

## Interpreting "Finality, Love, Marriage" by Phil McShane

8. May 2011 19:32

### Interpreting "Finality, Love, Marriage"

What is bothering many of us in our efforts to even see the problem of merging *Method 7* and *Insight 17.3* is the almost total failure to take the challenge of the book *Insight* seriously. Our generation was/is just not up to it. This is altogether too huge a topic for this seminar, but you are seeing now why I said it was to be the most difficult. It drives us back to our missing the full pointing of the first introduction of the distinction between description and explanation in *Insight*, the full pointing which blossoms out in the now-familiar comment of *Insight 755* regarding being breathless and later. It is brutally present in the claim of **The Triune God: Systematics**, 725: "

***Only in the intermediate scientific stage are relations divided into predicamental and transcendental and even in that stage such a division is not very useful***"

The issue for us, struggling towards a fantasy of the future collaboration which I talk of as operating maturely in A.D.9011. The fantasy initially is about heuristics, opening our vision through adequate symbolization ( See "Metaphysical Control of Meaning", *Method. Journal of Lonergan Studies* **24** [2006]). I have gone round and round that topic for decades, most recently nudging us - myself included - to think of the 17<sup>th</sup> word of *Insight* chapter 1 - **Renaissance** - in full crazy heuristic fashion: layers and complexes of chemical patterns. But let us be simpler here, with sexy memorability. So, let us suppose that we are pushing - as I have been for quite some time, and as is my present questioner: so that this effort is to be placed in the next **Q and A session** - for an interpretation, for the fullest meaning of "Finality, Love, Marriage." *Method in Theology*, 156-8 advises us that we should "Understand the Object". O.K.: so instead of the eleven-letter word **Renaissance** we take the ten-letter word **tumescence**, with its evident reference to a dynamics of penis, clitoris and nipple [60% of males enjoy nipple enlargement: something that needs to be a presence when reading my ramble, in *A Brief History of Tongue*, 149, about " a kissed nipple: is there not another almost identical? identical? longing, lonely for the present of the duality of lips."].

Am I being extreme here? On the contrary, I am talking about a heuristic openness adequate to the multidisciplinary sloping convergence of which I wrote in FuSes 5 and 6 and in Cantower 8, "Slopes: An Encounter".

Will the Tower People of 9011 need to know e.g. that the chemical Sildenafil citrate, sold as the drug Viagra, has the formula 1-[4-ethoxy-3-(6,7-dihydro-1-methyl-7-oxo-3-propyl-1H-pyrazolo[4,3-d]pyrimidin -5-yl)phenylsulfonyl]-4-methylpiperazine?

Obviously not, unless the focus of attention is on a related topic in the chemistry, psychology, or eschatology of physiology. But the Tower Person, the **elite** [*Method*, 351] person, needs to know that understanding the object Viagra, initially developed to treat heart disease, involves a layered dynamics reaching from electron to eschaton, from erection to resurrection. The issue before us to get a grip on the significance of the first metaword, **W<sub>1</sub>**,  $f(p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; r_n)$  as it weaves its way through other metawords - the relevant central image is **W<sub>3</sub>**, which hovers over all the other metawords. I would note that the crisis here is the meaning of the semi-colon, **;**, and the manner in which description is layered down through the levels, continually blocking the drive of the two canons of explanation, and of all the words that Tower Care meshes together as self-expressive of loneliness.

Viagra's dynamics [centering on the release of nitric oxide (NO) in the corpus cavernosum, which then activates the enzyme guanylate cyclase] is related also to the dynamics of dreams. Can we afford, then, to be simple-minded about the reality, the object, sexed or not, that is the **dream**? Or, to come nearer a bone of contention, **phantasm**?

Each our phantasms is a layered reality, and within general empirical method as adequately **described** [now there's a puzzle: what is it to **explain** generalized empirical method?!] on the top of page 141 of *A Third Collection*, is a necessary object of any interpretation. We are not near the linguistic feed-back that would keep us tuned to that cultural turn. What is your phantasm of an erect nipple, clitoris, penis, and how does that phantasm fit into the phantasm that is required within an explanatory heuristic of pure desires, evolution's 13.7 billion year achievement?

But I do not wish to go on here with an impossible pedagogy, a pedagogy required to lift one to an adequate interpretation of "Finality, Love, Marriage". And then there is the adequate functional history to be faced, the issue of the article's mesh with ongoing meaning [see **Fuse 10**, sections 4, "Meaning and Ongoing Meaning"]. Note x, which concludes the article in *Collection* [see pages 52, 263-4] points to a deep warp in Christian fantasy. *Finality Love Marriage* was an edgy edging towards a quite new spirituality of sexuality.

How are we to face its functional interpretation so as to deliver us from the demon of dualism, an offense against any decent divinity? Certainly, part of the full journey is exorcising the demon of description that, layer by higher layer, blocks us, in its rich darkness, from explaining our loneliness. Oddly, the same demon blocks us from getting to grips with the object that is the economy: Keynes' economics and its progeny are so locked in broad description that it is impossible for the Economic Establishment to read "There are two types of firm". So, humorously, I might claim that, whether in the finality of the activities of love and self-love or in the finality of economic activities there is a massive need to reread within a global and historical heuristic the little word *firm*.

The Tower People are to rise to such reading through the "come about" signaled by that key statement of *Insight* 537 , "So there comes about ....". Without that comeabout, the meaning of the second canon of hermeneutics is pretty-well closed to our generations. But do not give up the bewildered puttering: to recall a famous saying, "If something is worth doing, it is worth doing badly"! And do write to me more particularly regarding the problems of the climb.

Tags:

[Submit to DotNetKicks...](#)  
[Permalink](#) | [Comments \(0\)](#)

## Related posts

[Functionally Interpreting Communications by Robert Henman](#) &nbs...[FuSe 14C: An Attempt at](#)  
[Communicating history Functionally by Robert Henman](#) [FuSe 14C: An Attempt ...FuSe 17D Risking](#)  
[Positioning by James DuffyFuSe 17 D Risking Positioning James Gerard Duffy, ITESM Morelia james.duffy@itesm.mx](#)  
<http://eltoq...>