

Into the Neurodynamics of Jesus

What is the starting place of our climb here.

Indeed it is. The soiled what.

I titled this essay, in my first typing, “HOW 11+”, thinking it a suitable nudge about the start. It is the same start recalled in the previous essay: the starting paragraph of *Allure*.¹ It is the same start as that hidden in the first paragraph of *Insight*'s first chapter. A little thingsome, hovering, baby-faced, round talk-areas of wombed-neurodynamics. It is the riverierun, roon,² past Eve and Adam, away³ The riverrun, all ways the riverrun, all ways babyfaced ask-kin in its “tell me all.” But baby-wombed-faced becomes battered kid face, and the kidding around of arrogant Axial times, Poison-Poisson-leads teenaging poise beyond its awe-time high to “what else is new?” and the teenage-poise becomes a professed professor poise that bare-faced asked me once in a lecture, “are you talking about mystical experience?”

I had presented, in a supposedly learned lecture, one of my favorite puzzles:

OTTFSS

¹ No harm in quoting here the beginning of that chapter, “Sow What”: “The emergence of humanity is the evolutionary achievement of sowing what among the cosmic molecules. The sown what infests the clustered molecular patterns behind and above your eyes, between your ears, lifting areas – named by humans like Brocca and Wernicke – towards patterned noise-making that in English is marked by ‘so what?’”

² You recognize the beginning of *Finnegans Wake*. Useful here is my fuller treatment of the challenge and the reverie-roon in “The Importance of Rescuing *Insight*,” in *The Importance of Insight: Essays in Honour of Michael Vertin*, edited by John J. Liptay and David S. Liptay, University Press of Toronto, 2007, 201-25. *Roon* is the pronunciation of *run* on Gaelic, with the meaning both of mystery and love. Recall the conclusion of the previous essay regarding the sweet mystery of life.

³ And so on round, rooned, through the last line of *Finnegans Wake*.

Presented? It was there, *dasein*, d-ah-signed to weave, from black non-bored chalkpoised come-about, around stale neuromolecules, a conjured up being-spell: it was chalk in the beingstalk. What was my chalk-poised neuro-face-flight answer to professing poise but: NO.

“No: I am talking about a question from the 11+ exam in Britain.” And I talked further, hintertainingly, about that exam for pre-teens, before re-turning my chalk hand out of more non-bored letters to my puzzle:

OTTFSSSENT

How, HOW, many letters were needed to get beyond conventions of board-contemplation to the release of pre-teen joy, the everlasting joy of being human, an alignment with the universe’s “dynamic joy and zeal”:

OTTFSSSENTETTFSSSE

Yes, we have a pattern, a cosmic rhythm round:

OTTFSSSENTETTFSSSENTITTFSSSENTATTFSSSENTUTTFSSSENTTO, and so on clearly, unendingly.

Simply, it is a matter of repeating the vowels, O E I A U, ordered thus by a pattern of mouth-movements⁴—these being governed by neuromolecular macropatterns—and between each vowel there is the invariant TTFSSSENT. Call the invariant X: then there it is to see, See?

OXEXIXAXUXOXEXYIXAXUXO

⁴ You may think of King Sejong (1397-1450) ordering the vowels in his invention of the Korean script, based on back and front tongue positions. But I am thinking, within the full heuristic poise mentioned later, of the full layered topologies from lips to tips of invisible molecules.

But the dots are not now what-speak but plain song, unfretty Church chervil, or “song sung blue weeping like a willow,” a settled “well of loneliness.” But

“See, banks and brakes
Now, leaved how thick! Laced they are again
With fretty chervil, look, and fresh wind shake
Them.”⁵

Them fresh wind shakes to what again, a room filled with music whats again, a class stirs.

There is another way, wey, weighty wait, to go.

OTTFSSSENTETTFSSSENTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT

HOW far to lead, to go, in T-sing you, “you and me are subject to the blues now and then,”⁶ but subject thus to the sacrament of the present momentous “In”, Inn, 3.7 million millennia: One millennium, Two millennium, Three millennium . . . O millennium, T millennium, T millennium, F millennium, F millennium, S millennium, yeS millennium, 1 millennium, 2 millennium, 3 millennium, 4 !!!

3.7 million millennia—minus a few millennia—to go the way towards the ancient Jewish tradition concerning Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah,⁷ and another two millennia to go to rise to Alfred Edersheim’s exclamation, “*could* there be a greater

⁵ Gerard Manley Hopkins, the sonnet, “Thou Art Indeed Just, Lord,” lines 9–12.

⁶ I recall Neil Diamond’s 1974 *Song Sung Blue*.

⁷ I appeal here to an old (1880s) respected scholarly effort, that of Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, reprinted by Eerdmans, 1971,1990. See Appendix VIII, “Rabbinical Traditions about Elijah, the Forerunner of the Messiah”, 706-709. Edersheim was a convert from Judaism to Christianity. A further useful context is the recent book, with which I concluded in *Allure’s* final note (253): Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ* (New York: The New Press, 2012). A fresh venture here is related to the liberation of Jesus from Roman structurings of his netting of humanity, the catch of history considered in the unwritten volume 3 mentioned at the end of *Allure’s* Preface. See further, notes 14, 15, 38, 40.

contrast than between the Jewish forerunner of the Messiah and him of the New Testament.”⁸ But Rabbi Saul, who never read the New Testament, exclaims oddly, “it is Christ who lives in me.”⁹

And Rabbi Saul needs a turn of the letter for the better, the Better, G_{xw}.¹⁰ Writing webs out there, tongue-tied: but what is *it* that lives? Is there a heart of it? Does that heart pitter patter matter pulse prime, a well of loneliness’s finality?

What is the heart of the matter. Indeed. Might we push on to say that it is *The Heart of Matter*?¹¹ Or becomes it? That it becomes matter to become what, weaving the climb through “corruptibles”¹²? Are we distracted by scripture? Then one reads Teilhard de Chardin’s description of what I might call *Axial Temptation* differently.

“Judging by my own case, I would say that the great temptation of this century (and of the present moment) is (and will increasingly be) that we find the World of nature, of life, of mankind greater, more mysterious, more alive, than the God of Scripture.”¹³

The God of Scripture, of Abraham and *Acts*? The God of Science? The God of the philosophers or the pilgrims?

Like King Sejong, I try to name being’s breathing. OM? Should I try the turned-up L for a Korean *g*, *G*, gee: a command, a Jesus-surprise? A G-awed noise is needed, but the heart of the noise is what is needed, toweringly shared, twisting round both Paul’s

⁸ *Ibid.*, 709.

⁹ *Galatians* 2:20.

¹⁰ Re change of super- and sub-scripts. Relate to end of 257 and to end of Fund Soc.

¹¹ *The Heart of Matter* is the title of the last volume of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin’s essays.

¹² The meaning of corruptibles can be simply associated with the realm of plants and animals. It is a zone of concern for Thomas in his struggle towards an eschatology (see note 38 below). Clarity in regard to it brings Thomas third way out of a tradition of rationalism: on that, see my 1958 essay on the five ways, integrated (8–22) into *Cantower* 19, “Ultimates”: references to Thomas are on page 22. You might make a start on his view of time and eternity by musing over the text of Ia, q. 2, a. 3, on the third way: “... quaedam inveniantur generari et corrumpi, et per consequens possibilia esse et non esse.”

¹³ *The Heart of Matter*, 207. It is near the end of his short essay, “My Universe.”

claim and de Chardin's temptation. *G*: the mark of universal gravity in physics-talk the world over. *G*?

And, yes, we might speak here of a gravity at the highest possible level of our universe, my universe, Chardin's universe, your universe.¹⁴ Something like a singular Higgs particle, but at the top of the scale. One indeed could symbolize the Higgs reality as *G^h*, and the advantage of that is that it helps to nudge us wonderously away, a wey, a weighty way, from the God of Abraham, the God of the philosophers, the God of commonsense.

Nudge us wonderously?

Is it not rather an allure?

So, I cut off my T-sing ramble round about, (about)³, our puzzle, our piece of evolutionary what, our 11+ question, to pose our XI-plus question that starts O in this new series with, say, the emergence of language, and leans us towards thinking ordinally:

OmTmTmFmFmSmSmEmNmTm

The initial O and T are thus to be replaced by F and S:

FmSmTmFmFmSmSmEmNmTm

But the puzzle now is the contemplative puzzle beyond the X-mansion, an XI-plus reach. The puzzle, indeed, is beyond the Axial Period's thinking, its full solution

¹⁴ The difficulty I am inviting us all to face is the climb to "knowledge of all that is lacking" (*Insight*, 559), and here particularly to "The Existential Gap" (title of a section of *CWL* 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 13.2) between knowledge and expression in our own Lonerganesque reading and performance. More on this in *HOW* 12, "The Word Made Fresh." The deep personal problem is reading, the self-reading, of Lonergan's brief identification, "the field is the universe, but my horizon defines my universe." *Phenomenology and Logic*, 199.

eventually leading to its effective definition and its final closure.¹⁵ So, it is beyond us in this sensate mess of the 21st century.

And this brings us uncomfortably to the catch in our puzzle, indeed, to that catch as identified by Lonergan, to “the problem of general history, which is the real catch.”¹⁶

The catch is that there are many histories of many nations, many biographic and philosophic perspectives on individual achievements.¹⁷

The catch is that there are several different individuals, several different people, exercising their freedom. . . . the multiplicity of peoples. There is an interlocking, an interdependence of people, of the different exercises of freedom. I spoke yesterday of the notion of destiny as exhibited by drama, and that is the idea I am speaking of here. Finally, the possibilities of resisting the mechanisms and the determinism that can emerge historically are heightened almost to an unlimited extent by Christianity.¹⁸

Now I would note importantly that this stretching perspective did not gain expression in *Method in Theology's* two chapters on history. But let us leave aside subtleties of interpreting Lonergan here and simply think of our reading of those chapters. Did you read them with some tone of our ‘millennium’ puzzle in mind? Or was the tone some faint echo of Lonergan’s divisions of stages, or Jasper’s Axial thinking modified by

¹⁵ Chapter ten of [Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations](#), “Metaphysical Equivalence and Functional Specialization,” points out an elementary feature of this. The feature of definition and closure is to carry us forward through later strange stages of meaning and eventually to the balanced nescience of “Infinite Surprise” (the final words of *Wealth of Self's* Epilogue).

¹⁶ CWL 10, *Topics in Education*, 236, line 7.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 257. I would invite you to view that page in the context of the end of *Insight* 416: “Now let us say that explicit metaphysics is the conception, affirmation, and implementation of the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being.” How “Now” do I see my feet, my street, and the people I pass but do not greet? Not to speak of reaching out, an implement of progress, sharing in the catch of Christ. See the final note here, note 42.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

Voegelin and Toynbee, or Toynbees rhythms of ups and downs that, as a relevant exercise, you could associate with my simple puzzle:

A E F ¹⁹

B C D

That puzzle at least has the simplicity of needing an answer in 26 places. Our puzzle is totally open, both on the side of the subject and on the side of the object. But I do plead here for an existential pause: have I **really** got this puzzle? Has this puzzle **really** got me, **really** got to me? I characterized it above as an XI+ puzzle, and I was thinking of a paralleling of grades 1–11 in schools with the mansions 1–11 that relate to the contemplative climb about which the book *Allure* hovered.²⁰

Here again there is a plea, one that centers on the meaning of the boldfacing of **really** above. It is a plea with regard to what I mean by *really*. I am talking about my meaning of real apprehension, something that is not paralleled with Newman's meaning of real assent. I parallel it rather with really as it applies in serious scientific inquiry. The odd thing about my naming an instance of that paralleling immediately here is that you won't **really** get it, and that indeed is the point of the pointing. The **really getting it** presupposes a luminously-gripped context.

So here's my scientific instance: the problems of the type signaled by the Aharonov-Bohm effect. If you check the Wikipedia on the topic you find this lead sentence – with its colored words: “This topic **may be too technical for most readers to understand**. Please help improve this article [to make it understandable to non-experts](#) without

¹⁹ This is an old favorite puzzle of mine, best done person to person, with little leads. I recall spending two hours with a sociologist, patiently waiting for the moment of astonishment. But I also recall a student's small daughter glancing at the puzzle, as her mother labored over it, and expressing the right-on wow.

²⁰ See also, the various essays after *Allure*: in this series, e.g., *HOW 5*, “Searching for Avila, John, Jesus, Stein, Lonergan, *Moi Intime*, Etc. Etc.” and *HOW 8*, “The Making of Jesus Present.”

removing the technical details.” A serious pause over this is worth your while now, but let me add, immediately, a little more, before we pause together.²¹ The Aharonov-Bohm effect is the response—it is a quantum wave phenomenon—of an electrically charged particle to the electromagnetic potentials (\mathbf{V} , \mathbf{A}) when both the electric field, \mathbf{E} , and the magnetic field, \mathbf{B} , are zero. We are here, talking about Maxwell’s work, symbolized by his familiar equations: not familiar to you, of course, unless you have seriously ventured into physics. The effect points to the potentials being real, in some sense. “Feynman analyzes the Aharonov-Bohm effect, ending with a delightful discussion of what makes a field ‘real.’”²² How real are the potentials, if \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} are zero? And, if one pushes the problem further, classical electrodynamics becomes a tricky zone, “not even weakly separable”²³ from a perspective on “*non-localized gauge properties*.”²⁴

You find this way too far out? Perhaps, then, think in terms of a first university course in physics, where one may discuss what I call the Kepler effects, such as the sweeping out of equal areas by a planet journeying round the sun.²⁵ The effects are accounted for by gravitation: is it real when there is no tree falling in the forest?

²¹ A much fuller pause is invited in and by HOW 12, “The Word Made Fresh”.

²² Carver A Mead, *Collective Electrodynamics. Quantum Foundations of Electromagnetism*, MIT Press, 2000, 33. Feynman’s analysis is in *The Feynman Lectures on Physics* (Addison Wesley, many pb editions), volume 2, chapter 5, “The Vector Potential.”

²³ Richard Healey, *Gauging What’s Real: The Conceptual Foundations of Contemporary Gauge Theories*, Oxford University Press, 2007, 57. I am quoting here from the second chapter, “The Aharonov-Bohm effect”: from his final section 2.5 (54 -57) titled “Lessons for classical electromagnetism.” The book’s index leads you to a range on related details.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 56.

²⁵ What I call Kepler’s effects are his three wonderful laws: the law of ellipses, the law of equal areas, and the law of harmonies. Muse over the gap between them and Newton’s grip on an inverse square law of attraction. The first law of elliptic orbiting does not seem too remote. But think of the second law: an imaginary line from the sun to a planet sweeps out equal areas in equal time intervals. How does that “connect” with Newton’s view? And then there is the third law, tricky enough to get hold of for starters: the ratio of the squares of the periods of any two planets is equal to the ratio of cubes of their average distance from the sun. Think now, perhaps, of our average distances from the Sun, the cosmic law of allure, the law of kataphatic prayer, of

The advantage of my bringing in this simple illustration from elementary physics is that you can experience discomfort about it easily through viewing my neat little presentation of how to get from Newton's basic view to Kepler's effects.²⁶ But what is important is your pause over your discomfort.²⁷ As I noted already, the pause is to be extended in *How* 12, but let us hover over the Wikipedia introductory words: "This topic **may be too technical for most readers to understand**. Please help improve this article [to make it understandable to non-experts](#) without removing the technical details."

The discomfoting fact is that neither the effects noted by Kepler nor by Aharinov can be made understandable to the non-expert. There is needed, in the first case, a slow detailed climb up through understanding explanatorily gravitation, and in the second a scrabbling towards the beyonds of, say, quantum electrodynamics.²⁸ That climb involves an increasingly sophisticated symbolic marking of developing understanding. Such developed markings facilitate techniques of advancing in

Tower Harmony: "Grace, Grace, Grace, attune us to the Allure of the Scent of a Nomen." (*Allure*, 199-200, 223)

²⁶ I can hardly expect you to tackle the task of reading my lecture notes, from which I did not lecture—they were simply my own pre-lecture scribbles. They are available as [Website Articles](#), numbers 7 and 8. The consideration of the shift from Kepler to Newton begins at the bottom of page 18. A glimpse at the notes shows the sort of work needed to climb into the world of theory in this very simple zone. I regularly point out that presentations such as Feynman's first two volumes of his famous Lectures in Physics do not invite that. They nudge the bright people, but can easily slide into the world of *haute vulgarization*, the world of *Scientific American*. On Feynman's third volume see note 28 below.

²⁷ The first time I heard Lonergan speak, Easter 1961 in Dublin, he touched on *haute vulgarization* by telling the story of the lady who invited Einstein to tea, asking him to give her relativity theory in her own simple words. It took me five decades to get to grips luminously with the asking as a prevailing cultural reality, and the global consequence: a world being badly and brutally run by people locked into erroneous initial meanings. Our issue in Lonergan studies is to detect how easily we can float along in enriched heartfelt patterns of such vulgarity, leading the next generation into our illusion.

²⁸ I return to Feynman, mentioned in note 26. His third volume takes a quite different tack: it is a great scrabble towards the meaning of quantum phenomena. I spent a good year battling with that volume.

explanatory understanding, but it also helps the retentive techniques of talking and writing so familiar to students doing all-nighters before exams.

Such all-nighting can be extended so that one can talk one's technical way through a thesis and a thesis defense, even in physics. But the all-nighting becomes paradoxically easier as one moves up through the sciences: it is so much easier to have illusions about understanding Kepler than it is to bluff about understanding his effects. In human affairs the occasional all-nighting becomes a permanent ethos of benighting.

This topic **may be too technical for most readers to understand.**

But now *this* means our writing and reading here now.

The added difficulty is that the techniques are undeveloped because the topic is in its infancy.²⁹ So, I can write here the claim that our present problem is far deeper than the venture in *Gauging What's Real*.

Moving into our little distraction landed us into the wonderland of symbols that labeled potentials, potencies. Classical theory could not handle certain effects. In the full world of humanity there are effects, like allnighting and benighting, that cannot be handled effectively by present classical efforts. Might we eventually arrive at a gauge perspective that would be quite beyond present classical thinking, gauge properties of the full field³⁰ emerging from which present stunted classical views are "not even weakly separable"?

But I am bubbling forward into the topic of *HOW 12*, "The Word Made Fresh," which is to tackle the elusive topic of HOW-language consistently dodged in the book *The*

²⁹ That suggestion points to a massive geohistorical and genetic analysis grounded in various hints from Lonergan on the character of symbolic expression. Some discussion should find its way into *HOW 12*, "The Word Made Fresh."

³⁰ See notes 14 and 15 above, and follow on to notes 40 and 42 below.

Allure of the Compelling Genius of History.³¹ But the road to competent thinking and talking of HOW-language was not dodged. It was indeed sketchily mapped out, a road to contemplative control of self-meaning and global meaning. My sequence of Appendices in *Allure*³² point loosely at the climb to such control, a climb through ten kataphatic mansions that I have not written about.³³ The first Appendix points to the kataphatic challenge of being self-luminous about, (about)³, your judgments of value, something that I claim is way beyond the usual readership of those words in the section on it in *Method in Theology*. My appendix to that second chapter of *Allure* ends with the question—and so with the question mark, ?, to be kataphatically read: now what does that mean to you?—“would not the transition to self-luminous globally-effective Christian living be a wondrous thing?”³⁴ That transition’s road is skimpily described in the four appendices, meshed with the climbing of the book. The decade-long—at least—climb would leave one in what I now call the eleventh mansion, and so the question that I pose in my freshened version of the OTTFFSS puzzle is an XI+ puzzle of a quite different character, for a quite different character, than the grade 11 schoolchild.

I could go all sorts of ways here with further helpful hints. Let’s try thinking of the achievement of the X mansion as the “comeabout” Lonergan talks (about)³ in the last eleven lines of *Insight* 537. It is an existential embeddedness in the meaning of the first word of metaphysics that I name $f(p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; r_n)$, or briefly W_1 .³⁵ It is a

³¹ The question was raised first by me in chapter 2, “How-Language: Works?” of *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing 1998.

³² Respectively, *Allure* 24-26; 47-52; 125-26; 135-46.

³³ I have talked of this missing discussion—the kataphatic equivalent or Teresa of Avila’s *Interior Castle*, as *The Interior Lighthouse*. In contrast with Avila—passing over her anaphatic drive—such a work would point towards a redemption of sensibility, of ‘outwardness’ as described by Lonergan in chapter 8 of *Insight*, or I describe it in chapter 6 of *Wealth of Nations*, “The Inside-out of Critical Realism.” The text following returns to the pointing, and the final note 42 gives a pithy street-evaluation. Depending on interest, it could become a topic under the obvious title of “The Interior Lighthouse.”

³⁴ *Allure*, 25.

³⁵ See [Prehumus](#) 2, “Metagrams and Metaphysics.”

strange kataphatic achievement whose effects are described in the following fifteen pages there. But here, and in the conclusion of the lectures on education, there is the added context neatly dodged throughout the twenty chapters of *Insight*. Add that lift of quest, and one arrives at the XI+ question, pointing you quite out of your normal ballpark. Like talking you into the first page of Wiles reaching for the answer to Fermat's puzzling about $x^n + y^n = z^n$. My hints of course, are marvelously unsatisfactory: what of the climb of the previous ten mansions? Where is my helpful equivalent to Avila's *Interior Castle*? Where is my *Interior Lighthouse*? It ain't!

Rather, I go an odd but encouraging descriptive way. The nudging out of the ballpark reminds me immediately of my first introduction of that symbolism and Fred Crowe's response: do we really need this? That world was never comfortable for him. Yet it was comfortable for Lonergan, and in that same decade Crowe sent me a letter to him from Lonergan that also discomfited him, a letter showing Lonergan's ease with symbolic supports of his thinking. I invite you to find your own discomfort now, and find indeed that Lonergan is talking out the first part of his answer to my XI+ question. Here we go:

The Method of 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.e., metaphysics as I conceive it but plus transcendent knowledge.³⁶

You have met this quotation before perhaps but now its meaning is enriched by our context: or if you like the context of the title of our essay added to the context of the final page of the Education lectures. Further, the struggle is surely enriched by sharing Pat Brown's struggle with its meaning.³⁷

³⁶ This passage is from a letter by Lonergan to Frederick Crowe dated May 4th, 1954.

³⁷ See Pat Brown's essay, "Interpreting Lonergan's 1954 view of Theology," *Seeding Global Collaboration*, Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2016.

A little more than five years later there is Lonergan's weaving round that half-answer to my 11+, XI+, puzzle. What do I mean by half-answer? Again, there are so many ways of naming it. Think, for example, of the naming of it that is his syllogistic chat in *Insight*: certainly not chatting out there the missing Cosmopolis.³⁸ So, back we may go to that question: "would not the transition to self-luminous globally-effective Christian living be a wondrous thing?"³⁹

The 1954 answer points to self-luminosity, but not to the effectiveness that could carry humanity towards the sunflower stem-growth that would eventually be a communal smiling of the universe.⁴⁰ There was a little more than another five years of Lonergan climbing needed to carry his kataphatic effort to vision humanity's needed recurrence-schemes of moving stem-wise, Stem-Wise. Nor had he yet arrived at the full heuristics of the communal smile. Like Thomas in his unfinished push, he left us thus poised with his pragmatic leads to the possibility of adequate poise. That poise can become a tower community effectively present eventually:
88thMillennium89thMillennium90thMillennium

Indeed, that poise will become a tower community effectively present. But in what millennium? Might you not pull its global effectiveness back towards us in time through your kataphatic turn? And might you not, even now in a graceful beginning,

³⁸ From the perspective of the hierarchy of situation-rooms envisaged in *Allure* 191-97, Lonergan's effort (*Insight*, 421-26) may be seen as a feeble reach, indeed, within the Aristotelian perspective that he dumps and dumps on in the first page of *Method*.

³⁹ *Allure*, 25.

⁴⁰ Readers of my climbing efforts of the past decade will have noticed that it included a search for an eschatology. That eschatology lies behind my simple simile. It represents a climb beyond the final note of *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human*, in marvelous continuity with Thomas' searchings 750 years ago. The molecular climb from the big bang homes forward in finality and Spirit towards a neurodynamic community in the minding of Jesus. A 'tower' grip on the topic requires, alas, a decent self-luminous content-filled heuristic of chemical neurodynamics: a distant business, as is a full sublation of, e.g., Thomas' questions of *Contra Gentiles* IV, 79-97. Think of common sense's bewilderment at such puzzles as, "Do hair and nails grow in eternity? What age will I be? What of my moods, my friendships?" Think, further, of the redemptive answers to such questions that are to emerge in later times from the eighth functional specialty.

strain the numb molecules of your axial imagination to find the seeds of your way, your way, your trowth, your life,⁴¹ in the imagining of the cosmic molecules aching for their and your weaving into the neurodynamics of Jesus?⁴² But, in our present millennium, “This topic **may be too technical for most readers to understand.**”

⁴¹ “I am the wey, the trowth, an the life” is *John* 14:6 in the Scottish Bible translation that I used in *Allure*: I also use the three claims of Jesus as alternate headings for the three sections of *Allure* chapter 17, which corresponds to the seventeenth chapter of *Insight*, giving a Christological freshness to its three sections.

⁴² The imagining is concrete, a layered sensibility tuning into the loneliness and hope of street molecules, be they trapped in dumb automobiles or in teenaged tattoos, in coins of the realm or in care-chemicals of the amygdala. Thus we find, Toweringly in the twelfth mansion – but to be seeped, swept, globally through commonsense nerves – a profound meaning to the claim that Jesus is nervously calling us herenow.