

Q. 40 “The writers of such comparisons have to be brought gently to notice that they are using - in what we’ll talk of in Q/A 41 as inadequate self-luminosity - some norms, standards, of comparison.”(Q/A 38). How?

A. 40 Let us be simple and blunt in our musings, asking about the stances of speakers and audience at any Lonergan conference. If you wish, you can return to a sublation of the reading of the beginning pages of *Insight* 17.3, but here I wish for a more homely communal honesty. We have considered, all too compactly, U’s positioning on sequencing two authors, one perhaps being Lonergan. U’s position should be luminous to self and, as far as possible, made luminous to the audience. Within that luminously-expressed positioning the two authors are positioned.

The blunt question is, Is this complex of positioning a present ethos in audiences and speakers in our Lonergan Conferences? I doubt very much if it is ever a luminous radiance in our halls. Our halls, indeed, are already out there, with colleagues listening, reading or sleeping out there now really in front of us.

But even if we skip the discomfiting issue of comfortable commonsense realism, is there not, honestly, a discomfort about my first paragraph in this answer? Are we “at home”, together, in this transcendental searching?

Do you share my doubts about effective sequencing of views being in the air, in the heirs of Lonergan? And what of the hall being haunted by the geohistorical heuristic symbolized by M_{rat} ? Yet without at least the simpler luminous view of sequencing being incarnately present, can there be an effective reach for “cumulative and effective results”?

The issue is how we are to lift our game. But here my appeal is for ingesting the need for that lift. Otherwise our conferences will continue to be a communal lie.

That is surely a shocking claim: talking of a hall, a haul, of deceit-ful Lonergan students. Yet I have repeated that claim in milder forms over the past fifty years. The commonsense flow that dominated philosophy and theology since its origins

– skipping the serious sports – flowed solidly into Lonergan studies. So, let us again pause over the posed question.

“The writers of such comparisons have to be brought gently to notice that they are using - in what we’ll talk of in Q/A 41 as inadequate self-luminosity - some norms, standards, of comparison.”(Q/A 38). How?

How, indeed! The answer is HOW. Coming home, creeping home, being whirled home, to the community of selves in their depth as the **Home Of Wonder**, as **HOW**. The present hall-pervasive present norms, standards, have to be repentantly detected as, very fundamentally, a group nominalist self-satisfying closure of the *moi-intime* from the intimate loneliness of its own molecularity.¹ The detecting can slowly find its twister to a joyous fermenting of an ontic and phyletic seeding of the general and special categories cherished by Lonergan sixty years ago.

We are on the edge of the larger topic of Q/A 41, but before venturing there I would note that that communal historical answer needs always the intimate moments of self-discovery. As well as a message from the mount there is the need for quiet Nicodemus moments of night and light.

¹ I have, in those last sixteen words, swept through *Insight* 722 from top to bottom.