. “In philosophy we can rely upon good intuition as a final resort. Of course, good intuition is not a gift of heaven, it presupposes knowledge of the field we intuit Good intuition does not, however, make a philosophic system for the new insights have to be properly conceptualized, and all assertions have to be argued rationally.” (Agnes Heller, “Sociology as the Defetishisation of Modernity,” *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*, edited by Martin Albrow and Elizabeth King, Sage Publications, 1990. 37). “When it comes to worldviews, intuitions are everything. Sorokin, and also Toynbee and Spengler, however, think of “intuition” as if this unconscious human experience transcends logico-empirical analysis.”(David Richardson, “Civilizational Worldview as an Aggregate of Intuitions,” *Sorokin and Civilization*, Transaction Publishers, 1996,125.) How could we possibly break and break into such recurrence-schemes of ancient molecular staleness, when our neurochemistry is their captive? How can we plan towards promising statistical distributions of a common global minding field-glow? “The field *is* the universe, but my horizon defines my universe” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, 199: see the Introduction to the index there, and *Field*).

³⁷I think here of the book *Loneragan’s Hermeneutics. Its Development and Application*, edited by Sean E. McEvenue and Ben F. Meyer, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C. 1980: the book emerged from a gathering on the subject in Concordia

successful I see its efforts in the next decade as backfiring into the core need.

The core need to be manifested by the operation of the fundamental **Assumption**, boosted by the annoyance of **SGEME**, is the need to invite the next generation to take seriously Lonergan's challenge, "one has not only to read *Insight* but also to discover oneself in oneself."³⁸

The invitation: I suspect that it will not be taken. Rather, it will require history's mothering implementation of global functional collaboration³⁹ to get Lonergan's later disciples - African ladies, perhaps, of a later millennium - to intussuscept what the cosmic everlasting search for understanding really is, what caring understanding of understanding entails in our present sick-tadpole-stage of time.

University, Montreal. Sadly we never got round to the topic. Nor have Lonergan's canons of hermeneutics received serious attention since then.

³⁸*Method in Theology*, 260.

³⁹This is the topic of chapter 1 of *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*.