

Searching for Avila, John, Jesus, Stein, Lonergan, *Moi Intime*, Etc. Etc.

### A. The Brutal Truth of Interpretation<sup>1</sup>

You should recognize, in the essay's title, the reference back to some of the later [Lonergan Gatherings](#).<sup>2</sup> Indeed, at one stage of my musing over this 5<sup>th</sup> essay of the new series, it seemed to me that I could well point to the recycling of the entire series of *Lonergan Gathering* essays. But I must curtail myself, to be effective in nudging towards change. So, for example, what might I say regarding Edith Stein, except to place Byrne's paper of the conference referred to, and indeed all four papers,<sup>3</sup> in the new context, and ask them, indeed all of us, myself included, to pause over the dodged challenge of Lonergan's meaning of *Searching*. We are back at our terror at the challenge faced by Lonergan in the third section of chapter 17 of *Insight*.<sup>4</sup> To write on "Stein and Lonergan," is, in the new context, to struggle into the heuristic described in that paragraph that I have regularly named *60910*. Perhaps quoting it again here gives a no-harm reread that might well be a first read.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The reference is to that key piece of *Insight*: "**The Truth of Interpretation**," section 3 of chapter 17. I add the word *Brutal*, but it adds nothing to the meaning, since it was and is a brutal climb into the mists of future meaning. See note 4 below.

<sup>2</sup> So, the fourteenth essay is "Refining Our Quest for the Historical Jesus"; the sixteenth talks of the 2015 Lonergan Philosophical Society Gathering, where Edith Stein was a topic; but the general issue right through is the character of the effort in any area to do interpretation.

<sup>3</sup> The four papers are readily available (I can certainly supply them): Pat Byrne's on "Edith Stein and Lonergan," replied to by Chip Hughes; Anne Carpenter's paper, "The Eclipse and Recovery of Memory: Lonergan, Dadosky, and the Experience of Cognitive Redemption," replied to by Liz Morelli.

<sup>4</sup> It was an amazing challenge for him, an Everest of the summer of 1953 – when Hillary climbed that mountain – to be climbed before he departed for the strange life of teaching in Rome. And for us? It is a challenge Lonergan students – including myself – have not met. It is the challenge around which *HOW* essays 5 and 6 pause.

<sup>5</sup> I am fond of repeating, and have deliberately repeated texts a couple of times in this essay. You never step into the same text twice.

The explanatory differentiation of the protean notion of being involves three elements. First, there is the genetic sequence in which insights gradually are accumulated by man. Secondly, there are the dialectic alternatives in which accumulated insights are formulated, with positions inviting further development and counterpositions shifting their ground to avoid the reversal they demand. Thirdly, with the advance of culture and effective education, there arises the possibility of the differentiation and specialization of modes of expression, and since this development conditions not only the exact communication of insights but also the discoverer's own grasp of his discovery, since such grasp and its exact communication intimately are connected with the advance of positions and the reversal of counterpositions, the three elements in the explanatory differentiation of the protean notion of being fuse into a single explanation.<sup>6</sup>

So, to write on the search for the historical Jesus in the old style is to putter along like a medieval physicist in the era of Gauge Theory. That search, as now scientific, is to be dominated by the sublated version of paragraph 60910 represented by the meaning of *Comparison*<sup>7</sup> as it matures in the new cyclic science.

But I am not going to elaborate, repeating and refining my younger self. Enough has been said in the [FuSe](#) essays of the failed seminar series of a half-dozen years ago.<sup>8</sup> The first ten essays focused on functional research, but there was already a nudge

---

<sup>6</sup> *Insight*, 609-10.

<sup>7</sup> A familiar topic for my readers. Briefly, the techniques involved in *Comparison*, the methodical component slid over dazzlingly by Lonergan on page 250 of *Method in Theology*, solved the problem of the treatise on the mystical body raised by him on pages 763-4 of *Insight*. It does so by generating a sequence of theses on that topic. I would note that the push here for a geohistorical control of human meaning meshes with that objective, but HOW 6 manages to point to a masterly twisting of the task out of functional collaboration that makes our failure to rise to the challenge mentioned in note 4 above quite solidly blameworthy.

<sup>8</sup> Details of that enterprise are given in section 1 of [FuSe 10](#). There were to be 25 3-month e-seminars spread over six years, 8 on General Categories, 8 on Special Christian Categories, 8 on Global Revelatory Categories, and a final seminar on pointers to Eschatological Categories. The communal effort wilted as we battled into the fifth seminar, though I wrote forward in some of the other topics. The problems of the final seminar pushed me to write *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human* (Axial Publishing, 2013). Below I round off the key feature of an everlasting shared neurodynamics of Jesus. Helpful in that are notes 68, 74, 79, 153 below.

about Interpretation: [FuSe 2](#), “Pedagogical Puzzling over the Second Canon of Hermeneutics.” Interpretation was the focus of the next three essays of the series, listed immediately.

[FuSe 10](#): “Contexts of Functional Interpretation”

[FuSe 11](#): “Lonergan’s Crippling Difficulties with Interpretation”

[FuSe 12](#): “Interpretation’s Future and the End of Lonerganism”

Add to these, later comments, especially those that form the core of the recent book, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.<sup>9</sup> But these efforts of mine simply weave forward from Lonergan’s telling of the Brutal Truth of Interpretation, which, yes, is well worth putting in here, in this swift shot in the dark.

The foregoing sketch will call forth vigorous resistance, and it is of some importance to distinguish between different sources of opposition. The introduction into physics of tensor fields and eigenfunctions raised a barrier between theoretical physicists that grasped the mathematics but possessed no great skill in handling laboratory equipment and, on the other hand, the experts in experimental work for whom the recondite mathematics was sheer mystery. In similar fashion one may expect the diligent authors of highly specialized monographs to be somewhat bewildered and dismayed when they find that instead of singly following the bent of their genius, their aptitudes, and their acquired skills, they are to collaborate in the light of abstruse principles and to have their individual results checked by general requirements that envisage simultaneously the totality of results. Still, this is the minor resistance, and it should cause no greater difficulty in the field of interpretation than its analogue does in physics.<sup>10</sup>

I could distract both of us here by a fruitful diversion into the parallel between this set of claims and the claims considered by Lonergan in the first three paragraphs of

---

<sup>9</sup> *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* (Axial Publishing, 2015), referred to below as *Allure*.

<sup>10</sup> *Insight*, 603-4.

*Method*.<sup>11</sup> It would be both a sad and a hilarious distraction, but best focus the quaint humor on one simple parallel: the collaboration “in the light of abstruse principles.” How many of us regard Lonergan’s discovery of the X of Cosmopolis as the discovery of abstruse principles?<sup>12</sup>

My interest here is in bringing the two deep abstrusenesses together in this fresh start. “It is time to go back to the beginning and start again.”<sup>13</sup> The fresh, and I hope startling, togetherness is expressed in the view that they—we—are “to have their individual results checked by general requirements that envisage simultaneously the totality of results.”<sup>14</sup> That envisagement, in *Insight*, is densely expressed in the paragraph named 60910; in *Method in Theology*, it is altogether more densely expressed in the

---

<sup>11</sup> I have been delving into this topic, the first 3 paragraphs of the beginning of the first chapter of *Method*, for quite some time. See, e.g. *Allure*, 8–9. The failure of most of my Lonergan-scholar colleagues to read them increasingly astonishes me.

A short comment here may help the reader, indeed help the reader read freshly. It is the problem of turning over a new leaf at the bottom of the first page (3) of *Method in Theology*’s first chapter, which ends with that phrase, “academic disciplines.” Did you pause over those two words, or return to them, puzzled by the next page’s rejection: “do little to advance” (line 2 of page 4)? I suspect that most of my readers really do not know what this is all about. It is about the articles written in literary and aesthetic journals. It is about the “vigorous resistance” commented on in the quotation at note 10: but as yet there is no vigorous resistance but complacent survival of amateurism. One stays in one’s own school, indeed in one’s own corner, perhaps comparing the opinions of Jacque and Ghillie, not being pushed, as the doings of, say, physics, push towards “cumulative and progressive results” (*Method*, 4): spinning rather, in effete circles. There is much more to be said of course: the doings of physics are no longer paradigmatic, since physics needs increasingly to get its standard model into an enlightening genetic sequence of such models that would nudge it out of its present messings.

<sup>12</sup> [Joistings 22](#), “Reviewing Mathew’s Lonergan’s Quest and Ours,” brings into focus the coincidence of the quest for the X of Cosmopolis with the drive towards the X of functional collaboration. A certain convenient Lonerganist nominalism brushes aside the X reached as, for it, an unknown. The X of the achievement of 1965 would seem to be, for that group, a librarian’s achievement of filing. But then, should not such disciples of Lonergan hunt for a solid answer to the search for the X of Cosmopolis?

<sup>13</sup> Joan Robinson and John Eatwell, *An Introduction to Modern Economics*, McGraw Hill, London and New York, 1973, 52. The Establishment blocked the fresh start. See Marjorie Turner, *Joan Robinson and the Americans*, M.E. Sharpe, Armour, N.Y., 1990. I am, frankly, not optimistic about my shifting the present establishment. But you could prove me to be lacking in hope.

<sup>14</sup> *Insight*, 604.

single word, “*Comparison*.”<sup>15</sup> The meaning of this single word sublates 60910 into the genetics of theses on the mystical body.<sup>16</sup> So there is a glorious shift in the final words of 60910 from “fuse into a single explanation” to “fuse into a single Explanation.”

Two powerful metatheoretic cultural shifts thus merge, something of an impossible dream, an improbable scream. One can associate that merging with the seeking that flowed in genius fingers as they typed of the contrast between that genius and the commonsense eclecticism that enshrouds his followers: “Theoretical understanding seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view.”<sup>17</sup>

I return now to the comments of the first paragraph of this section. I am sketching here, in my 85<sup>th</sup> year, with the hope of attracting the effective attention of a slowly increasing number of those interested in Lonergan’s climb and pointers. The interest has to be towards some authentic effort to bring forward, in themselves, in others, in history, the achievements of his climb. It is precisely sixty years since I began my own climb, and in the last decade accelerating towards a decent grip on the remoteness of his meaning.<sup>18</sup> Might I bring that sixty years to bear on the present tragedy of Lonergan studies? It is not that the study of Lonergan decayed in those sixty years: it started in a small world—I recall still his voice-rhythms as he talked in Dublin, Easter 1961, of big frogs in little ponds.<sup>19</sup> The frogs are there now, in a pond called Lonerganism. So it seems best to halt my musings on that pond here, and turn

---

<sup>15</sup> See note 7 above. On the meaning of *Comparison* as Lonergan struggled with it, see Pat Brown, [Lonergan Gatherings 10](#), “Some notes on the Development of Method page 250.”

<sup>16</sup> The topic is most fully treated in my *The Road to Religious Reality*, Axial Publishing, 2012. See especially 18-21, 38.

<sup>17</sup> *Insight*, 442. The paragraph that follows there brutally identifies settled eclecticism and the pseudo-modesty of common sense.

<sup>18</sup> The point of a missing ethos of growth is made varyingly in several of my writings, being gradually more refined. For a compact statement of a decade ago see pages 161-3, “Bacchuspiece,” of my *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2006).

<sup>19</sup> Memorable too because he made the remark in front of the *Caravaggio*, now worth millions, then an unknown dull painting on the Jesuit dining room wall in Leeson St., Dublin.

helpfully towards zones that I can relate to us all reading again, for the first time, that pinnacle of achievement that is *Insight 17*'s third section. I add four sections here that relate to questions that have emerged from readings of my last—in both senses—book: *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*. There are puzzlings around my four Appendices on contemplation and my all-too-brief comments on Teresa of Avila's strategies of climbing.<sup>20</sup> There were puzzles in *Allure* about my views of N.T. Wright's magnificent struggling with the New Testament.<sup>21</sup> Thirdly, some people are beginning to distance themselves from Lonergan, and this is in a good sense. Might we not have a shot at sensing that good sense? What could he have meant by his throw-away line of the early 1970s: "You're on your own"? Finally, we look to a lift of that line in the final section, asking you to try a solo walkabout, with your *moi intime*, in your own locale, searching for a seemingly impossible sharable view of an effective global scientific futurology.

Before moving on it seems as well to pause over a sentence of one of the quotations above from Lonergan.

One may expect the diligent authors of highly specialized monographs to be somewhat bewildered and dismayed when they find that instead of singly following the bent of their genius, their aptitudes, and their acquired skills, they are to collaborate in the light of abstruse

---

<sup>20</sup> See notes 31, 37 and 38 below. It seemed pointless at this stage to add any kind of description of the mansions' climb. In the case of my own mansion-structures, it is equally pointless. It looks to a large book, perhaps titled *The Interior Lighthouse*. Different climbs will emerge as effective for different cultures, personalities, periods and places, all to be revealed by geodynamic analyses. However, I would note that the present crisis is, to recall Sorokin, to get moving out of a sensate culture of initial meanings, especially in the cluster of sick initial meanings of money, layered into muddled statistics and mindless psychologies, that cancer our commerce. So, obviously, that move might well be nudged best by a shift to serious understanding in economics. Global economic planning based on mythic economics certainly is a manifest zone for a layer of mansion shifts regarding and guarding the meaning of *Concomitance*. (See the index of *CWL 21, For a New Political Economy* under *Concomitance*. *Concomitance* is the largest entry of the index.)

<sup>21</sup> See *Allure*, 122-3, 129, 217. See also the reference and relevant connections in note 56 below.

principles and to have their individual results checked by general requirements that envisage simultaneously the totality of results.<sup>22</sup>

The tragedy of Lonerganism is that the diligent authors among his followers were not bewildered or dismayed. They carried on with their monographs, theses, papers, in the old established style of “academic disciplines.” In *Insight*, I would urgently note, Lonergan had already presented a “third way ... difficult and laborious.”<sup>23</sup> One can miss that pointing in *Method in Theology*, where he writes there, “some third way, then, must be found and, even though it is difficult and laborious, that price must be paid if the less successful subject is not to remain a mediocrity or slip into decadence or desuetude.”<sup>24</sup>

The real difficulty with the collaborative functional dynamics of *Method in Theology's* fifth chapter is not that freshly discovered strategy: it is the failure of followers to notice the lift into science of interpretation that is the core of cycling and recycling. That failure showed up, without embarrassment, in the Montreal Conference of almost 30 years ago: *Lonergan's Hermeneutics. Its Development and Application*.<sup>25</sup> It remains the ethos of workshops, Festschrifts, theses, classrooms.

A central problem for me at this stage in my effort to lift the Lonergan following from “decadence or desuetude” is to what lengths I should go, or rather write? There is a very big book to be written on genetic systematics and its place in hermeneutics, but even if I plunged into it in my 85<sup>th</sup> year, would it break through for my intended audience any better than the genius effort of Lonergan's efforts in his very big book? I have often recalled my own luck in learning how to read compendiously big books in the mid-1950s. I still have on the shelf behind me the dominant book of my years in

---

<sup>22</sup> *Insight*, 604.

<sup>23</sup> *Method in Theology*, 4.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> The book was edited by Sean E. McEvenue and Ben. F. Meyer: The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C., 1989.

physics: Georg Joos, *Theoretical Physics*,<sup>26</sup> a book the same length as *Insight*, and I have often compared the two. Indeed, I recall comparing Joos' fifth chapter, "The Mechanics of a Single Particle,"<sup>27</sup> to *Insight*'s seventeenth chapter, both roughly the same length. One does not teach Joos fifth chapter: one gets down to the tough climb of detailed exercises and simpler texts. You might find it interesting to peruse my own teaching of the topic.<sup>28</sup> This morning I considered the problem of presenting the stuff of two pages of *Insight* (600–601) on "Interpretation and Method." Imagine notes, equivalent to my notes on particle dynamics spread over a course of serious effort, presented to an audience that, unlike my students then, are not at all open to thinking their way by exercises into a new paradigm? So I weave a shorter suggestive route, hoping that the exchanges of the series of HOW essays, and other ventures, would lift us to the new context. But alas it seems that what we need is, not a new deal, but a new deck.

## **B. The New Context of Teresa's *The Interior Castle***

First I note that I use here, as a matter of convenience, an old translation of Teresa's work.<sup>29</sup> I do so because it is available on the Web, so you can follow my references easily by consulting it or even printing it off. Next, there is my question of procedure. My aim, in this and the following sections, is to help you break forward into that third section of *Insight* 17. So, why not start there? Indeed, my eventual bright decision was to have us try to take to heart, in the three sections, **B**, **C**, and **D**, only three subsections: 3.1 then is connected with the venture of interpreting *The Interior Castle*;

---

<sup>26</sup> Blackie and Son, London, 1951<sup>2</sup>. Ira M. Freeman collaborated in this second edition. It is no doubt dated, as is the work by Lindsay and Margenau that Lonergan used in the same zone. On my shelf beside *Joos* — my way of referencing the book — is a decent, larger (1100 pages) replacement for *Joos*, but not for Lindsay and Margenau: Roger Penrose, *The Road to Reality. A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*, Vintage, London, 2005.

<sup>27</sup> *Theoretical Physics*, 79-105.

<sup>28</sup> The course is available on my website: numbers 7 and 8 of the [Website Articles](#).

<sup>29</sup> *The Interior Castle; or, The Mansions*, Written by Saint Teresa, translated from the Spanish by The Reverend John Dalton. London: T. Jones, 63, Paternoster Row, 1852. Referred to below as *The Interior Castle*.



3.6 will hold our attention as we consider interpreting John's Gospel; 3.8 is to be our zone as we ask about interpreting *CWL*. The remainder of section 3 will occupy us in the final section E.<sup>30</sup> But now I recall my conclusion of the first section. When I came to that conclusion of keeping this to short suggestions, I had already envisaged something that looked horrifically like a book that would take off from Teresa's Interior Castle.<sup>31</sup> Like the book suggested at the end of my short Preface to *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, I leave the task to someone else.<sup>32</sup>

So we begin our little venture. I must assume that you have to hand a copy of *Insight*. Our zone of interest in this section is a single page: from the 14<sup>th</sup> last line of page 585 to the 14<sup>th</sup> last line of page 586.<sup>33</sup> We wind our musings, literally, into Teresa's "beautiful and delightful castle; we must consider how we are to enter in,"<sup>34</sup> with the help of six paragraphs from Lonergan.<sup>35</sup> The first paragraph points to the distinction—the topic of the next five paragraphs—between "expression, simple interpretation, and reflective interpretation."<sup>36</sup> So we find immediately that we are dealing with an expression: "a verbal flow governed by a practical insight" of Teresa. Does Teresa's practical insight fit the listing (A) to (F)?

---

<sup>30</sup> In the end I did not stick rigidly to these division, but it could be of interest to have a shot at identifying parallels. Further, I would recommend venturing into my website book, [Christ in History](#), chapter 9, "Interpretation," and chapter 10 "Reinventing History," to detect the relationship between the canons of section 3.8 and *The Sketch* of section 3.6.

<sup>31</sup> The question occupied me a stages in the writing of *Allure*, and so I came to gather detailed notes on *The Interior Castle*. But it is to be a long road to an explanatory treatment of Teresa's efforts as guide to contemplation. It is nudging the community to begin this contemplative star-trek that preoccupies me here. All I can do here is give hints of the huge communal geohistorical science, a vastly different business from a descriptively-trapped comparison of, say, Teresa's view of contemplation and mine.

<sup>32</sup> *Allure*, 1. Recall note 8, with its incomplete tasks, and add the very scattered incomplete hints of the five essays on "Foundational Prayer" in [Prehumus 4-8](#).

<sup>33</sup> My suggestion is that you hold to that limit, and, of course, puzzled re-reading and diagramming helps.

<sup>34</sup> *The Interior Castle*, 4.

<sup>35</sup> These are the first six paragraphs of section 3.1 of *Insight* chapter 17: pp. 585-6.

<sup>36</sup> *Insight*, 585: the first short paragraph.

Teresa had not read *Insight*, nor discovered herself in herself.<sup>37</sup> She is a woman of sound common sense meshed uncomfortably into a mix of anaphatic and kataphatic achievement.<sup>38</sup> She faces the task of writing to her sisters without a serious grasp of the meaning of that previous sentence of mine.<sup>39</sup> Her soundness, including her grip on a shared common meaning, carries her forward to instructions that have been admired for centuries and those instructions have been repeated in like circumstances, or even quite different circumstance: as here, with you and me.

Now even when repeated in like convent circumstance, we are lifted into the world of the sixth paragraph, regarding “reflective interpretation”: for *like* obviously means *unlike*. An English sister can miss Spanish twists: indeed the twists may baffle a translator.<sup>40</sup> She and the translator notice difficulties. What sort of differences, and how are they noticed?

---

<sup>37</sup> See note 31 above. There are paragraphs in *The Interior Castle* about how the contemplative sister is to “enter into herself,” but such a venture in its full seriousness was quite beyond Teresa and her culture. Was it a matter of neglected subjects or truncated subjects? (See *A Second Collection*, 73). The question belongs in the geohistorical analysis. Add the view of the next note.

<sup>38</sup> The same geohistorical analysis would reveal the manner in which contemporary orthodoxy mediates talk of what is called mystic experience. Think of Catherine of Siena’s orthodoxy. There is a cluster of questions that need heuristic answers in dealing with all this, but noting one central point is important. We are dealing mostly here – regarding Teresa, St. John, Lonergan, ourselves – with talk of what is called, and is, “absolutely supernatural” (*Insight*, 747). Foggy talk in such matters can be avoided in so far as one is luminous in one’s meaning and use of analogy, which involves the triplicity of affirmation, negation and eminence. The affirmation of having a divine friend need no way be foggy: the mystery is focused by the other two tag-teaming. On this focusing of the mystery see the fifth thesis of *CWL* 11.

<sup>39</sup> The important issue, of course, is your psychic stand on the matter as you read and re-read both sentences. Perhaps it is worthwhile to skip to note 146 below to get a sense of “horizon and dread” (*CWL* 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 284-8). A massive axial crisis is the lack of sensibility with regard to growth of meaning.

<sup>40</sup> The translator of my copy of *The Interior Castle* (see note 29 above) has abundant indications of difficulty, quoting the Spanish at times to leave the issue open. Two footnote references stand out: 174: “This sentence is altogether unintelligible to me”: 177: “‘*Lo esencial de su alma*’ is an original expression, which I am unable to understand.” We have a host of subtle issues hovering round here, coming perhaps under Lonergan’s fifth canon of statistical residues, where “its proper appreciation calls for distinction between the systematic, the genetic, and the incidental” (*Insight*, 615). I invite you to push further here – but later! History’s molecules invite us – into

Let me begin this, our crucial musing, by suggesting that neither the sister nor the translator is lifted into the world of the sixth paragraph. Are we? Are you?<sup>41</sup> We can go back over the previous five paragraphs now and sense some failure of lifting in what I wrote, in what Lonergan wrote.

I have, on various previous occasions, talked of the comedy of this sixth paragraph. We have here a “problem of liberation,”<sup>42</sup> a move “that puts a familiar Tom and Dick”<sup>43</sup> and Sister Mary “in unfamiliar roles.”<sup>44</sup> The trickster Lonergan is at his best here, slipping complex answer-poised expressions of the problem past your eyes, trompe Louis and Louise, so that the solution is staring you in the face. You may even have slid along comfortably past the chasm on a first reading, as I did in 1958.

The next paragraph—slipping now beyond our limited page of six paragraphs—bites back at the end and begins a new paragraph, a new multi-referential paradigm. “Reflective interpretation is a smart idea, a beautiful object of thought. But is it a practical possibility? Has it ever been achieved? This brings us to the basic problem of interpretation.”<sup>45</sup>

---

the full heuristic of e.g. variations in the chemodynamics that go with variations in language. Helpful here would be a start in section, “Tonguetide” in my *A Brief History of Tongue: From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, 1998, 116-25. I would note that my use, in *Allure*, of Scot’s English for the New Testament connects with this issue and with neurochemical liberations. The same may be said for my odd appeal to you, in this context of contemplation’s demands, to read *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* (see notes 62, 66, 87, 138, 152, 153) with a slow and leisured attentiveness that allows for rooting and routing around in your chemical self.

<sup>41</sup> I am continuing the nudge of note 39, possible unwelcome. I recall an early effort of mine (*Towards Self-Meaning*, with Garrett Barden, Logos Books, 1969) regarding which there was trouble with the publisher. “You can’t do that!” was the reaction to nudges to “take your eyes of the page” (a phrase of Gaston Bachelard) and dance around your own minding. It is so amazingly easy to drift on without intussuscepting the home-quest, the homing-quest. Section E below is my invitation to you, yes, you, to take a week off for a Walkabout, a Walk (about)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> *Insight*, 643. Relevant here is the mood of the ninth chapter of *Topics in Education*, CWL 10, compactly expressed in the Conclusion, page 232. “The recreation of the liberty of the subject” when centuries of daftness “have done not a little to make live unlivable.” *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 649.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 587.

The beautiful object of thought involves our comprehending jump from the interpreter grasping “the anticipated audience’s habitual intellectual development  $C''$ ”<sup>46</sup> to the interpreter grasping “the audience’s habitual grasp  $C$ ” of its own intellectual development  $C'$  and of the difference between that development and the habitual accumulation of the insights  $C$  in the initial audience.”<sup>47</sup> I beg you to pause with me over this crazy typing of the summer of 1953 and the type-casting the finger-pointer had in mind.

Like a marathon runner impossibly switching to sprinting for the last few miles, he had in mind the paragraph 60910 as being a strange fresh start, yet one not yet identified as the turn to the X-Mansion.<sup>48</sup>

The previous paragraph is quite a shocking claim, and I cannot pause our effort to bring forth its grounds. But I would ask you to pause in some initial fashion about the key problem here: the grasp and expression of development, and the grasp and

---

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 585, end.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 586, lines 16-17.

<sup>48</sup> I have dodged the challenge of listing the layers of mansions – they would be geohistorical, not genetic: and this in the two senses, O-60910 and P-60910 – but I conveniently talk, here and in *Allure* (note 26, 235 and 225-6), of the X-mansion, the tenth mansion, to be shared, within cultural diversities, by the collaborators of the Tower. Despite diversities, they are comfortable with “pure formulations” that “proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint (*Insight*, 602). Notice here, an edging in 1953 towards the functionally collaborating audiences of 1965. Think, too, of the “hypothetic expressions” (*Insight*, 603, line 5) that might blossom through the functional collaborators into local effective expressions. In the same context think of the *Selection* of lines 12-14 of *Method* 250, that picks out dialectically opposed stuff but “dismisses other affinities and oppositions.” The dismissal is temporary: there can be layers of re-entry through the last three functional specialties and the broad zone of operations that I classify vaguely as  $C_9$ . The mansions have commonsense equivalents, a geohistory of them and their realization in relatively commonsense people. Certainly, as Teresa remarks, “God will lead them from one mansion to another, and place them in a country where these beasts cannot touch them or attack them” (*Interior Castle*, 24), but these well-dressed axial beasts are all around us. There is need for the mediation of transnational guiding light. “Never has adequately differentiated consciousness been more difficult to achieve. Never has the need to speak effectively to undifferentiated consciousness been greater.” (*Method in Theology*, 99: the end of chapter three on ‘Meaning’) And that speaking has to be about a massive shift towards self-luminously conversing with God.

expression of that, and then? .... well, you may recall my symbolism, “(X)<sup>3</sup>”<sup>49</sup>, for such complexification. We are talking about, and thinking about, a major meaning of any empirically-residual finitude, and the adding of populations of whats adds infinitely to the complexity of that meaning. Then one adds—the one being Jesus—the rich graceful complexity of the absolute supernatural and shift to a quite different class of infinitization.<sup>50</sup> Nor am I wandering here way beyond out topic: for developments within that infinitization is precisely Teresa’s topic.<sup>51</sup>

But before we return to Teresa and her sisters, and turn to me and my sisters and brothers, let us hover round the apparently simple words *development* and *growth*.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> I first introduced this symbolism at the end of chapter one, “The Value of Lonergan’s Economics for Lonergan Students,” of [The Redress of Poise](#), a website book of the mid-1990s. There I was writing about discernment: one may recall Ignatius of Loyola, but this reaches quite beyond his descriptiveness. I was writing about the discernment of discernments of discernments, thus pointing implicitly to becoming discerningly luminous about the geohistory of discernments, or more simply the development of the meaning of discernment. The handy symbolism suggested itself: (discernment)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> This is an extremely difficult zone of inquiry. We lack analogues that go beyond mathematics and physics. You might start by fumbling around with the index to *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, under *Infinite, Infinity*. Generally, there is a tendency to not regard the positive infinity of a Divine Person as altogether ‘beyond’. So, for instance, Jesus is normally shrunken in his Odd reality as human, and thus, e.g., my key suggestion of (np + P) sharing a neurodynamics (see note 122 below) that swirls forward darkly now as the symphony of P shared by np, where n is in the region of 10, is beyond the pale of serious thinking. To bring it out of the pale is to make a prolonged serious contemplative effort – that is the character of entering the Tower of Able – to get to grips with His present friendship with the individual human being that is reading this here and now. That shift rises up, mansion by mansion, to a hope that sees the mess of axial molecular aggregates that clutter our lives – think of the products of the automobile industriousness – as molecularities to be massively reinvented in the millennia to come, weave into chords of a great human symphony.

<sup>51</sup> Digging out that identification, that symphonic continuity, from Teresa’s efforts is part of that long geohistorical struggle that I am urging on the global Christian community. The struggle is to be shared by all of humanity, an *exigence* within (See CWL 18, index) that will not be denied: but that is another topic. For the Christian group, doing theology requires this concrete cherishing of the climb out of the pretensions of these first millennia of Christianity to glimpse in them “something better than was the reality.” *Method in Theology*, 251.

<sup>52</sup> I have to hand three old respected books which pivot on the topic without getting beyond fogginess regarding the core of the inquiry. They are [i] Karen Horney, *Neurosis and Human Growth* (Norton, 1950); [ii] Kneale and Kneale, *The Development of Logic*, (Clarendon Press, 1962), [iii] Bell, *The Development of Mathematics* (McGraw-Hill, 1945). Nor has the core been tackle in the

During my early struggle with their meanings I ventured into the world of biology. I was impressed there by one author's honesty. "Does not everyone have some notion of what development implies? Undoubtedly most of us have. But when it comes to formulate these notions they usually turn out to be very vague."<sup>53</sup> There was an earlier phase<sup>54</sup> and later phases<sup>55</sup> of my interest in climbing beyond this vagueness, but what I wish to nudge you towards is a sense of the centrality of this naming of growth or development in our effective contemplation of finitude's journey, and the persistence of vagueness: what I call initial meanings.<sup>56</sup>

How might I turn to Teresa's pointings and to mine? I reached around for days before leaping to a strange bridging. The lead involves blanking out on summary presentation of either, yet in another way not thus blanking. Let me (LOL) **explain!**

---

decades since, despite surges of sophistication in these and all other areas. The brilliant heuristic nudge of Lonergan's heuristics of development remains a neglected peek, peak.

But now I pause – as I do later on, very relevantly on in my revisioning, at note 83, musing on your development, Jack and Jill and Jane Eyre. Yes, *Jane Eyre* is a fourth old respected book about moving towards home. Have you found a home, like Stephen McKenna? Perhaps not yet. "How people feel when they are returning home from an absence, long or short, I do not know: I have never experienced the sensation" (Charlotte Bronte, *Jane Eyre*, Scholastic books, 1962, 265). "The question followed: where was I to go?" (*Ibid.*, 266). The question follows here, in section E. And on my mind is the pace of the walkabout, like the pace of meeting Jane Eyre, or – as Michael Jackson suggests – meeting yourself in the mirror. The first reader of *Jane Eyre*, George Smith, read the manuscript enthusiastically in a day. We need a slower pace, and perhaps the companionship of friends: though this is tricky if one edges towards the hidden lonelinesses of the *moi intime*, where one "keeps some matters entirely to oneself, and refuses even to face others" (*Insight*, 495). On, then, to note 144.

<sup>53</sup> Paul Weiss, *Principles of Development*, New York, 1939, Preface. I first quoted Weiss, and elaborated on his work, in "Insight and the Strategy of Biology," 80-83, *Spirit as Inquiry: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan, S.J.*, edited by F.E. Crowe, Herder and Herder, 1964, 74-88.

<sup>54</sup> Some account of this interest of 1958 in Thomas's meaning of "growth" is given in the website book of 1990: *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young Christian*, 1958: at the beginning of chapter 2.

<sup>55</sup> The complex climb of the later phase began with my discovery, in the early 1970s, of Lonergan's hints about the growth of a genetic systematics of mathematics in "*De Intellectu et Methodo*" (see note 108 below).

<sup>56</sup> See *Allure* 51, note 24 and 145 note 23. A relevant essay is [Lonergan Gatherings 9](#), "N.T. Wright on Resurrection: the Problem of Initial Meanings."

The full task, sneakily placed in that paragraph on reflective interpretation, is to rise to an adequate ontic and phyletic perspective, the latter including the former. The adequate perspective is, essentially and image-wise, that to which I point in the fourth and final Appendix in *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*. In that genetic perspective, a shadowy skeleton at present, there are to be effectively and openly loaded bent towards two slices of the geohistorical image, one with the interpretation of Teresa's Interior Castle and one with an interpretation of mine.<sup>57</sup>

I turn now, in strange fashion, to tune you into the seed of both interpretations by moving back in history to a contemporary of Thomas Aquinas (1225-74): Dogen Zenji (1200-53).

All our activity is rooted in the eternal nature of 'everyday mind'. Most of the time we forget this but Buddhas are always aware of this fact. If we have *hosshin*—the resolve to attain supreme enlightenment—surely we will enter the Way of Buddha. This desire for enlightenment must be self-generated; it cannot come from others. Enlightenment is the natural activity of 'everyday mind.' This is the way of learning through the mind.<sup>58</sup>

Yet the desire for enlightenment is generated in the context of others and of what we have done so far with the molecules of God. I recall now, still brightly, the evening of my first day in the Jesuit novitiate, September 7<sup>th</sup> 1950, being led astray through being asked to spend 30 minutes the next morning getting some superficial message out of the story of the rich young man: no urging of whatting there! How much was and is that Christian system of satisfying the everyday mind meshed into the axial sickness, the "life unlivable"<sup>59</sup>?

---

<sup>57</sup> Think for the moment of a simple genetic analysis, unrelated to global spacetime coordinates: Teresa view would belong to an early part of the genetic dynamics. Your push into this area may come from Insight's treatment of genetics in chapter 15, or you find the lead mentioned in note 55 helpful.

<sup>58</sup> Dogen Zenji, *Shobogenzo*, translated by Kosen Nishiyama and John Stevens, Tokyo: Kawata Press, Volume I, 1975, 13.

<sup>59</sup> Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, CWL 10, 232.

I later built Dogen's searchings into an invitational expression of the kataphatic climb,<sup>60</sup> even though Dogen's drive, and indeed much of that drive, like the drive of the past few millennia, is, like Teresa's: dominantly apophatic.<sup>61</sup> The task of full expression is one of paralleling, conveniently, the climbs of these and other apophatic guides.

Since Teresa work was on my mind during the writing of *Allure*, I mused over the climbing challenge in terms of mansions.<sup>62</sup> But one might also use an image such as the strategic camps in the Everest Climb.<sup>63</sup>

My recent writing in this venture moves, in the end, to talk of an X-mansion. X is nicely ambiguous. I am, yes, talking about the mansion that is to be the core of Tower

---

<sup>60</sup> See note 87 below.

<sup>61</sup> Relevant here are the five Website essays on "Foundational Prayer," [Prehumous 4-8](#). A key text here from Lonergan, to which we refer later, is the last paragraph of *Method in Theology* 341 and the first paragraph of the next page. Best quote some sections of that text as part of our context in grappling with the climb towards Them. "However, if there is to be an affirmative or kataphatic, as well as a negative or apophatic, theology, there must be confronted the question whether God is an object. .... If by an object one means anything that is intended in questions and known through correct answers, anything within the world mediated by meaning, then a distinction has to be drawn. .... On what is called the primary and fundamental meaning of the name God is not an object."

<sup>62</sup> See *Allure*, 50-51. Indeed, in my notes of the summer of 2015, I made various attempts at sketching parallels to Teresa's climb in the steps of Lonergan's 'crisis shifts.' I shall touch on some of the shifts below (see, in particular, note 119) but I gave up there any attempt to treat of Teresa's mansions. However, I do weave about them in various suggestive ways: see note 66 below. The next note is the beginning of such helpful hinting.

<sup>63</sup> The venture I write of, towards the peak, peek, of 60910, needs analogies and narratives that encourage and stimulate. On May 29<sup>th</sup> of 1953 Edmund Hillary and Tenzing Norgay arrived at the top of Everest. At that date Lonergan was in the thin air of the later chapters of *Insight*, heading for the inventive climb to 60910. It was a shocking solitary battled fingered up, in molecular lightness, on a little typewriter. I recall vividly working through the typescript in the early 1970s, and my imagination was shot back to the scene in the film *Amadeus* where Salieri, looking at some Mozart pieces, remarks, "but there are no corrections!" We are dealing with a shocking level of genius here, and we must find staggeringly what we are capable of intussuscepting. A month's or a decade's failed staggering may produce little result beyond admiration. Then so be it: just don't join the fools described in that great central paragraph of *Insight* 442, or the worse fools, who fail to brace themselves towards Camp Chapter 5 of *Insight* yet claim to be emending later chapters.



radiance, the answer to the central uncompleted search of *Insight* for Cosmopolis. “Still, what is cosmopolis? Like every other object of human intelligence, it is in the first instance an *X*, what is to be known when one understands.”<sup>64</sup> Is that *X* also a pointer to the arrival at a tenth mansion, a tenth camp? We may muse on that: but the key to the whole ethos is there—“when one understands,” and is to be there, sunflower smiling, on the seed’s sway: 1, 2, 3, 4 ... 10. It is the old badly-battered bent—in all religiosities—of faith seeking understanding.<sup>65</sup> I recalled, in my [Cantower](#) 101 essays,<sup>66</sup> the joy of a young lady in my pointing out to her that prayer and thinking merge. Further, there is the need for many to discover that the true road is pious but

---

<sup>64</sup> *Insight*, 265.

<sup>65</sup> Lonergan writes abundantly on this, and within this, InWithinTo this (See note 84 below), but perhaps a single Christian-focused central reference gives an anchor slice in the genesis of a needed fuller view: *Verbum. Word and Idea in Aquinas*, CWL 2, 213-22. Note 67 below points the way to a larger context of global religiosity seeking explanatory understanding and thus mediating a lift in global piety and care.

<sup>66</sup> The listing of essays is given in [Field Nocturnes Cantower 43](#), where I built various essays into the Cantower project of 2002. The 101 ‘essay’ is, in fact a series of 13 essays titled [Eldorede](#), and available under that title on the Website. The series is a type of introduction to the kataphatic attitude, and the essay in question here is [Eldorede 3](#), “Prayer, Spirituality.” *Field Nocturnes Cantower 43* gives a more complex set of guidelines to the longer enterprise. I think of Tess of the d’Urberville “End of Second Phase” (Thomas Hardy, *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*, Random House, 1951, 127): “‘By experience’, says Roger Ascham, ‘we find out a short way by a long wandering’” *Ibid.*, 124. [Roger Ascham tutored the young Queen Elizabeth I in Latin and Greek. Does he not fit into our geohistorical heuristics? And then there is John Dewey, who regarded Tess of the D’Urbervilles as first in influence of English novels.] Other notes relating to Tess are 40, 62, 87, 138, 152, 153.

not pious,<sup>67</sup> that it is mysterious but not mysterious.<sup>68</sup> But these discoveries are road-kill come-about. And where in that mansion-layering is the stare-kill in which

it comes about that that the extroverted subject visualizing extensions and experiencing duration gives place to the subject oriented to the

---

<sup>67</sup> I here take advantage of this odd phrase to give a nudge towards the central shift of the culture of interpretation. Think of the lesser shift of Abelard's "Sic et non," (*Method in Theology*, 279, 297) and take a flight of fancy regarding the meaning of "pious but not pious", even add humor if you have met strange types of piety: "sick and not"? I recall now, 70 years later, meeting "Pius Aeneas" (*insignem pietate virum*" {bk 1, line 11}: see the comments in the Introduction by Bernard Knox, to Fagles' Translation, *The Aeneid*, Penguin 2008, 13-15) in my school Latin studies and being deeply impressed by the meaning of *pious* involved. It seemed very distant from my local parish's stirrings. But now I ask you to think of the geohistorical humbler context of asking "what is piety?" What of the millennia of Chinese pieties, of the *Upanishads*, of the Zulus, of Dogen? What we are fermenting towards is a global piety, but the fermenting involves a massive multinational multidisciplinary "*Selbstvollzug*" (*Method in Theology*, 363). One is to find, then, a geohistorical context that places the sixth gift of the Spirit of Isaiah and Thomas (see *la Ilae*, q. 68, a. 4) within the interpersonal global care of the divine. I am nudged, as I write, to lengthen my note considerably here by adding a piece of this week's correspondence with the scholar Aaron Mundine, working on letters of Voegelin: "two extracts from letters, one seemingly meshing with the other: "It is strange that Thomas, in his *Summa Theologica*, has no doctrine concerning the Church; and all neo-Thomist efforts notwithstanding, there is nothing to be done about this. I can explain this peculiarity only by assuming that Thomas, in his symbol consciousness, had a few thoughts about the Church that he preferred not to put down on paper" (Voegelin to Alfred Schutz, January 1, 1953 [CW 30: 131]). "Even [the] expansion of the *fides* ... to all of the experiences of divine reality in which history constitutes itself, cannot be said to go beyond 'Christianity.' For it is the Christ of the Gospel of John who says of himself: 'Before Abraham was, I am' (8:58); and it is Thomas Aquinas who considers the Christ to be head of the *corpus mysticum* that embraces, not only Christians, but all mankind from the creation of the world to its end. In practice this means that one has to recognize, and make intelligible, the presence of Christ in a Babylonian hymn, or a Taoist speculation, or a Platonic dialogue, just as much as in a Gospel." (Voegelin, "Response to Professor Altizer", *CW 12* (1990), 294). My thanks to Aaron for this and for his permission to use it. There is the full deep challenge of *Comparison* (*Method in Theology*, 250) to leave the cultured personae of molecularly-boxed piety in favor of a paradoxical transformed global *moi intime*.

<sup>68</sup> This is a massively complex global issue of religiosity, but perhaps – as in note 65 – a single Christian illustration of the problem would help focus: that is given in note 74's reference to a text of Rahner. The broader problem is getting into a luminous psychology of the triple twist of meaning in thinking analogously, thinking in a fresh self-controlling fashion of, and in, affirmation, negation and eminence as a psychic unity. One can affirm thus clearly a personal friendship with the Infinite, clearly hold to "critical method with respect to the ulti-Mate" (*Insight*, 708) and rise – within the added depth of the "absolutely supernatural" (*Insight*, 747) – to the precision given by a focal inverse insight (*The Triune God: Doctrines*, *CWL 11*, Thesis 5), that gives a remote eminence to the mystery that even weaves into the everlasting minding of Jesus. See further, note 79.

objective of the pure desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies.<sup>69</sup>

In the weave and to-and-fro of many mansions that deep poise of “Insight as Science” may well only reach self-luminosity when one is coming about to find, in God’s minding of “the greatest of all works,”<sup>70</sup> the Minding and minding of one’s minding in an ever-accelerating pilgrim glimpse.<sup>71</sup>

You find me here rambling round features of a kataphatic climb that would have parallels in Teresa’s description of the convent climb. Might they be ordered? Only, I fancy, in a loose fashion, and certainly not in this rather weird essay. Levels of mansions are identifiable. I recall now an effort I made to give key pointers in [Cantower 9](#), “Position, Poosition, Protopossession.” However, after my initial indications there of position, and the higher mansion of poosition, I wandered in my own searching for some meaning of a communal mansion, a protopossession that I was still searching for when I came a decade or so later to write [Posthumus 8](#), “My Story, His Story, Position” and [Posthumus 9](#), “Poosition, Comparison, Finite Processions.” The searching continues, though in section D below I do arrive at a decent intimation of an existentially satisfactory plateau. “Is the intimation fleeting?”

---

<sup>69</sup> *Insight*, 537. This is a central text of all kataphatic mansion searching. On its enmeshing into Divine Conversation see *Allure* chapter 19, “The Well of Loneliness.” There, you may, literally, encounters the switch, within your divine mindedness, to the luminous darkness of knowing that “God is not an object” (*Method in Theology*, 342, line 2). On the interplay and sequencings of kataphatic mansions, see notes 119 and 153 below.

<sup>70</sup> *The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 491.

<sup>71</sup> I recall here, as I have many times before, a piece of a letter of Lonergan to Crowe, May 6<sup>th</sup> 1954, typed without italics as he did at the time: “The Method of Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating  $[1 + 1/n]^n$  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.” Later I push this perspective in a variety of ways. See below notes, 85, 120, 146. There is to emerge eventually a common pilgrim view on an eschatological reality of *Imago hominis in Deo*, a strange magnificently-cunning neurodynamics of God. See note 153.

Does it touch our deepest aspirations? Might it awaken such striving and groaning as would announce a new and higher birth?"<sup>72</sup> The intimation, in each such mansion-shift, begins by being a fleeting shock that, Grace-clasped, becomes a noticing which tweets and tweaks, perhaps butterfly-flies, through what-prise into a pious intussusception that is not pious.

My final sentence there is far from the talk of the good St. Teresa though we share a fondness for butterfly imagery.<sup>73</sup> Such imagery helps our empirical residence to tune to the ever-present allure, but the luminosity of analogy is to control it in its kataphatic form.<sup>74</sup> Adequate precise talk of this, and of the things of the spirit, is a thing of the future,<sup>75</sup> and while I claim a refinement of horizons quite beyond Teresa, I can still echo, for our axial times, what Teresa wrote. "These interior subjects are so difficult to understand, that whoever knows no more than I do is compelled to say many superfluous and foolish things, in order to mention a few things that may be useful."<sup>76</sup> Still, like Teresa, but now in a new leaning Tower horizon of shifting statistics of effective lighthouse contemplation, I appeal for preliminary discernment in finding

---

<sup>72</sup> Lonergan, "Mission and the Spirit," *A Third Collection*, edited by F.E. Crowe, S.J., Paulist Press, 1985, 27.

<sup>73</sup> See *Allure* chapter 15, "Systematics and the Elements of Meaning." The paralleling of chapters in *Insight* and *Method* is a key strategy of *Allure*. That chapter's drive is central to this essay's ramble round the need for a genetic systematics of global control. See note 108 below.

<sup>74</sup> A concrete illustration of the need for such control emerges in Karl Rahner's 1970 Florida Lonergan International Conference contribution—he did not make it there, as I remember, due to flight messes. The piece was his sound reflection on Lonergan's *Method* chapter 5, published in the *Gregorianum* in 1969: it was published in the same journal in 1971. He was quite clear about its broad relevance to the humanities, but his perspective on mystery led him to doubt its capability of respecting properly *Mysterium Christi*. My answer to his problem is sketched in note 68 above. I recall now, as a relevant aside, the remarks he made, in what was his final lecture—it appeared in *Theological Studies* early in this century—about the sad absence in the theology of a serious eschatology: "where are we going?" See further, note 79.

<sup>75</sup> The second half of my book, *Sane Economics and Fusionism* (Axial Publishing, 2010) develops this point. The point is implicitly made in *Insight* 541- 543, where Lonergan moves along in his own genius minding regarding the meaning of the spiritual, the venture of an evolutionary sport. Here, certainly, we putter about with initial meanings all too confidently.

<sup>76</sup> *The Interior Castle*, 9.

one's road to enlightenment. There is a massive literature, from all cultures, seeking to replace or update or Orientalize Teresa's shot in the dark. We need to heed her shrewd advice about finding guidance. "I advise you to make a choice of one who is very learned; and if you can, one who is also spiritual."<sup>77</sup> The choice, in later times, is to be mediated by a global X-mansion.

We have been sketching along towards a glimpse of the piece of that X-Mansion which gives such new context as will lead us all slowly and collaboratively to get Teresa's effort and mine into parts of a geohistorical genetics.<sup>78</sup> But the problematics of the next section give us a better sense of the leap involved, and so it seems sensible to postpone further hintings about that powerful genetic heuristics until we have wandered around the needs of the study of scripture for such a lift.

### **C. The New Testament and the New Context**

I leave the mansion-trailing incomplete to view another path, another camp, another prayerbreak. Old and New Testament are there, as well as *Upanishad* and other markings of human trails. But my focusing effort brought me to the New Testament. For weeks I have mused over the reach for words that might help, help to encourage you to tune into the new context in your reading of the New Testament. The climb expressed in *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* must weave, decade-slow,

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 151. I suspect that this was the passage Lonergan had in mind when he wrote (*The Triune God, Systematics, CWL 12, 113*) "it also helps to remember that St. Teresa considered the advice of a genuine theologian more useful than that of a saintly priest."

<sup>78</sup> Recall note 57. I had best keep the enlargement simple here, though its fullness requires a sophistication of Markovian analysis (see my *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, Gill, Macmillan and Notre Dame, 1970, 237). Imagine a honeycomb of tubes moving out from the globe, tubes giving local contexts of meaning. The start date can vary. For further consideration of the image see the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> appendices (to chapters 10 and 11 respectively in *Allure: "Reaching for an Image of Global Valuing"* (125) and "Deepening the Image of Global Valuing." (135)

into the tuning of the molecular you.<sup>79</sup> Wishing you and I to focus a little on the New Testament and the genetics of its meaning for “the beginning” gradually tightened to a focus on the Gospel of John, but then today the focus tightened and spread around two verses of John’s Gospel. “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not die but have eternal life. For God did not send his Son into the world to be its judge, but to be its Savior.”<sup>80</sup> The tight focus spreads round that verse like the way in which mathematicians spread their evolutionary whats around the sent, the scent, of the words “ $a^x + b^x = c^x$ ” wishing for enlightenment, luminous enlightenment, about the meaning of the “nomen”<sup>81</sup> x there. So here now, now here, nowhere, there is the meaning, of X—or G—in the equation X

---

<sup>79</sup> My regular reference here, my invitational pointing, is to that single and singular page 722 of *Insight*. A key point of the present essay is the advance into a mansional joy regarding the final sentence. “But good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.” But there must be a communal contemplative asking, empirically and in the full reach of what towards “unrealized possibilities” (*Method in Theology*, 53), about the order’s molecular zeal. It is not just – I quote loosely – “oxygen’s more excellent end to contribute to the maintenance of human life” (“Finality, Love, Marriage”, *CWL* 4, 19) but the entire galactic plethora plunging forward to become that maintenance in the neurodynamic shared home of the minding Jesus. I would note – and it can be of huge existential importance – that this fulsome view of molecular finality can lift one’s hopes and fantasies enormously, as one walks past lonely molecules trapped in present madneses of urban life. Brood brightly over mind-reaching metals in speeding cars. We have strange fresh liberatings to invent in these next millennia. Brood too over the place of this fulsomeness: is it a window-view of the X-Mansion?

<sup>80</sup> *John* 3: 16-17.

<sup>81</sup> I am thinking here of Thomas’s question 33 in the *Summa Theologica*, about *nomen Patris*, but in a broadened sense, considering *nomen* as an X, something reached for in the companionship of the third trinitarian Person, named conveniently, in *Allure*, “Grace,” with a grounding contemplative quest specified by the prayer, “Grace, Grace, Grace, attune us to the Allure of the Scent of a nomen.” (*Allure*, 199-200, 223). The basic image context is the bottom line of the diagram  $W_3$ , but its meaning is enhanced enchantingly, tingly, as one pauses in the triple naming that is *Clasping*, *Craving*, *Cauling*. [That naming is part of the naming, *Clasping*, *Cherishing*, *Calling*, *Craving*, *Christing*, that points to the existential intussusception of Lonergan’s suggestion regarding our participation in the Trinitarian reality: *The Triune God: Systematics*, *CWL* 12, 471-73. For a fuller context for this existential shift see my Epilogue, “[Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling](#)” to *Seeding Functional Collaboration*, edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy, Axial Publishing, 2016. See also note 153 below.

=  $G_{jk}$ ,<sup>82</sup> an equation hugging those two verses. It is the X-mansion that I hinted at in the closing stages of *Allure*.

Hugging? Should I say embracing, with more seeming propriety?<sup>83</sup> How is one to describe the “Agonbite of InWithTo”<sup>84</sup> that entwines the neurodynamics<sup>85</sup> of that

---

<sup>82</sup> On the symbol  $G_{jk}$  see note 106 below. I might well vary the symbolism. How, for instance, does the following equation strike you behind the eyes? :  $i^G + j^G = k^G$  . Can you lift it into the question that haunts chapter nineteen of *Insight*: “What, then is Being?” (*Insight*, 665). Rather, it haunted the writer of the chapter, who knew that the “twenty sixth place” (*ibid.*, 691) was not an end but a beginning, mind-molecules teetering on the edge of the twenty seventh haunting question of Thomas, a question lurking in the last supper speech of Jesus. G? Gee (a euphemistic contraction of Je(sus): *Webster*): Gee whiz (*Webster*: old slang for something strikingly excellent): ??  $i^G + j^G = k^G$  .

<sup>83</sup> The problem is to bring into your meaning the integral molecularity both of you and Grace. Concretely, in your thinking, push the virtue of charity into the stretching of *Insight* 489 and following – “study of an organism begins....” And so, “Being Breathless and Late in Talking about Virtue” (the title of the website [Quodlibet 3](#)) mansion-climb towards being a ‘character’ (*Method*, 356) of such talk.

But here I must pause over the issue of integral molecularity. Yes, it bubbles up in note 144 pretty explicitly as the allure of sexuality is brought into some focus. I am not addressing here – by now you may see that address as a disorganized parallel to Teresa’s guide to the convent sisters – a celibate audience. My readers, in the main, relish the polysensual joys of genital moistenings. The neurodynamics of such joys are a high point and pointing of our finitude. They are to be weaved into the allure of the compelling genius of history, and they find their way into the *eschaton* when charity finds its home base and, indeed, “good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.” *Insight*, 722, end.

<sup>84</sup> The phrase originates from the title of the 14<sup>th</sup> century Kentish translation, *Ayenbite of Inwit*, of the 13<sup>th</sup> French moral treatise, *Somme le Roi*. Joyce uses it in *Ulysses*. The meaning however is enormously different from Joyce’s and from the original author: it points to the reach for integral consciousness talked of in the previous note. *InWithinTo*: what does it name? Is our apparent single personhood fourpersonal, at once a seeded Listening, Spoke, Speaking? I recall my first leap to the related 4 questions that I share with people who ask of the meaning of the Divine Three. That leap occurred in the 1960s as I vested for Mass, and then preached to a mixed audience of nuns and retired prostitutes. The four questions are our common and commonsensely identified quest in pilgrim finitude. “When did I last have a real conversation? When was I last understanding, understood? When did I last speak? When did I last listen?” (See pages 7-8 of the 2005 edition of *Music That is Soundless*, referred to in note 87: I carry forward some reflections there on the place of these question in mansion-questing). In note 95 below I am nudged towards a modification of the phrase *InWithTo* through more recent mansion-weaving.

<sup>85</sup> The word neurodynamics should not be a shock to anyone taking the sixth and seventh chapters of *Insight* seriously. Lonergan ends these chapters by remarking that “our account of common sense relates it to its neural basis and relates aggregates of successions of instances of common sense to one another” (*Insight*, 269: commenting on both chapters in the last lines of

mutual hugging in which “God is not an object”?<sup>86</sup> “It is all so much, so sadly much beyond words.”<sup>87</sup> Yet might we not now correct that last end-statement of 48 years ago? If I am talking, as I am here, kataphatically, then it is no more beyond words than Andrew Wiles end-statement in his proof of Fermat’s Last Theorem:<sup>88</sup> “It follows that

---

chapter 7). The drive is carried forward through the rest of the book. See further notes 95, 120, 146 and 153 below.

<sup>86</sup> *Method in Theology*, 342, line 2. Some pointers to the move to a mansion of subjectivities are given in *Allure*, in the conclusion of chapter 19.

<sup>87</sup> P. McShane, *Music That Is Soundless. A Fine Tuning for the Lonely Bud A*, Axial Publishing, 2005. The subtitle is a change from the first edition of 1968, which was “An Introduction to God for the Graduate,” with an implicit reference to the Film, *The Graduate*. In this later edition the implicit subtitle reference is to Dogen Zenji’s *Shobogenzo*. I take advantage of this reference, and the four questions that haunt it (see note 84), to ask you to pause over my skipped considerations of either the sequence of mansions in Teresa or stages of the climb in kataphatic reaching. It is a pause that asks for a decision about the longer Walkabout pause of section E. I think now equally of Tess of Avila and Tess of the d’Urbervilles. In Thomas Hardy’s magnificent novel (my edition is Random House, 1951: referred to here as *Hardy*), Tess has in fact seven “phases” (xxxiii) to give another climb, and I recall George Eliot’s wonderful writing (Preface: *Middlemarch*) of “many Teresas other than Avila” who live hiddenly. My interest is in our turning to the little particulars of luck that tilt us to climbing, and particulars especially that are away from academe. Hardy’s novel helps even in the very demand for a slow reading, as well as abundantly identifying life-leaps. Of the hero, Angel Clare, we discover: “he was even in the habit of neglecting the particulars of an outward scene for the general impression.” (*Hardy*, 154). How long does the hero take – a 280-page reader’s journey – to notice “the mistake of his allowing himself to be influenced by general principles to the disregard of the particular instance.”? (*Hardy*, 434) Pause over the problem of “no-man’s land” in intellectual living (see note 133 below, and link the bold print there to the *Hardy* 154 and 434 quotations). In [Cantower 9](#), “Position, Poision, Protopossession,” I talked of years of climbing to rid my psyche slimly of naïve realism. My first conversation with Lonergan – Easter 1961 – was right in there and he remarked with his usual high-pitched ending, “When I got it, I had to go and ask somebody!” The climbs, in whatever pattern or order, are not done easily nor – and here is the paradox – are they done with easy genuineness in the ethos of the present academy, where, God help us, neat distinctions of conversions are “already-out-there-now.” Too much to say: you must journey and journal your unique way to your Agenbite of Inwit. No harm, however, in recalling here Hermine’s great weaving words to Harry, where she ends: “Ah, Harry, we have to stumble through so much dirt and humbug before we reach home. And we have no one to guide us. Our only guide is our homesickness.” Herman Hess, *Steppenwolf*, Penguin, 179. (See further notes 152 and 153.)

<sup>88</sup> On the last page (548) of his “Modular Elliptic Curves and Fermat’s Last Theorem,” *Annals of Mathematics* **142** (1995) 443-551. Referred to below as *Wiles*. The next paragraph contains the word **show**, thus, in bold face, three times. “Philip said to Him: **show** us the Father; that is all we need” (John 14:8). This entire paper of mine has weaved round the **show** problem. What does Avila **show**? What does Wiles **show**? Wiles final-sentence word *alpha* might well replace Philip’s



$S = T$ , as otherwise  $S = \ker(\alpha) + \text{im}(\alpha)$  is a nontrivial decomposition as  $S$ -modules, which contradicts  $S$  being local.”

But let us move back in Wiles effort from the end-statement to a bit of his chapter 3: “The most difficult step was to show that if  $r_0$  was unramified at a prime  $l$  then one could find a lifting in which  $l$  did not divide the level.”<sup>89</sup> The **show** of the step is helped by Ribet, but it is not beyond words. Is it beyond the words of Aczel’s light presentation in *Fermat’s Last Theorem*?<sup>90</sup> Yes, indeed it is: just as the **show** steps of  $X$

---

*Father* or *Avila’s Majesty*. To the problem of placement and grounding I shall return in note 99. Here, however, I wish you to pause over another show, a **show** of mine that has so far caught no interest among my senior colleagues. The show is the connection between *Method in Theology’s* word (250) *Comparison* to an uncompleted theorem of Loneragan’s *Insight* 763. “I would like to suggest that it {the historical aspect of development} may possess particular relevance to a treatise on the mystical body of Christ.” Briefly, H connects to a missing B. But how? Look now at the title of Wiles essay, where it can be asked, how M, Modular Elliptic Curves, connects with F: a missing theorem about  $x^n + y^n = z^n$ . Both problems – let me call them *HB* and *MF* – have had more than a two millennia run. On we go now to notes 89 and 90.

<sup>89</sup> *Wiles*, 503 (3:7–9). I am quoting from the half way mark in *Wiles*. I might have quoted from a halfway mark in history – see note 90’s reference – but let me slip over to the other problem, and a sort of half-way mark in Aquinas. “It is strange that Thomas, in his *Summa Theologica*, has no doctrine concerning the Church; and all neo-Thomist efforts notwithstanding, there is nothing to be done about this. I can explain this peculiarity only by assuming that Thomas, in his symbol consciousness, had a few thoughts about the Church that he preferred not to put down on paper” (Voegelin to Alfred Schutz, January 1, 1953 [CW 30: 131] I am indebted here to Aaron Mundine). Note now that you and I, most likely, clash here: for me both halfway marks are about an  $X$ . The first  $X$  is a bit of the genetics of Wile’s result. The second  $X$  is in the clouded *alpha* of Philip’s *Father* or *Avila’s Majesty*. You are less likely to clash with me if you are a kataphatic climber as specified by my four Appendices in *Allure* (24-25; 47-51; 125-26; 135-40). You, in a much later generation, will cherish the Tower community in which the clash has faded. You will then have a community such as Wiles has: a community that understands slimly, and struggles with, the wonderful meanings of  $x^n + y^n = z^n$ . Imagine that distant community that understands slimly and struggles with the wonderful meanings of God named in the equations  $a^x + b^x = c^x$  or  $i^G + j^G = k^G$ . (See above at notes 81 and 82). What was possessing the mind of the lonely middle-aged Thomas regarding the symphony of Jesus? Yes, **What**, the  $X$ , but in sweet darkness.

<sup>90</sup> Amir D. Aczel, *Fermat’s Last Theorem. Unlocking the Secret of an Ancient Mathematical Problem*, Four Walls Eight Widows, New York, 1996. The index points you to Ken Ribbet’s contribution: it is an interesting exercise to look for its description in *Aczel’s* text. *Aczel’s* book places us lightly in the story of the unlocking of *MF*. I add, as the entire paragraph above does, the problem of the unlocking *HB*. I encourage serious analogical thinking, but obviously I cannot do more than point to the relevant oddity in *MF* that I nudge you to think about in relation to my odd connecting in *HB*. Again look at *Wiles’* title. What have modular elliptic curves to do with

=  $G_{ijk}$  or  $i^G + j^G = k^G$ , is beyond the light presentation of John's account of what I might call *Jesus' Last Theorem*.<sup>91</sup> Is it beyond the **show** steps of Aquinas? Obviously useful here is to move into Thomas third lesson in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, where he muses over *John* 3:16–21. But here it is not merely useful but essential—for

---

Fermat's problem regarding a Diophantine equation? It is of little help to find that the curves in question are neither ellipses nor curves but polynomials like  $y^2 = ax^3 + bx^2 + cx$ , and modularity is a strange patterning. What is important is to reach some neurosympathy with Aczel (99) as he writes about Taniyama [of the 'Shimura-Taniyama conjecture' at the back of all this]: "It was an intuition, a gut feeling that the automorphic functions with their many symmetries on the complex plane were somehow connected with the equations of Diophantus. It certainly wasn't obvious. He was positing a hidden connection between two very different branches of mathematics." My gut feeling was, you might muse, about the connection between *Comparison* and 60910. My main point is that I did not, nor do I have, the parallel international surround of companionship in help, opposition, intrigue even, to what Taniyama, Shimura and Wiles had. My conjecture regarding Loneragan's puzzle is, I would claim, of some significance. Again, I recall Aczel (135): "The profound nature of the theorem is that not only does its history span the length of human civilization, but the final solution came about by harnessing – and in a sense unifying – the entire breadth of mathematics." For mathematics I would ask you to read, or re-read, *theology*. My theorem has not been challenged; it has not even been acknowledged. So much for the enthusiasm of scientific spirit in Loneragan studies: or for the integrity of its leadership.

<sup>91</sup> You can take me to be referring here to Jesus speaking at the last supper, or you might narrow it to the last theorem of Jesus given in *Method* on page 367: "The ideal unity is the fruit of Christ's prayer: ' . . . may they all be one . . . ' (John 17:21)." Yet I cannot help taking the opportunity to point to distant heights of the new theology. There is, then, the rare air of the last eschatological theorem of Jesus: His human self as a wondrous Goedelian Incompleteness Theorem, being spoken and cauled for all of us InWithinToo. I am stating something here in continuity with Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q.10, a.1, but in this new heuristic world about which I have been chatting. The nature of the divine is infinitely elusive to any human mind, ours or Jesus', pilgrim or paradisiac. And might we not think of that eschatological adventure as a dynamic acceleration of mind and matter that yet is everlastingly beginning?

I conclude here by noting the incompleteness of Loneragan's brief description of the position on page 413 of *Insight*. There is obviously no axiom or theorem of intentionality, but one could also list various other axioms of infinity and of incompleteness that have to find their way into our geohistory of the symphony of Jesus. Perhaps you might sniff the two sides to incompleteness in attending to the first and last chapters of the website book, [Loneragan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry](#): the entire book deals with incompleteness. In the lengthy (2-67) first chapter, "Goedel's Incompleteness Theorem," there is a focus of mind on Kurt Goedel: in the final lengthier (147-236) 14<sup>th</sup> chapter, "Communications: An Outreach to Loneragan Students," – the chapter represents the third part of the book, Existential Incompleteness – the reach is focused by Sinead O'Connor's CD, *Faith and Courage*, in 13 sections, one for each song. The integral human tower subject needs science and mollivoicing in a contemplative *moi intime*.

“bolder spirits”<sup>92</sup> who represent “the conspicuously successful science of their time,”<sup>93</sup> to represent their yes-answer in a genetic sequencing of answers. And in that necessary lift there is, later in the sequence, the context of *Allure* chapter 19, which meshes Aquinas Trinitarian Hypothesis<sup>94</sup> into *Insight* ‘s climb of the ninth section of chapter 19 and so lifts both searchings as to reach for the meaning of John’s words that locates one’s minding in the Divine Subjects’ Practical Minding in a manner that brings the *Agonbite of InWithTo* into the mutual “3 and all” hugging that is so elusively and delicately meant by *Agonbite of InWithinTo*, a fresher heuristic frontline.<sup>95</sup>

Here we can both find amusing the recurrent phrase of *CWL* 12, “these things being well understood.”<sup>96</sup> I am no more communicating here than was Teresa writing of a sixth mansion to younger sisters. But let us stay with parallels from such successful zones as mathematics, with the kataphatic then. What is my crazy paralleling about?

Let us shift back to the apparent simplicity of Lonergan’s discussion, in *Method in Theology* of interpretation, and focus on the first of his deceptively simple four prerequisites. “One understands the object to which the text refers.”<sup>97</sup> What is the object in the case of Fermat’s Theorem? Is it a curiosity connected with Pythagoras, or is the object a quirk of finitude’s dimensions? What, is the object of the theorems

---

<sup>92</sup> *Method in Theology*, 3.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>94</sup> One begins with Q. 27 of the *Summa Theologica*, perhaps helped by hugging my effort of *Theological Studies* 1962, “The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God.” That effort emerged by my continued contemplation from the late 1950’s on, of Lonergan’s *Divinarum Personarum Conceptio Analogica*, Rome, 1957). In 1964 Lonergan sent me what became my book of common prayer, what is now the heart of his *CWL* 12.

<sup>95</sup> I am unapologetic about the massive complexities lurking in these pointings. The italics of the two *Agonbite* statements recall the source and significance of my phrase (see note 85 above). The slight shift from the first to the second phrase, from *With* to *Within* connotes a mansion-ascent related to the molecularity of our embeddedness in the Symphony of Jesus – or what is traditionally called “the Mystical Body.” The mansion-ascent is related to the long contemplative climb that is to lift the scripture references at the end of *CWL* 12 into a present and future front-end of a geohistorical climb to the communal identification of each our *moi-intime*.

<sup>96</sup> A regular remark of Lonergan as he weaves forward through the dense subtleties of the Trinitarian reality in *The Triune God: Systematics*, *CWL* 12.

<sup>97</sup> *Method in Theology*, 155.

of John. Is it not God, and finitude's relations to God, including the dimensions of the everyday activity of our molecular loneliness? Again, I think of Dogen, and repeat:<sup>98</sup> All our activity is rooted in the eternal nature of 'everyday mind.' Most of the time we forget this but Buddhas are always aware of this fact. If we have *hosshin*—the resolve to attain supreme enlightenment—surely we will enter the Way of Buddha. This desire for enlightenment must be self-generated; it cannot come from others. Enlightenment is the natural activity of 'everyday mind.' This is the way of learning through the mind.<sup>99</sup>

But whether it is God or God's Mater or Grey Matter or Dark Matter in the geometry of spacetime, the object is elusive. We have a new context for successful science: a necessary genetic heuristic context, or indeed, a geohistorical heuristic.<sup>100</sup> Notice that, in an odd way, we thus get a piece of page 4 of *Method in Theology* back into page 3.<sup>101</sup> It is a cultural shift that emergent probability ferments forward in all areas. But here the shift we seek to encourage and cultivate is Tower kataphatic contemplation in the context of the study of Scripture. Earlier I raised this issue in the context of the work of Jonathan Bernier.<sup>102</sup> We could well pause over that work here, both as illustrating

---

<sup>98</sup> Recall note 5 above. There comes to mind here a Zulu proverb, "The *isisusa* wedding dance is always appreciated by being repeated." See note 10 of the Prologue to my *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2006), p. 166, for the source of the Proverb. I am thus pointing to the massive geohistorical flow of Africa that increasingly is to be weaved into the genetics around which this entire essay hovers.

<sup>99</sup> Dogen Zenji, *Shobogenzo*, translated by Kosen Nishiyama and John Stevens, Tokyo: Kawata Press, Volume I, 1975, 13. Layers of issues bubble up here, craving geohistorical sequencing, but the grounding issue is the what-reach of the everyday mind, a reach for alpha that increasingly craves to be met with functional subtlety. In its Towering mediating-reach it needs the climb through the early kataphatic mansions that intussuscepts position and poosition. Without that climb, expression of a Tao, be it in medicine or in mathematics or in mysticism or in metaphysics, is boxed into metaphors and muddles, whether the expression is of Dogen or Teresa or Chopra or new-age splutterings, all trapped in an already-in-here-unreal. The alpha problem is that the **what** of the everyday mind's *is? is! is.* eludes all contemporary cultures. The solution is the global meshing of the two searches, O-60910 and P-60910 in effective functional patterns. That effectiveness would ground a coming convergence of the worlds of religion, sciences, arts, technologies, and of all lonely alpha bethels.

<sup>100</sup> See notes 57 and 78 above.

<sup>101</sup> See the conclusion to note 11 above, on the turn of the page problem.

<sup>102</sup> See [Loneragan Gatherings 14](#), "Refining Our Quest for the Historical Jesus." I refer there to Bernier's "Ben F. Meyer and the Renewed Quest for the Historical Jesus," a seminar paper delivered in Regis College, Toronto, in the Autumn of 2015 and also to Bernier's doctorate work,

a present ethos and as giving us a peculiar springboard. Yet, as I did with my musing on a re-location of Avila's directions and mine, it seems as well to hold back on that till the conclusion of this section. Nor can my musings be extensive here: later reflections, questions, efforts, will bring forth the meaning of the new context for this and all studies. Then, perhaps, we may spread our wings and review the past century of Johannine studies, meshing in the better-known broader field of the search for the historical Jesus, spreading further to get a little sense of the full search for finitude's weave. But after puttering round quite a bit here it seemed best for you and me to bring this section to an end by the eccentric strategy of stealing from the ending, already written, of the next section. It makes odd reading here, a leap of fantasy. Will it be more plausible after the adventure of reading that next section? Here we are then:

"This is not a tale told by an idiot, a *Complete Idiot's Guide* to scriptural entrapment in *Exploring God*.<sup>103</sup> This is a quiet implicit tale trolled by a lonely savant, inviting us, in ever-fresh fantasy, to "taste and see!"<sup>104</sup> G<sub>jk</sub>.<sup>105</sup>"

What is meant by the initial "This"? It refers to the missing guide to present Scripture studies that I might have foolishly attempted here, a heuristics of the studies that

---

*Aposynagogos and the Historical Jesus in John: Re-thinking the Historicity of the Johannine Expulsion Narrative*, Biblical Interpretation Series, Leiden: Brill.

<sup>103</sup> The reference here is to Jeffrey B. Webb, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Exploring God*, Alpha Penguin, 2007.

<sup>104</sup> *Psalms* 34: 8.

<sup>105</sup> Surely a discomfoting end to this ramble on interpreting Lonergan: the clash of the meaning of the Psalmist with the meaning reached by Lonergan by venturing along one geohistorical genetic road of humanity's *Exploring God*. There are all the other untraveled roads described in Webb's book, roads that are to lead us all, when freshened, into the neurodynamics of God Incarnate. This places my ramble in the context of the final paragraph of my short Preface to *Allure*, where I refer back to the general categories of *Futurology Express* and forwards to a volume reaching out to these other roads. *Futurology Express* gives a "fuller characterization overlapping theology with the integral dynamics of culture, thus including implicitly the full spread of religious cultures, though that is a topic only skimpily treated in the present work and deserves a third volume, From someone else!" *Allure*, 1.

would reach not only into Old and New Testament, but into the sacred writings of the world, and the commentaries on them, to which Jeffrey Webb points in his book, *Exploring God*. “This” is to emerge, not as a book, but as an ethos of global whatting in these next centuries, leaning forward in a geohistorical genetics of ever-larger meanings destined for local lonelinesses. This will unveil the gruesome oversights regarding a divinity that, yes, knows all, even perhaps, guides all, even perhaps is portrayed a making finitude “a checkered board of nights and days, where destiny with men for pieces plays.” But at best it is a divinity of glorious commonsense kindly understanding. The God of Abraham and of the philosophers and even of the Sufi poets, for which I have a fondness, is not the God I write of when I use the Christ-offer symbol  $G_{jk}^i$ .<sup>106</sup>

The symbol  $G_{jk}^i$  is wonderfully symbolic of a shock to the system: or should I say *lack of system*? We are back at that discomfoting quotation from *Insight* 17.3 over which we paused in the first section. The sections between have brought us oddments that can help to make sense—effective sense I hope—of the suggestions made by Lonergan. There is the problem of critically and coherently lining up all the various traditions regarding contemplation, including the little patches of the story we touched on in section **B**. There is the similar but perhaps more disturbing problem that emerged in this section **C**: it certainly disturbs the holders to the old slogan, *Sola Scriptura*, whether that slogan is taken in piety or in positivism.<sup>107</sup> This HOW essay

---

<sup>106</sup> Christ-offer: I am twisting the name of what I may call a partially-contracted Riemann-Christoffel,  $G_{jk}^i$ . The usual contracted tensor is symbolized as  $G_{jk}$ , a familiar symbol of Einstein’s equations. Like Einstein’s equations, my Christ-offer symbol points to the twist and turns of space and time, grasped so shabbily by us even when focused only on the simplest of sciences. Consider, then, *Insight* chapter 19, section 7, “The Secondary Component in the Idea of Being” and weave into your glimpse of the divine ‘scientific’ grip on the totality of finitude, God’s offer of Christ’s sharing- caring molecular suffering offer of lifting forward, through Grace’s tuning, the reading of all the scriptures of the world, towards an effective science of God’s scientific cauling of human joy.

<sup>107</sup> Regarding piety, see note 67 above. Positivism should be given the same full context if it is to be dealt with in a manner yielding “cumulative and progressive results” (*Method in Theology*, 4, 5). Perhaps this central message is now coming across to you, perhaps any one of these gives

only adds a little more to pointers regarding this central component of the rescuing of humanity through an omnidisciplinary science of its battered quest.

So I risk a few concluding fresh comments here on this vast issue, my central theme.

I still recall vividly the shock of the 1970s in the Lonergan Toronto center when I found that passage on ingesting the history of mathematics to arrive at a genetic systematics.<sup>108</sup> But for you, if you are beginning your struggle, my effort at communicating the necessary shift to explanation in hermeneutics by the strategy of comparing the two sets of canons may well be the right focus for the jump required.<sup>109</sup> One may be eloquent about the color red of roses and sunsets and blood and blushes but explanation demands that one line up red, yellow, etc. in sequence, and so also then with ordered scientific talk of all the properties of things. Systematic control of talk of mansions or *apodynamos* belong there, and rise to the potential of the convergence of their meanings and the control of their future meanings. One begins thus to glimpse the massive heuristic power of 60910, and its mesh of O-60910 and P-60910. But “for the comprehension of everything in a unified whole” more is needed. One is nudged in that direction, as I certainly was by indexing *Method in Theology* in 1971, by *Method's* index under **Context(s)**. There are the weavings of overlapping, merging, etc. contexts that push us up to the control of geohistorical diagramming, a control-strategy that, so to speak, wraps round the globe Markov's

---

you a “so it comes about” (*Insight*, 537, eleven lines from end) lift towards the multiple paradigm shift involved in Lonergan's standard model? See, further, note 119, on a flexible approach to coming about.

<sup>108</sup> The passage is in *De Intellectu et Methodo* (1959), with translation (Michael Shield, 1990) title, *Understanding and Method*. This was a great leap in handling my problem of the slimness of Lonergan's 15<sup>th</sup> chapter in *Method*. The relevant passage is quoted frequently by me since I first did so in [Cantower 7](#), “Systematics and General Systems Theory”, 12-13: an essay relevant to our present topic. It is quoted in *Allure*, 117-18 from CWL 23, *Early Works on Theological Method 2*, 175-7.

<sup>109</sup> Useful here is my bringing together the two sets of Canons in [Cantower 14](#), “Communications and Ever-ready Founders,” especially pages 7-12.

diagramming of emergent probability's flowing contexts.<sup>110</sup> All this cries out for further detailed hinting, and some way we'll find a way in through footnotes that I add later. But one point seems important here and now in our effort to upgrade our following of Lonergan. That point is quite simple. The complexification of 60910 by geohistorical diagramming suggested by *Method's* more concrete approach to the interplay of contexts is not essentially tied into the further complexification that is functional collaboration. That, as emerges in the next essay, blossoms into a great strategic advantage in battling patterns of decay. So, we can carry that same geo-imaging of meaning's growth and control into this following section. Interpreting Lonergan rises into the same geohistorical context and, further, Lonergan's standard model is to become simply the Standard Model.<sup>111</sup>

#### **D. The Interpretation of Lonergan**

We turn now to the problem of interpreting *CWL*, the collected works of Lonergan including fragments yet to emerge. We can aim at conceiving doing so in the context

---

<sup>110</sup> See my *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, 254, on Markov's efforts. The sophistication of bringing it into a spherical form is my own, and additional features are the manner in which it grounds an imaging of context-flows: meshing, overlapping, etc. See *Method in Theology*, Index, under *Context(s)*. Helpful too is a musing over "The Ongoing Genesis of Methods" (*A Third Collection*, 146-65). The diagramming helps pattern operably "the individual subjectivity that is correlative to the world mediated by meaning and motivated by value" (*ibid.*, 151). The broader and more elementary heuristic context of emergent probability poses the discomfiting problem of having a theoretical grip on the meaning of probability: see note 130, below, and the text there.

<sup>111</sup> Obviously, this claim is mine but not an *a priori* business as we move forward. It is as well to note here that you could profitably regard this essay as my rambling attempt to contribute a version of lines 20-24 of page 250 of *Method*. Note that I am avoiding using the terminology of conversions here: I prefer to focus on their content and avoid classifications and refinements. Section E, below, is my invitation to you to walkabout towards articulating your position, at least to your self. It need have no reference to functional collaboration, but, yes, it can have strange depths that disturb the *moi intime*. (*Insight*, 495). On the *moi intime* see further notes 144 and 153.



of section 3.8 of *Insight* chapter 17, and indeed, in our slim HOW trip here, can see how “in another sense it is quite difficult to be at home in transcendental method.”<sup>112</sup> That other sense—LOL: “we must, then enlarge our interest”<sup>113</sup>—the reach we have been thinking about, at least lightly, through this fifth HOW essay. The sixth essay is to liberate us all from debates about functional collaboration and settle us, and the entire Christian cultural community, in a global culture that can no longer stay in either the patterns of successful science of physics or the slovenly erudition of “academic disciplines”<sup>114</sup> but must live in a geohistorical heuristics redemptive of all these searchings of art, science, technology.<sup>115</sup> I thus raise the already discomfoting bar I set in the tenth chapter of *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*. We are in the core<sup>116</sup> heuristic of the standard model of what I call *Futurology*. Call it what you like, but it had best be a nameless science. Not *Lonerganism*, then: but it could well be named *pragmatism* or *existentialism* or *whatever*, but in some global “non-academic-discipline” sense. The canons of section 3.8 are not intrinsically allied to a school, but they sit under a title, *Methodical Hermeneutics*, that is not only clumsy but ridden by too many cowhands.

---

<sup>112</sup> *Method in Theology*, 14: relate this to the pointing of 350-1, as a context for our push for genetic control, especially as it is to blossom into a geohistorical control of an eight-layered intervention in local situations.

<sup>113</sup> *Method in Theology*, 15.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>115</sup> One must beware of eloquence that does not embrace the problems of the street. It seems worth mentioning the problem of redemption, close to my present minding in the context of grand-parenting, of the international and local gross disorientations in the provision of clothes, strollers, aesthetic diversions, etc. for the new born. A stroll here in and past conspicuous consumption wildly differentiated by greed-cancered creativity.

<sup>116</sup> This is an important point strategically, as will appear from the next short essay, *HOW 6*, “The Pullet’s Surprise.” One can operate towards generating this core in philosophy and theology without subscribing to the fuller venture of functional collaboration.

So I stick for the present with *Futurology*,<sup>117</sup> and think of its core, layered into Christian special categories, as the geohistorical heuristic that we were weaving towards in the previous two sections. Might I weave that heuristic more fully? Yes, indeed: but the weave is only a continuation of the weaving of Lonergan towards the genetic heuristics of an up-to-date standard model,<sup>118</sup> and makes serious sense only to he or she who “comes about.”<sup>119</sup> So, lurking in fragments of Lonergan scribbling and thinking there is a reach for an eschatology that would give, as it were, a tail-end heuristic to his cosmology,<sup>120</sup> a lift of Thomas’s abandoned struggle to envisage “Christ home, Christ and his mother and all his hallows.”<sup>121</sup> What sense can you make, for

---

<sup>117</sup> The preference of using the name *futurology* is expressed in the title of the secular version of the global venture, *Futurology Express*, Axial Publishing, 2013.

<sup>118</sup> The clear parallel of theology’s need with the climb to a standard model in modern physics only took shape for me at the beginning of this century. One result was the website book, [Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry](#), where I took issue both with Roger Penrose and Robert Doran.

<sup>119</sup> I am recalling the key transition of *Insight 537*, but perhaps now we may think of it as lifted luminously into the context given in the final two chapters of *Allure*. Lifted? Given? The needed correction is already in the text’s “only if”: “the keys to: given” ends *Finnegans Wake*. It would mean being at the front edge, being beyond the level of one’s time. I hunt here for help. So, it would be a towering poise to see the film version (*The Young Messiah*: Nowrasteh, 2016) of Anne Rice’s book, *Christ the Lord: Out of Egypt*, or to read the reach of Peter Rollins’ *The Divine Magician: The Disappearance of Religion and the Discovery of Faith* (Howard Books, 2015) as geo-effectively “something better than was the reality” (*Method in Theology*, 251). We are, perhaps, a millennium away from an adequately progressive presentation of the young Jesus, or a culturally-effective coherent grip on Rollins’ final sentence: “Just like with Jesus and his two disciples on the road to Emmaus, the show ends with the disappearance of the one who performed the trick” (op. cit., 279). Imagine seeing way beyond Rob Bell’s frontispiece view of Rollins’ pointings as “a form of flying. And it is quite thrilling.” Imagine attending Nowrasteh’s film as an existential Jesus-meshed InWithinTo, twirling its inner inner *son et lumiere* into an effective geohistorical heuristics of the longing of eternal hills that are already not out there. Unless you are an evolutionary sport, these imaginings are way beyond your present neurodynamic capacity for fantasy.

<sup>120</sup> Lonergan did not get round to write a formal eschatology. In *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human* (Axial Publishing, 2013) I recalled conversations with him about the area during Easter of 1961 (14), and add a piece of his 1934 scribbles on the course he took on *De Novissimis*.

<sup>121</sup> I quote the concluding line of Hopkins “The Starlit Night,” a line which also concludes *Allure* chapter 3, on economics. One might fantasize here on Lonergan’s view (*For a New Political Economy*, CWL 21, 20) of the shift forward in civilization to moneyless promise, a springboard to, and symbol of, the neuro-intimacy of eternal communal care about which I write presently.

example, of reading now about the swirling<sup>122</sup> of cosmic particles beyond “The Last Three Minutes,<sup>123</sup> beyond the dispersed weakness of our galactic being, into a multipersonal sharing of the neurodynamics of Jesus, and “the other animals, and plants, and mixed bodies, those entirely corruptible both wholly or in part, will not remain at all in that state of incorruption.”<sup>124</sup> Such a fuller heuristic gives a decently adequate context for the control of the open sequence of treatises on the mystical body that are to emerge, under the strange title, *Comparison*, in these next millennia and indeed, might I suggest, in the Eschaton?<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> There is to be a large geohistory of this swirling, including refinements of the historical minding of Jesus in its various stages, but pirouetting on the leap of a divine conception (see the web-book [The Redress of Poise](#), chapter 7, “Grace: The Final Frontier,” and on the subtle negotiation of the Second Person’s weave through temple – and synagogue – visiting, through transfiguration, through Eucharistic talk of His transient body, beyond Resurrection and Ascension, to NOW-care, there now reading eye, of what He knows to be His Body. On the issue of the historical causality of Jesus see *Allure*, 170, note 56. There is a quite a sequence of strange neuroscientific senses to emerge of such a saying as “the nerve of Him!”, or such a Johannine word as *apospynagogos* (see the doctorate work of Johnathan Bernier referred to in [Lonergan Gatherings 14](#), “Refining Our Quest for the Historical Jesus”: he deals there with the three occurrences of *apospynagogos* in John).

<sup>123</sup> I am referring here to Paul Davies book of 1994, *The Last Three Minutes. Conjectures about the Ultimate Fate of the Universe*, Phoenix paperback, 1984. The beyond in the text can be placed in the context of the various anthropic principles to give what I have called “the strongest anthropic principle” a startling precise lift. See my *Lack in the Beingstalk*, Axial Publishing 2006, 85-6, and 194-5 (notes 97-102).

<sup>124</sup> *Summa Contra Gentiles* IV, 97: quoted in a fuller context in *Futurology Express* 4, “Thomas Aquinas and Eschatology,” at note 11. The final footnote to *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human*, 125, note 86, is also relevant. It is as well to be clear on Thomas’s meaning of *corruptible*, which rescues his third way from a tradition of misreading. See [Cantower 19](#), “Ultimates,” p. 11 on this aspect of the *tertia via*, with relevant references listed on p. 22.

<sup>125</sup> I do not think that everlasting life is some odd molecular stasis. Where, then, THEN, is the *moi intime* going? There, indeed, is the crowning “majesty” (a very frequent word in *The Interior Castle*: it is a huge stretching of the imagination to sniff how its synonyms would be handled in a geohistory of contemplative expression) of the greatest of works. “There will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage” (Matthew 22:30, Mark 12:25) but a vibrant blossoming of pilgrim allure. But how do we travel to the meaning of that *moi intime*? Notes 144, 146, and 153 below, are pale pointings. However, I have previously given broader elementary pointings in *Allure* at notes 14 and 15 of page 43, and perhaps some insertion here would help. So, note 14 continues thus: “to reach for an explanatory grip on allure requires rising to the context of my recent 21 [Posthumous](#) Essays, with their main focus in Trinitarian theology. The central essay there, [number 11](#), is titled “Allurexperiences,” which title has a neat ambiguity of reference to all

In this skimpy ramble I ask only the enlargement of interest that would bring communal seriousness and honesty into the reading, the interpretation, of a single paragraph of Lonergan: 60910.<sup>126</sup> Let me, for convenience, split the interest into two overlapping zones: 0-60910 and P-60910, according as we are thinking primarily of ontic—Lonergan’s and our own climb—or of phyletic geohistory. So, we might well focus here on *CWL* 1, 2, 3—named in this paragraph just 1, 2, 3—and the various problems of recycling, quite apart from the full scientific recycling of functional collaboration.<sup>127</sup> We should wish to arrive at a luminous sorting out, distinguishing, of 1, 2, and 3. 1, I would note, was written prior to 2, and 3 was forced to move forward through ethical elements without the adequate ingesting of 1’s “sixty-three articles in

---

your experiences, and raised the problem of an adequate delineation of the range of religious experiences. Especially important is it to lift the meaning of Lonergan’s essay, “Finality, Love, Marriage” into the full world of sexual allurements.” And there follows note 15: “‘lovely in limb, and lovely in eyes not his’ (2<sup>nd</sup> last line of Hopkins’ “As Kingfishers Catch Fire”). But I would have you think differently of that loveliness, like the little boy did in his telling of the story of St. Vincent in the 2014 film of that name, with St. Vincent played by Bill Murray. I recall now quite vividly Fred Crowe speaking to me on the day of the assassination of Robert Kennedy, “some day we may come to speak of people like him as saints.” We desperately need to step out of the flow of mythic thinking regarding “the just man’s justices” (Hopkins, op. cit., line 9). But that is grist for a later mill. It will take courage, the fourth gift of the spirit, a courage that needs to be bred in the full Christian community. This is true especially in the shambles of myths regarding sexuality’s place in the cosmic groaning of *Romans* 8:22. There is a quite large lift to be given to Lonergan’s efforts of “Finality Love Marriage”: perhaps an essay titled, “Finality, Love, Courage.” The reach of trees, the lust of bees, the homing of salmon, the rutting of beasts and boys and girls, need to be swept up into towering luminous graceful activities of ‘craving’ (‘Finality, Love, Marriage’, 49, line 17) in human beings, unleashing new levels of recognition and joy.”

<sup>126</sup> I hardly need the reference, but yes, it is to the second paragraph of the second canon of hermeneutics, a page-turning head-turning paragraph (*Insight* 609-10), with 609 having the last dreadful word, “shifting.”

<sup>127</sup> This is the key point of *HOW* 6: a brilliant unavoidable ( ?? : ( ??) grounding of non-functional collaboration that would blossom slowly into a division of labor. I talked in the text of us focusing here, but it is important to add a realism regarding that focus and that division of labor, a focus to your walkabout of section E below. The immediate division is between understanding and implementation. I have the suspicion that 90% of present Lonergan students would contribute richly to present needs by turning towards small implementations, like writing a grade 10 text in chemistry, or hunting among acquaintances for a responsible journalist who could flag up Lonergan’s economics.

a row.”<sup>128</sup> Further, 3 was way beyond the competence of almost all the first three generations of those interested or enthusiastic.<sup>129</sup> A modest test of this for you is a pause over what you mean by probability<sup>130</sup> and emergent probability. An immodest not-to-be-mentioned<sup>131</sup> test would take you to the doctrinal embarrassment of e.g. the “bridge” of chapter five. A middling test would poise you over what is really and existentially meant by intellectual conversion. That existential aspect of course, would lift you into the discomfiting world of the conclusion of *CWL* 18<sup>132</sup> and the vigorous pointings of *CWL* 6.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> *CWL* 1, 94. This venture meshes with the first of the four appendices in *Allure* on the contemplative climb.

<sup>129</sup> Let me recall the seminar effort that failed. (See note 8 above). It did not fail for lack of enthusiasm. The climb was just too much for us. It still is. So: there is the realism expressed in note 127. But also there must emerge some mad few. “a perhaps not numerous center ... strong enough to refuse half measures and insist on complete solutions even though it has to wait.” “Dimensions of Meaning,” *CWL* 4, 245, last lines.

<sup>130</sup> The probability of a serious grip on the meaning of *probability* fits nicely into the statistical distribution discovered by Poisson (1837). Bortkiewicz made a famous application of it (*The Law of Small Numbers*, 1898) to deaths by horse-kick in cavalry corps over a period of 20 years. Might my kicking shift to a Bell curve, in the next 20 years, the stats of the death of descriptive complacency?

<sup>131</sup> “Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company” (*Method in Theology*, 299). In the next few footnotes I mention such doctrines and think of the brutally revealing light they cast, e.g., on presentations of Lonergan’s *Insight* and *Method* by senior colleagues. They make painful reading and watching.

<sup>132</sup> I am thinking of the discomfiting personal challenge of the final two chapters, “Subject and Horizon” and “Horizon, History and Philosophy.” But they have to be met as such: see note 151 below.

<sup>133</sup> The index gives two references to *haute vulgarization*. To them I have referred regularly. Should I cite Lonergan’s statements more fully? It would seem very appropriate here, adding quite bluntly and plainly to the discomforts referred to in other notes. In this essay I am not talking vaguely about pop-writing, I am talking about the evasion of, well, “fuller indications are in *Insight*, chapter 17, on the truth of interpretation.” (*CWL* 6, 154). If you are not tackling interpretation within that context in its full geohistorical heuristic of O-60910 and P-60910, then you are dodging sacred science: and all science is sacred. Rich as your descriptive spread may be you most likely have (*ibid.*, 155) no “real apprehension of the difference between Thales and the milkmaid,” “no real grasp of theory of any kind,” were “never bitten by theory” and so are “with no apprehension, no understanding, for example of the fact that Newton spent weeks in his room in which he barely bothered looking at his food, while he was working out a theory of universal gravitation.” And now the bite and metabite of *ibid.*, 121: “People have great respect for the great theoretical names – Newton and Einstein, Aristotle and Aquinas, weren’t they

As I write I find myself lifted way out of an earlier ambition of surveying the full span of volumes already in print.<sup>134</sup> There is so much shabby puttering—including my own—to be faced and remedied in this new millennium.<sup>135</sup> Quite certainly, now, it is better to simply encourage a poise, your own poise towards all this: and to this poise and its existential problems I turn in the final section. But here it seems to me useful to ask to have a shot at meeting the 30-year-old Lonergan in his frustrations and aspirations. There is the frustration expressed in his letter to his superiors, and here surely you might pause with him in asking:

What on earth is to be done? I have done all that can be done in spare time and without special opportunities to have contact either those capable of guiding and directing me as well as to read the oceans of books that I would have to read were I to publish stuff that is really worthwhile. Briefly, this question is: shall the matter be left to providence to solve according to its own plan, or do you consider that

---

wonderful people!—but they have no experience of the intellectual pattern of living, of what it is to live the way a theorist lives, to have that pure domination of intellect as a part-time mode of one's subjectivity. They do not know by experience what that is, they are not familiar, strictly and accurately, with any field of theoretical objects. They have a very inadequate notion of what theory is, yet at the same time they are not in the world of community, they do not apprehend the concrete, the particular, as they really are; **their apprehension is mediated by universal norms, laws, criteria, classifications, serial types, and so on so that they do not know what the concrete is.** They are lost in some no man's land between the world of theory and the world of common sense." I bold-faced that piece there because, frankly, too many Lonergan experts comically fancy that what Lonergan condemns there is, well, their own theoretical world. "Really!" {this word ends a relevant page, 39, of *CWL 2, Verbum*, on "Scotist rejection of insight into phantasm" (ibid.)}

<sup>134</sup> To carry forward the discomfort of sensing the missing shift I simply focus on *CWL 21*, which I edited and indexed. Think of the end of the previous note and then muse over my odd Wordsworth quotation at the end of the introduction to the index (326): "And now I see with eye serene, the very pulse of the machine." To thus see the very pulse of the economic machine in future serious theory is to lift the index entry under *Concomitance*—the largest in the volume—into a geohistorical grip that tilts us gloriously towards progress. It is to recognize and live in a larger vision that I had when I wrote of *Piketty's Plight and the Global Future* (Axial Publishing, 2015).

<sup>135</sup> Obviously, this O-60910 facing of folly is to benefit from P-60910 progress. There will emerge something parallel to Leonard Boyle's account of the centuries-long dodging of Thomas's challenge. (Leonard Boyle, "The Setting of the Summa of St. Thomas," Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto, 1982.) The Prologue to *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human* is essentially a commentary on that article and its present nudging possibilities.

providence intends to use my superiors as conscious agents in the furtherance of what it has already done?<sup>136</sup>

There is the ambition and hope expressed in the fragment left to us of his “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” one passage of which is worth including here as leaning even then into “statistically effective”—mentioned twice—thinking.

But what is progress? It is a matter of intellect. Intellect is understanding of sensible data. It is the guiding form, statistically effective, of human action transforming the sensible data of living. Finally, it is a fresh intellectual synthesis understanding the new situation created by the old intellectual form and providing a statistically effective form for the next cycle of human action that will bring forth in reality the incompleteness of the later act of intellect by setting it new problems.<sup>137</sup>

The massive challenge is to bring forth acceleratingly and joyously, in a vortex of effective Godelian fantasy, both the incompleteness of any stage and the town and gown sacrament of the present momentum.

I must end this brief pointer to the voyage of interpreting *CWL*, but I am inspired to recall, in so concluding, a dangling tale, wagging the dogma in a way isomorphic with the venture of the previous section, and with the venture of Lonergan’s light and hope

---

<sup>136</sup> Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010, 154. This concludes his ten-page letter of 1935. I ask you to pause over this on 0-60910 stance both in relation to Lonergan and in relation to you in your situation of being addressed or abused (Lonergan was admonished regarding his attitude) by ‘superiors’ in the academy. Eighty years later there is in fact little improvement in the intellectual ethos, despite an inflow of Lonergan’s writings. What on earth are you to do? I propose caution, as Lonergan did to me in my problem of dealing with my Oxford ‘superiors’ in the 1960s. But you might well live dangerously and question their shrunken perspective, as Lonergan risked doing.

<sup>137</sup> Michael Shute, *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research*, University of Toronto Press, 2010, 20. This is an amazing anticipation of the reach for a standard model “yielding cumulative and progressive results” (*Method*, 4). The work is full of such a pragmatic optimism, ending with a hope that pushed me towards the posing of the question – with **my** yes answer: how about **yours?** – “Do you view humanity as possibly maturing – in some serious fashion – or just messing along between good and evil, whatever you think they are?”

of 1954.<sup>138</sup> It is the tail of the four volumes on the divinity, *CWL* 8, 9, 11, 12, those scripture-rich pages at the end of the twelfth volume that invite us forward through a gathering of initial meanings.<sup>139</sup> This is not a tale told by an idiot in some illusion of

---

<sup>138</sup> See above, note 71. Pat Brown comments at length on the passage in his contribution to *Seeding Global Collaboration*, edited by Pat Brown and James Duffy, Axial Publishing, 2016. But by now, have we not come, at least in inspired aspiration, some little distance from note 71, however obscure that flash of Lonergan light? Think of him, that Mayday of 1954, craving to reach beyond the madness of *Insight* 17.3 and his darkness (*ibid.*, 763-4) regarding the mystical body: “what, then, is being” (*ibid.* 665) a theologian? He would find “a third way” “difficult and laborious” (*Method*, 4) more than decade later, and would talk skimpily about it and its meaning for interpretation, using “an instance from the history of ideas” (*ibid.*, 166) that was palatable to his backward audience. Note 152 talks further about self-tracking in a mess of other instances. I suspect that most of my audience will find my associating Hardy’s *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* with *Tess of Avila* puzzling, even disconcerting. (See notes 40, 62, 66, 87). But do not both books talk oddly about contemplatively climbing through layers or phases of living? Might not either book lead humanity to enlightenment? So we find ourselves called into a viewpoint that is “universal not by abstractness but by potential completeness” (*Insight*, 590), facing “all levels and sequences of expression” (*ibid.*, 592) “in the totality of documents” (*ibid.*, 602). **Find ourselves called into?** Caused into? So I bring you back, or forward, to Lonergan calling us beyond his trapped expression of his years in Rome. It is the calling from *CWL* 12, 471-3, there from its first writing in 1956: it is a calling to, or in, or In, a shared Listening. It is the calling caught in my expression InWithinTo, or more fully in the prayer, “Double You Three in me in all, Claspings, Cherishing, Calling, Craving, Christing.” See further notes 152 and 153.

<sup>139</sup> A huge re-cycling venture would be to pick up on the scriptures as functionally dislocated in those volumes, moving them into the fuller standard model offered by Lonergan. It would be quite a different world from that represented by the so-called search for the historical Jesus. I have touched on that shambles already in talking skimpily of Jonathan Bernier’s work. (See [Lonergan Gatherings 14](#), “Refining Our Quest for the Historical Jesus”) A footnote is not the place to sniff remedies for the modeless, “*Voraussetzungslos*” (*Insight*, 600) skimming along of two millennia. Might you imagine “the formality of divine missions” (*CWL* 12, 483) in that remote context that centres on  $G_{jk}$ ? Might you boggle at future generations contemplative conversational intimacy that dances in a self-luminous geohistorical meaning of “the Holy Spirit sent to each of the just” (*CWL* 12, 489)? So, as I weave to a conclusion I carry forward from the end of the previous note, and indeed from that prayer that is seemingly to Grace that we paused over earlier (see note 81). And we are back at the end of the previous note’s poise. Our openminded praying is, indeed, In Grace: Grace and you are within a listening that intussuscepts into your story the patterns of a fundamental orientation, calling, cauling, of finitude. The Other Two are Calling into Christing. You Two are thus eternally calling Us, us: “with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal” (*Insight*, 722: the end of that powerful page that brings us, in repentance, into the embrace of the seventh gift of Grace. That embrace has, of course, to be conceived within the full genetic heuristic of virtues, and what is normally operative in such conception, affirmation and implementation is a front-edge conception strongly tinged with the forward bent of The Leaning Tower). See note 153.



all-is-said, a *Complete Idiot's Guide* to global scriptural entrapment in *Exploring God*.<sup>140</sup> This is a quiet implicit tale trolled by a lonely savant, inviting us, in ever-fresh fantasy, to “taste and see!”<sup>141</sup> G<sub>jk</sub>.<sup>142</sup>

### **E. Roun Doll Home James**

The title of this final section is the title that eventually emerged as suitable for the [Cantower](#) enterprise that I undertook for my 8<sup>th</sup> decade, on All Fool's Day of 2002, which happened also to be Easter Monday, coinciding thus with the day the foolhardy Irish revolution began in Dublin in 1916.

There were many ways in which I could have ended this patchwork essay on the how-to-start into Interpretation. Do I mean here, by Interpretation, the chapter of that title in *Method in Theology*? Or do I mean here the crazy venture indicated by that third section of *Insight* chapter 17? Obviously, I carry forward “on the way”<sup>143</sup> all the mixes of those two meanings that hovered over the first four sections. But here perhaps you should take it that I am wishing you into the fifth section of *Method*'s chapter seven, “Understanding Oneself,”<sup>144</sup> and indeed into the fourth of its five paragraphs, which

---

<sup>140</sup> The reference here is to Jeffrey B. Webb, *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Exploring God*, Alpha Penguin, 2007.

<sup>141</sup> *Psalm* 34:8.

<sup>142</sup> Surely a discomfoting end to this ramble on interpreting Lonergan: the clash of the meaning of the Psalmist with the meaning reached by Lonergan by venturing along one geohistorical genetic road of humanity's *Exploring God*. There are all the other untraveled roads described in Webb's book, roads that are to lead us all, when freshened, into the neurodynamics of God Incarnate. This places my ramble in the context of the final paragraph of my short Preface to *Allure*, where I refer back to the general categories of *Futurology Express* and forwards to a volume reaching out to these other roads. *Futurology Express* gives a “fuller characterization overlapping theology with the integral dynamics of culture, thus including implicitly the full spread of religious cultures, though that is a topic only skimpily treated in the present work and deserves a third volume, From someone else!” *Allure*, 1.

<sup>143</sup> The Gospel of *Luke*, 24:32.

<sup>144</sup> *Method in Theology*, 161. Recall note 111 above. This challenge can be taken at all sorts of levels, within various view of the *moi intime*. A very odd view of the quest for a *moi intime* can come from musing at some length over a consideration of Ernest Renan's work (in *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, Art and Finance*, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 1863, p. 752). “What is the

speaks of the existential dimension in the face of decay. I am posing here, as a crown of my long struggle, a strange challenge, an odd view of scripture. With reverent reserve I pick out the first of two scripture quotations in that paragraph. "Did not our hearts burn within us, when he spoke on the way and open to us the scriptures?"<sup>145</sup> Jesus opens up the scriptures of the world. I claim that I am adding to his opening, and that the claim is to eventually take scientific status when it finds its place in a geohistorical genetics of meaning that stabilizes the opening towards an eternal Divine neurodynamics.<sup>146</sup> Does your heart burn, or is there a lurking dread, or worse still, a lazy scorn? So I come to the second scripture quotation of the paragraph. "Go to this people and say: you will hear and hear but never understand; you will look and look but never see."<sup>147</sup>

---

difference between a man's apparent being, or what common people would call the man himself, and his true being – his 'part of the general consciousness'? They are the same thing considered from different points of view; and how an any human creature even honestly affect to consider himself, in reference to all existence, absolutely and relatively, past, present, and future, and then to sacrifice himself to the ideal self, or *moi intime*? Imagine a man trying to conceive himself in reference to the differential calculus or the Great Wall of China, both of which are integral parts of M. Renan's God." Skip the strange Ernest view haunting this and consider the wondrous larger madness of you intussuscepting a *moi intime* that is InWithinTo a Tripersonal God, with the molecules of the Wall and of the all of integral human calculus swirling in the circumincessional Three.

<sup>145</sup> Luke 24: 32, quoted on *Method in Theology*, 162.

<sup>146</sup> In handy terms, this shift can be thought of as a massive shift in the meaning of "terminal value" in the spread of words of page 48 of *Method*. It lifts the meaning of the entire spread. In existential terms, one can be seized by the dynamic images of the cosmos of molecules weaving forward in and around oneself, heading, literally, for the Head. I, at the end of my ramble in this essay, am quite at a loss regarding other clues. I see something in recent notes that might help, so I add it in italics. *The destiny of materia formata was, from the beginning, Clasped thus IN the Spirit, to weave, cauled by the first divine Person, into the eschatological neurodynamics of the second divine Person become human. Intussuscepting this is a core life-time challenge of kataphatic contemplation. The intussusception requires the climb through science transposed by **Insight**, and it is an integral business, laying down the molecularity that grounds integral subjectivity, swerving the **moi intime** into sanity. Further, the climb is to be increasingly luminously neuromolecular, a neurolaying down through years, a venture that gives quite new and distant meanings to the family of phrases related to 'real assent' and 'real ascent'.*

<sup>147</sup> Acts 28: 26. As Lonergan mentions there (*Method*, 162) Paul is recalling Isaiah.

In 2004 there was what I now call the lazy scorn of the centennial Lonergan conference. Yes, there were good things there, but in the main it was a week-long travesty of 30 minute papers of the “academic disciplines” cast. I was not invited but I went anyway, as I was heading for Dublin to console a widowed sister. During a week in Dublin I managed to do Walkabout, brooding on the grossness of the Toronto meeting and on the general sick drift of Lonergan studies. Part of the result was [Quodlibet 8](#): “*The Dialectic of My Town, Ma Vlast*”.<sup>148</sup> As I brooded over the range of topics that could occupy us in ending this ramble towards *HOW 8*’s sting in my tale, it dawned on me that the message of Quodlibet 8, in particular of the second part, “Reverierun,” might bring you towards imitating me in doing your own Walkabout. You? Let me, sadly, skip the older “Guys and Dolls”<sup>149</sup> and think of you as still young enough in your admiration of Lonergan’s pointing to your possible self-discovery to vibe with the two scripture quotations of the paragraph in question. Might you take a modest of mighty step towards salvaging his lonely 30-year-old aspiration? The modest step might be a seriousness in the search for an economist or journalist open to the shock of shifting economics from phlogistonitis to science, or the venture of putting together a grade 11 text in some subject, with a twist away from truncated subjectivity, or even a little protesting, but perhaps not in a Lonerganic classroom<sup>150</sup>:

---

<sup>148</sup> My reference here – *Ma Vlast* – is to the composer Smetana and his work, *My Homeland*, the best know part of which is that wonderful riverrun on *The Moldau*. Each of us has our town and/or our river. Joyce commemorates this in that wondrous *Finnegans Wake* passage (196-216: twenty pages which, he said, nearly killed him), beginning with the Liffey and flowing past the Moldau, (“Merced Mulda” [*Finnegans Wake*, 212, line 26]) through all “the rivering waters of, hitherandthithering waters of.” (*Finnegans Wake*, 216)

<sup>149</sup> I am recalling the musical that Damon Runyon concocted out of some of his short stories. But I recall too Lonergan, “Like the characters in Damon Runyon’s stories,” politicians and statesmen are confined to doing what they can. Runyon (1880–1946) was born in Manhattan, Kansas: a convenient mixed address from my point of view. He got out of Kansas his own way. I like to think that I am moving along here, especially into and beyond the final section E, to get you dreaming of being off to see the Wizard.

<sup>150</sup> I have often repeated Lonergan’s advice to me about playing along. I think of the inconvenient questions I raised in my days of theology: I managed to get myself exiled, in the final year, from the Dublin theologate to England. But it is up to you to mix cunning with poise

“Why were you arrested?’ ‘Because I read *Insight*’.”<sup>151</sup> Or you may be mad enough and talented enough to say, like Stephen McKenna, in his mid-thirties, thinking of the translation of Plotinus, “this is worth a life.”<sup>152</sup> At all events, do give the 30-year old Lonergan an open read, and may it carry you to your own version of my 72-year-old Walkabout. Let, then, the young Lonergan speak to your graced heartiness.

We have mentioned the fact that the greatest evil in the world is the evil that is concretized in the historic flow, the capital of injustice that hangs like a pall over every brilliant thing, that makes men and nations groan over each other’s glory, that provokes anger and suicide and dire wars, that culminates in the dull mind and sluggish body of the enslaved people or the decayed culture.

The Christian counterpiece to this is the Christian’s victory over sin in charity. For charity becomes not anger over wrongs, charity does not nourish hatred or threaten war, charity does not despair; charity is an eternal fire of optimism and of energy, dismayed at naught, rebuked by none, tireless, determined, deliberate; with deepest thought and unbounded spontaneity charity ever strives, struggles, labours, exhorts, implores, prays for the betterment of the unit action of man,

---

of attentiveness. Perhaps you could throw in the key message that I identify in *HOW 6*, “The Pullet’s Surprise”.

<sup>151</sup> James Marsh, “Self-appropriation as a Way of Life,” *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology. Essays in Honor of Robert Doran*, edited by John Dadosky, Marquette University Press, 2009, 324.

<sup>152</sup> Stephen MacKenna (1872-1934) was an odd and brilliant Irishman who lived in those fermenting years of Irish literature and rebellion. He bought *The Enneads* in St. Petersburg in 1905 and two years later journaled in 1907 about Plotinus, “It seems to me that I must be born for him, and that someday I must have nobly translated him.” You can track him in “Journal and Letters of Stephen MacKenna” on the Web, worth adding as a background to the Walkabout towards which I have been edging you: get a sense of the psychic displacements that are all too glibly talked of as conversions by Lonerganism. Your own self-tracking requires slow narrative existential back-ups, be they factual like MacKenna’s or fictional like Jane Eyre or Tess of the d’Urbevilles (see notes 40, 62, 66, 87, 138), theoretic like Goedel or aesthetic like Sinead O’Connor. The issue is finding luminous self-directedness. A little later MacKenna expressed his personal bent: “To have no set purpose in life is the harlotry of the will.” There, indeed, is a bent to carry into a stream-of-consciousness re-reading of the last two chapters of *CWL 18*, *Phenomenology and Logic*. So, you may thus be nudged to challenge your axial superego, face both the present terrible Existential Gap, and “an invitation to understand something of the process of history, and a summons to decisiveness at a rather critical moment in the historical process.” *CWL 18*, 300.

for the effective rule of sweetness and light, for a fuller manifestation of what charity loves, Wisdom Divine, the Word made Flesh.

The Sovereign Pontiff has proclaimed the Kingship of Christ. Do you know His Kingdom?

'In the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say: Come, and let us go to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths. For the law shall come forth from Sion: and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge the Gentiles and rebuke many people: and they shall turn their swords into ploughshares and their spears into sickles. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation: neither shall they be exercised any more to war.'(Isaiah 2: 2-4)

Is this to be taken literally or is it figure? It would be fair and fine, indeed, to think it no figure."<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Essay in Fundamental Sociology, Michael Shute, *Loneragan's Early Economic Research*, University of Toronto Press, 2010, 43-44. This optimistic conclusion of Loneragan is a good place for me to end my own reflections of this essay. What follows in the essay was written in 2002, and I leave it unmodified. Obviously, it has fresh meaning for me now, as I renew his appeal seventy years later. The appeal is given a fresh twist in that it identifies Tower People who are to be the kataphatic replacement of the mansion-seekers that Teresa of Avila wrote of five centuries ago. They are to seek, in hierarchies within the X-mansion, a shared understanding of the minding of God. They are to lift up not only the 'Tess of Avila' types but the 'Tess of the d'Urbervilles' wanderers, the Hermines and the Harrys, all those seeking "the desirable mansion" (*Hardy*, 495), all of us capable, destined, exigent (*CWL* 18, 348-9) of "entering a dark mansion .... Suddenly, it is illuminated and you see exactly where you were. Then you enter the next dark room ..." (Andrew Wiles on his decade of climbing: *Aczel*, {note 90} xi). The X-mansion must reach out to all. All are in there, factual and fictional, "somehow with us" (*Insight*, 303). The Tower People are called, cauled, to interpret with and for them, for each and all, "the successive stages of the greatest of works" (*CWL* 12, 491) and to discover and uncover that beyond the X-mansion the focal fact of pilgrim and ultimate being is "You Two Calling Us Two," the Spirit and each of us cauled by the Sigh and Scent of God. See above notes 81, 138, 139.

## Quodlibet 8.2 Reverierun<sup>154</sup>

The single-word title of this subsection came to me a few weeks ago as I walked north on North Circular Road, parallel and close to Bloom's Eccles St, where I came to live in Dublin first in 1936. It captured for me the mood of what I think of as a Third Ulysses or a later Finnegans, Awake: not, THEN,<sup>155</sup> a day in Dublin's usuality<sup>156</sup> nor a night-life on the Liffey, not a riverrun, but a reaching reverie structuring the city's molecules in art-hope—towards post-axial meaning.

That week or so in Dublin, after the Toronto Lonergan Centennial Conference of August 2004, I walked as I had walked Manhattan<sup>157</sup> during the spring of 2002, but now with larger minding. I walked, you might think, like Lonergan's zoologist,<sup>158</sup> watching and sensing with systems of functional collaboration in ontic minding. It was a larger minding in so many ways: I had grown way beyond<sup>159</sup> my Manhattan self, but also Dublin, unlike Manhattan, was my town, a molecular me-mesh of 68 years,

---

<sup>154</sup> The first word of *Finnegans Wake*—and one might say the last—is riverrun. It flows round from the ending of the book “The Keys to. Given! A way a lone a last a loved a long the (618) riverrun, past Eve and Adam's, (Adam and Eve's is the local name for a right-bank Church as the Liffey nears the sea). Run, in Gaelic, pronounced **roon**, has the meaning both of beloved and of secret: recall the Nordic meaning. I change the word to reverierun. See below, at note 165. A lengthy reflection would be required to point to the lift from literary story-telling to literary foundationality that lurks in this shift of word, this suggestion of a different dream-book.

<sup>155</sup> The title of [Cantower 5](#) is “Metaphysics THEN,” which raises a question continuous with the pointing of the previous footnote, a question which is to be considered in the following Quodlibet, the orientation towards the concrete future expressed in the word fantasy.

<sup>156</sup> In the conclusion of chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, Axial Press, Halifax, 204, I note the massive destructiveness of “the usual” in Dublin's talk, between friends, from parents to children, etc. Adult growth dies early: it gives fresh meaning to Joyce's short story of the Dubliner's, “The Dead.” For a meshing of those short stories with relevant reflections on growth, see [Cantowers](#) 7, 8, and 9.

<sup>157</sup> [Cantower 14](#), “Communications and Ever-ready Founders,” parallels chapter 14 of *Insight*, but moves towards a concretization of strategies. The third section focuses, with the help of local and historical traveling, on “Founders of New York.”

<sup>158</sup> When father and son “both pause to look at a giraffe, the boy will wonder whether it bits or kicks, but the father will see another manner in which skeletal, locomotive, digestive, vascular, and nervous systems combine and interlock.” *Method in Theology*, 83.

<sup>159</sup> See note 166 below.

never left.<sup>160</sup> So, I *assembled* and *completed* and self-assembled, street-wise. The assembly, of course, was random, yet it comes closer than you might expect to the Lonergan-reach of the top of page 250 of *Method*. Not only was there the assembly and self-assembly of my 68 Dublin years: the reach was a reaching of reachings, a reading of street signs and faces, library-loads and bottled lonelineses, talk turning mind-molecules towards the staleness of an axial smell. But there were also membered and remembered walks with Lonergan in those streets, both in his Ulysses days of meaning and in his wiser cycling-minding steps.<sup>161</sup>

His 1930s decade of economic stretching was with me as I perused, in Eason's Bookstore on O'Connell St, Denis L. O'Grady's new school-text on economics.<sup>162</sup> That text is being spread as a mental illness in teenage brain-sellout through Dublin, through Ireland, preparing a way for sick first-year university courses. Might I not reverie about a "No Thank You, Denis" as I did previously about the current Irish University text, an outrageous outreach of Mankiw?<sup>163</sup> But the reverie, to be beautiful, needs the pragmatic envisagement of a complex of revolutionary communities.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup> There is Samuel Beckett's description of an Irishman: "An Irishman is one who, somewhere else, is where he was."

<sup>161</sup> Two different contexts here. There were the walks like the Ulysses walk, in Easter 1961, round Stephen's Green, down O'Connell St, in order to buy him shoes; the walks and dinings and evenings of drinking together for two weeks in 1971, when he talked of oddities of his life and lectured on functional cycling. But there is the other context: the little book, *Plants and Pianos* – later the first half of *The Shaping of the Foundations* – in which I weave *Ulysses* and Bloom into *Insight's* take on botany, and *Finnegans Wake* into the cycling book's incarnation in musicology. See below, note 179 .

<sup>162</sup> [*Leaving Certificate*] Economics, Follens, Dublin, 2002. The text is for the final two years of school, leading to the equivalent of grade 13 in Canada.

<sup>163</sup> I am referring to *Beyond Establishment Economics: No Thank You, Mankiw*, written by Bruce Anderson and myself. In the Editorial Conclusion "Inventing Ireland: Here Comes Everywhere," I reflect on the tainted university text, *The Macroeconomics of Ireland*, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1998, written by Anthony Leddin and Brendan Walsh. I conclude the piece with the words, "No Thank You, Anthony and Brendan."

<sup>164</sup> I extend foundational fantasy in this direction in the two final chapters of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism*: But here, surely, there is an existential question for

So I invite you to wander, reverie,<sup>165</sup> your own realm, assembling but above all self-assembling. Who are you and how do you stand regarding and regurgiting and guarding the differentiations that your realm, whatever it is, desperately needs? You are most likely younger than I and thus—normatively—less refined in your sensing of decay and desire.<sup>166</sup> I would wish you, against all odds, to take the path of accelerating growth, of becoming increasingly a stranger to yourself of last week, so that you see in your realm the larger possibilities and probabilities that I conclude to in this essay. If you are lucky, you will not be alone, but, through this and later centuries, witness the blossoming hoped-for emergence “that intellectual collaboration would develop down the ages.”<sup>167</sup> But, even if you are not alone, your luck must involve being somehow beaten on a head, where Zen becomes Ven life-teaching. Certainly, I can claim that I have had my share of luck and rough-luck. Who am I that walked in Dublin this August? I stood and stand as someone beaten up and down by a warped Christian education and the Dublin culture of the usual; but school years also were Chopin times and the geometry of Descartes. There was the lift of a Dublin listening, in Easter 1961, to Lonergan musing about the shock we shared in the shift from naive realism. There was a new walking of the city after the summer of 1966 when he startled me into the functional business, that is so much richer now, 38 years later.

In 1968 Lonergan sent a card to me in Dublin asking me to find an economist. I failed, but a quarter century struggling with his 130 paged economic text of 1944 changed

---

those who take Lonergan’s suggestions of economic democracy seriously: a minimal challenge of making conversion to economic understanding a topic.

<sup>165</sup> The French, looking back to Middle French and to *rever* (to wander), has the meaning of fanciful dreaming or musing. The next *Quodlibet* will push for a more accurate notion of foundational fantasy, which is what I am asking for here.

<sup>166</sup> Of central importance through our efforts is a slow-growing suspicion that there is such a thing as accelerating adult growth, and that it’s fostering is a focal facet of the emergence of the third stage of meaning. See my brief blunt statement of the challenge in the final pages of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2004.

<sup>167</sup> *Insight*, 727[748].



my seeing of Dublin. While Leopold Bloom fiction-walked in 1904, Joseph Schumpeter climbed in Austria to the edge of the peak of economics, but was sidelined.<sup>168</sup> Later Ezra Pound accused Mr. Joyce of missing his critical chance by not reading Douglas.<sup>169</sup> Later still—a distraction this—a learned chap approached my wheelchair<sup>170</sup> under Joyce’s Ballast Office clock, mistook me for someone wise, and told me of Pound’s conversation with Paddy Kavanagh: “Are you a genius?” “No” sez Kavanagh, “but I am a very very clever man.” And through the decades of my Dublin years, starting in Keynes’ 1936,<sup>171</sup> Flawed Keyned and Hicked<sup>172</sup> economics scarred Dublin’s face and faces with naive central planning. And later Eurocentralism gave us a glorious wasted lift.<sup>173</sup>

But of course other things happened in that Dublin century of the longer cycle of decline. Oriental eyes and black skin now brighten Henry Street and Moore Street, sites of outdoor business and of the 1916 Easterweek End. Instead of windowed corsetry teasing Leopold’s eyes, large photoed barebums framed in thongs call out to

---

<sup>168</sup> Schumpeter’s greatest work, *The Theory of Economic Development*, was bubbling up at the time. It did not flow into the tradition. His later massive 2-volume work, *Business Cycles*, appeared at the wrong time, in 1939: Keynes and Hitler and New Deals shelved him. But people have begun to pay attention to him in recent decades.

<sup>169</sup> The relevant text is quoted on page 73 of *The Shaping of the Foundations*. It is available in an essay by Pound on Joyce on pp. 251-2 of *Pound Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce with Pound’s Essays on Joyce*, edited by Forest Read, Faber and Faber, London, 1967.

<sup>170</sup> A decaying hip gave me the pleasure that year of being wheeled round Dublin by my good wife Sally: a fresh view of the city, breast-high, bardshigh, tomastoned. (“bard’s highview, avis on valley! I would like to hear you burble to us in strict conclave, purpurando, and without too much italiote interfairance, what you know in petto about our sovereign beingstalk, Tomas Tamazeus. O dite!” [*Finnegans Wake*, 504]). Sally wheeled me, too, that year, into a parade that moved down O’Connell Street past the revolutions G.P.O, protesting racism. The wondrous voice of Sinead O’Connor started us off from the edge of The Garden of Remembrance, a grove that grew on me, in me, hightonedview, these few years later.

<sup>171</sup> The year of the publication of Keynes’ *General Theory*.

<sup>172</sup> What really went into operation was Hick’s simplification of Keynes view, published in 1937.

<sup>173</sup> The 1990s brought the years of the Celtic Tiger. A bundle of European-donated money flowed annually into the country, enough – if well used – to generate a few decent Rostow takeoffs. On various messes in Irish economic policy and practice, see Richard Douthwaite, *The Growth Illusion*, The Lilliput Press, Dublin, 1992.

mine. Overhead trains now join Joyce's Howth in the north with Beckett's higher-class south, and joy is blocked off in a Temple Bar where "the usual" is disguised frenetically.

I am not asking you to reach for the full range of assembling and self-assembling that I weave round here, skimming autobiographically.<sup>174</sup> That certainly is the discomfiting task and core-task of page 250, of the full dialectic effort. I am asking you rather to reach for a minimal assembly and self-assembly, so that conversion to functional specialization at least becomes a topic.

On this last August trip to Dublin there emerged a focus of attention. I returned regularly to The Garden of Remembrance, a quiet enclosure on Parnell Square, commemorating the dreamers and their followers who occupied the General Post Office a few hundred yards away, and other convenient and inconvenient Dublin spots, in an Easter Monday stand against an empire.<sup>175</sup> My Cantowers, started with that stand in mind, indeed started on Easter Monday—also April Fool's Day—of 2002. But the Garden of Remembrance reaches further back, with the dominance of Oisín Kelly's magnificent sculpting representing **The Children of Lir**, a glimpse of which I give you on the next page.<sup>176</sup> Carved on the surrounding wall, in Irish, English and French, are the following reflections of Liam Mac Uistin:

---

<sup>174</sup> Making conversion a topic with narrative honesty is, I must repeat, a necessity of taking the end of page 250 of *Method* seriously. I make no attempt to do that here, but I might well have worked through the last five decades pinning down ventures into various zones and the patterns of growth involved, and reaching forward into this accelerating eighth decade. Some normative reflection on the process is given in [Cantower 9](#): "Position, Position, Protopossession."

<sup>175</sup> I am thinking of one inconvenient spot, Stephen's Green Park, surrounded by high buildings. Joseph Plunkett (dying poet and strategist of the 1916 revolution) and Countess Markievitch were led to dig in there—they slipped out to a local 'Green' building, the College of Surgeons, soon enough—from admiration of the trench warfare in Europe.

<sup>176</sup> Lir was the Irish god of the sea. His three children were turned into swans by a wicked step-mother, and condemned to swim the seas for 900 years. The sculpting depicts them coming ashore and dying, with swans surging upwards. It has, of course, a whole range of ascensional symbolisms.

*"In the darkness of despair we saw a vision,  
We lit the light of hope and it was not extinguished  
In the desert of discouragement we saw a vision.  
We planted the tree of valour.  
And it blossomed.  
In the winter of bondage we saw a vision  
We melted the snow of lethargy  
And the river of resurrection flowed from it  
We sent our vision aswim like a swan on the river.  
The vision became a reality. Winter became summer.  
Bondage became freedom.  
And this we left to you as your inheritance.  
O Generations of freedom remember us, the generations of vision."*



I read this in my own way, as you do now in yours. Yet perhaps some of my musings can be shared. I was thinking, as I read and copied that text, of *Generations* in broader contexts. The generations of the past as the processions of inner words blossoming from assemblings and completions; the generations of, towards, the future, that are foundational characters. And I was thinking of the Ultimate Foundational Characters that are the Generators of Dublin, “Howth Castle and Environs,”<sup>177</sup> lifting us sufferingly, slowly, cyclingly, and collaboratively forwards to pragmatic visions and PragmaticVision.

This surely is daft reverie: but what pragmatic visions might there be, fermenting in the galactic molecules of global village for the second and the sixty-second millennium of my town? Perhaps other shapings of answers will push on towards the third Ulysses, lifting lanes and longings beyond the usual, like the *Perelandra* of that strange Belfast man C.S. Lewis? At 40, Joyce swung into the years 1922–39 in a reach for his anastomotic word<sup>178</sup>—might it be *riverrun*?—as I at 40 swung forward from *The Shaping of the Foundations*<sup>179</sup> to try desperately to “say it all” for beginners in *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders* in 1989, a book of a year’s walking in my other town, Oxford.<sup>180</sup> “Ho hang! Hang ho! And the clash of our cries as we spring to be free.”<sup>181</sup> And those longer wordings of mine relieve me in my present

---

<sup>177</sup> *Finnegans Wake*, 3.

<sup>178</sup> I deal with this reach, in the context of Kavanagh’s reflections on the elder Shakespeare and on Pericles, in the final section of chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2004.

<sup>179</sup> See note 161 above. *Plants and Pianos* became the first two chapters of this four-chapter book, which then became symbolically a four stage thing, the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Finnegan-Blooming.

<sup>180</sup> I walked Oxford during the winter of 1988-89, avoiding its academics but availing of its libraries, in an effort to write the book, *Process: A Paideiad* promised at the end of [Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations. Self-axis of the Great Ascent](#). It was to have been an advanced book: but it was too soon for such a book, so I settled for the introductory work, [Process: Introducing Themselves to Young \(Christian\) Minders](#).

<sup>181</sup> *Finnegans Wake*, 627.

brutal brevity. So there is some good, I think, in recalling them and indeed recalling the final words of that solitary Oxford bookwalk:<sup>182</sup>

The third stage of global meaning, with its mutual mediation of an academic presence, is a distant probability,<sup>183</sup> needing painfilled solitary reaching towards a hearing of hearing,<sup>184</sup> a touching of touching, 'in the far ear,'<sup>185</sup> 'sanscreed,'<sup>186</sup> making luminously present—in focal darkness—our bloodwashed bloodstream. It is a new audacity, a new hapticity, to which we must aspire, for which we must pray.

Sandhyas! Sandhyas! Sandhyas! Calling all downs  
Calling all downs to dayne. Array! Surrection!  
Eireweeker to the wohld bludyn world. O rally,  
O rally, O rally! Phlenxty, O rally! To what lifelike  
thyne of the bird can be. Seek you somany matters.  
Haze sea east to Osseania. Here! Tass, Patt, Staff, Woff,  
Havv, Bluvv and Rutter. The smog is lofting.<sup>187</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> The notes belong in the original text. I noticed, as I typed, that the final note referred to a note, 94, of that other text, *The Shaping of the Foundations*, and it does indeed broaden the context. So its conclusion is worth adding here: "Sandhyas is a Sanskrit word meaning 'twilight, the period between aeons, period of junction'. No one, you may say, can beget the habit of thinking all the mesons of, thinking all the oxygen of, thinking ... of, say, Frederick the Great's horse, or of Bucephalus. No one? Can? 'A way, the Margan, from our astamite, through dimdom done till light kindling light has led we hopas but hunt me the journey on, iteritinerant' (*Finnegans Wake*, 594). Time, the second million years, is on our side."

<sup>183</sup> The title to the Preface (pp. i-xxii) of McShane (ed.), *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, University Press of America, 1985, is "Distant Probabilities of Persons Presently Going Home Together in Transcendental Process."

<sup>184</sup> "Merced Mulda!" (*Finnegans Wake*, 212, line 26) "Yessel that the limmat?" (*Ibid.*, 198 line 13). See John Bishop, *Joyce's Book of the Dark*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1986, 342. This transposition of Joyce, of course, demands precision of, and 'boning up' on, the notion of the notion of thing, pushing on from Aquinas, Ia, q. 76, a.8, on the soul's bodipresence.

<sup>185</sup> See Bishop, *op. cit.*, 343-46.

<sup>186</sup> *Finnegans Wake*, 215, line 26.

<sup>187</sup> The final quotation is from *Finnegans Wake*, 593. See my comments, note 94 of page 185 of *The Shaping of the Foundations*. The text there broadens the kontekst.