

Method in Theology: From $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ to $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$

Philip McShane

“With the reader’s kind permission, we shall endeavor to create in his mind’s eye the impression he would have had when crossing with us the threshold of that Great Hall, along that motley throng in surcoat, acton, and *cottehardie*. First of all, our ears are ringing with the din! Our eyes are dazzled by what we see.”¹

The $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ in my title comes from a letter of Lonergan to Fred Crowe of May 1954. The $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$ comes from my May *Vignette 10* of the series of 24 essays of three months in 2018.²

Immediately I ask my reader not to panic: if indeed you are still with me and curious, and have not fled the seen. The climb to making sense of either of the two compact expressions is tough work, though paradoxically the second expression, $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$, will prove to be easier to handle than the first, $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$.

Getting a glimpse of the aim of my title would be a significant achievement, even if you went no further than musing on my pointing towards symbols as necessary or useful. Going further is a matter of getting our minds focused in some homely manner³ on the growth-

¹ Victor Hugo, *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, Buccaneer Books, New York, 11.

² Vignette 10: A Place in the Son: Rise With Me

³ I am thinking of a positive *haute vulgarization* in contrast to the usual negative vulgarization that can shrink consciousness. See *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 6 [CWL 6], ed. Robert C. Croken, Crowe, and Doran, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 121, 155. Conceiving of the dynamics of that positive shift weaves into the difficulties of initiating the post-axial time of the temporal subject. See *The Triune God: Systematics*. Translated from *De Deo Trino: Pars systematica* (1964). *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* [CWL 12], trans. by Shields, eds. Ed. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 2007), 403ff.

dynamics of our view of method in theology, and then sniffing that the dynamic may take a leap that takes us into a shocking new temporality.⁴

Does this glimpsing ring a bell, connecting it with Lonergan's beginning of the book *Method in Theology*? Recall the first paragraph of the book:

Thought on method is apt to run in some one of three channels. In the first, method is conceived more as an art than a science. It is to be learnt not from books or lectures but in the laboratory or in the seminar. What counts is the example of the master, the effort to do likewise, his comments on performance. Such, I think, must be the origin of all thought on method for such thought has to be reflection on previous achievement. Such, also, will always remain the one way in which the refinements and subtleties proper to specialized areas will be communicated.⁵

Has a bell rung yet?⁶ Indeed, there are different bells ringing in the title and in what I have written so far. Some of them are quite comic, and relevant to that comic side of our efforts here is an old favorite joke of mine about the hunchback of Notre Dame's decision to take a holiday. Best put that in a footnote and we'll weave back to it in the conclusion, picking up, on the way, the double punch-line.⁷

⁴ I am talking about the phase-leap from the negative Anthropocene Age to the positive Anthropocene Age. There is lurking here, here and now, the deep problem of "a genuine self-acceptance" of a resonance with "the influence of other temporal subjects" (CWL 12, *The Triune God: Systematics* 405): "The condition of a temporal subject is such that one can hardly make the transition from the first phase to the second phase apart from the influence of other temporal subjects. For temporal subjects intellectually inform and actuate their sense life by their own intention to the extent that they experience a true self-revelation and a genuine self-acceptance. This revelation takes place either concretely and symbolically or technically and exactly" (*ibid.*). In this essay I point to the exactness of the W₃ 'Tower mediation' as a source, through positive *haute vulgarization*'s concrete flows, of a leap for all.

⁵ As readers of my *Vignettes* and other recent writings of mine will know, pausing over this paragraph seriously is key to a fresh reading of the entire book. I might say, helpfully and simply, that the clue-in to this fresh reading is to intussuscept a noticing of the sad fact that the 'bolder spirits' missed that clue-in.

⁶ Is this an unfair question? It relates to you now presently reading, or reading on in a way boned into our culture. Read, then, these first seven words of the second paragraph of *Method in Theology*: "There are, however, bolder spirits. They select": in what way did they select, do or did you select?

⁷ The hunchback of Notre Dame decided he needed a holiday, so he put an ad for a replacement in the local parchment. After weeks of no reply he heard a knock below one morning and roll his way down to find that his brother outside, he with no arms, looking for the job. "But...!" "But yes, I can manage

A bell that may have rung upon reading the title is that the sub-title seems to have nothing to do with the title *Method in Theology*, and that is a significant bell. If you heard it, then you rise bell-wise to a chortle when you read immediately after, in the next sentence and sentencing, about getting a homely grip on our own view's growth dynamics. Pause and perhaps find that you may even not have much of a view to start with of theological method, much less a view on the dynamics of its growth. A bent of religiosity or laziness led you to religious studies or theology, and you assumed the professors had some decent method both of teaching and of following their careers. In for a penny, in for a pound. There was the offer to the lazy of what in my old university was called 'a bird course,' a first-year cake-walk penny lane,⁸ or, we may think, in the other hand, of religious persons: then such a course seems to them to be a way in to a sincere pounding through years that would lead to self-guidance and guidance of others. So, what's this problem of method of either teaching or searching? The master or mistress gives example and examples and off I go. I think now of my own entry into a university course on mathematical physics, a course I was to teach seven years later. Yes, my teaching in 1959-60 was different from the teaching I received in 1952-53, but that can be put down to a delightful intervening lift of presentational methodology.⁹ The same held true for other courses I taught that year: graduate course in both mathematics and physics, undergraduate courses in engineering and commerce. There was no serious shuffling or shake-up of content, even though the pedagogy was

the bell: let me come up and show you." The hunchback rolled up and the brother staggered up, then took the rope between his teeth and ran back and forth. He had just hit the right pace when the rope escaped his teeth and he went over the balcony. The hunchback rushed rolling down to find a crowd gathered round a gendarme all gazing at the dead face. "Do you know this man?" says le cop to the hunchback. Quasimodo replies "his face rings a bell." And one of the crowd mused, "he's a dead ringer for his brother."

⁸ Yes, the Beatles song of the late 1960s is on my mind, indeed haunts us here in our problem of the so-obvious apparently clean machine of lightweight religious thinking flowing in our blue suburban disguises of the slums of our times. See *Topics in Education. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 10 [CWL 10], ed. Doran and Crowe, revising and augmenting the text prepared by James Quinn and John Quinn, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 253. "Penny Lane is in my ears and in my eyes / There beneath the blue suburban skies / I sit, and meanwhile back / In Penny Lane there is a fireman with an hourglass, / And in his pocket is a portrait of the Queen / He likes to keep his fire engine clean, / It's a clean machine."

⁹ Obviously, I slide over here a large question of the lift of the intervening years of self-discovery through taking Lonergan seriously. Years later there fermented forth what I call the Child-Out Principle, 'When teaching children geometry one is teaching children children.' The principle applies beyond children and beyond geometry, blossoming in principles of linguistic and non-linguistic imaging-feedback applicable globally. See note 50 and then note 49 below.

tuned up through my grip on how students actually moved forward in understanding.

What I write of as true for the starters in any area may well be true of the professors in that area. Again I think of my own teaching in that unique year, 1959-60, of teaching.¹⁰ Was I not teaching commerce in the commerce class? Was I not teaching engineering in the course I gave in second-year engineering mathematics? The question, “How were these all connected?,” never even vaguely occurred to me. At 29 I was not at all in the same ballpark as whom I dare now call my brother in arms at the same age, Lonergan. At 29 he was brooding very precisely about how they all hung together, and we shall weave around that brooding as we move along.¹¹ But might I make the strange suggestion that you could pause now, “eyes off the page,”¹² thinking in and of your own age, and of our age, “a clean machine” whose surface of cleanliness has gone global in its cover of covens and covenants “that hangs like a pall over every brilliant thing.”¹³ When, pray, did that sick glib goings-on of global order go global in him and for him as alien to him and to “that order’s dynamic joy and zeal”?¹⁴ It was, methinks, part of his religious and aesthetic bent, a light in his boyhood eyes and ayes as he halted in his parents’ garden, smallboy-listening to his mother playing music

¹⁰ One uniqueness of the year is relevant here. The ethos of that single year teaching a respected science was quite different from the ethos of philosophical or theological classes and discourse. The nun’s story in physics that I refer to regularly became, mainly, the none story in my trying to teach people about themselves in philosophy. The following year, 1960, I went into the “slum” (CWL 10, 253) of theology, where climbing was so foreign to the ethos that the second, third and fourth year course were done in a cycle. Thus you could move from a first year of gross common sense to what might have been a fourth-year course without missing a beat of initial meanings (see note 116 below).

¹¹ The brooding I would, and will, invite you to focus on is that available in Michael Shute, *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research [LEER]* (University of Toronto Press, 2010), 16-44, which reproduces Lonergan’s of 1934, *Essay in Fundamental Sociology*, to be referred to below by that title. It brings to mind now Lonergan asking me, exactly fifty years ago this autumn, to find an economist. I would note that the more mature partner of my present essay is to appear in *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy and Education* in the next year under the title is “Finding an Effective Economist. A Central Theological Challenge.”

¹² I am thinking of Gaston Bachelard’s advice on reading in his *Poetics of Space*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970), 14, 39, 47, 83 but now giving it a fresh discomforting twist. You are, I expect, not tuned to such a poetics of the spacing of reading as, for example, to pause now and then, and of course now now, eyes, irises, high-risks, off the page?

¹³ “Essay in Fundamental Sociology” in *LEER*, 43.

¹⁴ *CWL* 3, 722, the final words.

resurrected freshly in his molecules by the Kreutzer Sonata.¹⁵ There was in him some sense of genuineness, craving, oneness of finite flow, that years later I found him expressing as he stood alone, in the recorded presence of Ozawa conducting a Beethoven Piano Concerto, waving his arms and claiming, “I am Ozawa!”¹⁶

There is a mad sense of us being reachingly one, a sensibility that can radiate on all levels of molecularity on concerting and disconcerting occasions: a sudden outburst of grandeur: not just “the moment in the garden”¹⁷ but the moment in the mall,¹⁸ in the talent competition,¹⁹ in a startlingly shared “hello,”²⁰ in “the little, nameless, acts of kindness and of love”;²¹ outbursts of grandeur by “which the heavy and the weary

¹⁵ We were at my apartment in Halifax in the early 1970s. I had just played the Kreutzer, and noticed him, as it were, floating bright-eyed, hand waving, smiling. Then he told me the garden story. Later I traced down a piano version of the Kreutzer – done by Czerny methinks - and heard it. It was not, of course, what Lonergan’s mother played, but the Beethoven, heartily heard, brought it to his minding. Not knowing till later what his mother was in fact playing – a piece called ‘The Mocking Bird’ – led me chasing for the piano version of the Kreutzer and finding a wonderful pianist, Elgin Strub, granddaughter of Liszt’s last pupil, Bernhard Stavenhagen, enthusiastic to play it for me. Was I off track, or was I somehow getting close to Lonergan’s bright Iris? (Recall note 12: the iris theme floats through this essay: see notes 66, 77, 78, 83, 84, 86, 96, 108, and finally, with more fulsome suggestiveness, in note 116.)

¹⁶ Matt Lamb and I were with Lonergan in Matt’s residence after a lecture by Lonergan that left him quite high. As Lonergan wandered around Matt asked, “what are we to do?” “Play a Beethoven Piano Concerto” was my suggestion.

¹⁷ I am thinking of T.S. Eliot’s *Four Quartets*’ “unattended moment, the moment in and out of time.”

¹⁸ Consider the effects of those unexpected musical outbursts in relation to ‘The Cargo Pants’ reflected on in *Vignette 19*, a Pentecostal essay of that title.

¹⁹ I focus on this in chapter 19, “The Well of Loneliness,” of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, (Axial Press, 2015), 225-6: the globe’s hidden talents, and X-factored seeds of the X of Cosmopolis (CWL 3, 263).

²⁰ I am recalling here a conversation with Bernard Lonergan about Dante and Beatrice: his remark was to raise his hand and say, “Hello!: that’s what life is all about!”

²¹ Best give the surrounding lines of Wordsworth’s “Lines composed a few miles above Tintern Abbey” since they are an echo chamber of my central pointing. Might sufficient symbolisms in theology eventually be “felt in the blood and felt along the heart”? There was a parallel appeal in the conclusion to the Preface to my index of *For a New Political Economy. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 21 [CWL 21], ed. Philip McShane (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998). The central entry in the index is *Concomitance*. Might you, and indeed the politicians and economists of the distant future, come to read it in the heart-blood mood of Wordsworth: “And now I see with eye serene / the very pulse of the machine” (taken from the poem “She was a Phantom of Delight”). Here, then, a piece of the Tintern Abbey poem: “Felt in the blood,

weight / Of all this unintelligible world, / Is lightened.”²² Yet that lightening and lightning goes deeper in our four-playing what what what what to say spookily yet street-wise that our finitude is somehow not unintelligible.

Was that lightening not there when Bernard Lonergan hunched his back to type his hunches about “a real and an ideal unity”²³ in the third last paragraph of *Method in Theology*? On he went then to echo an earlier lightening of his 29-year-old self.²⁴ “The real unity is the response to the one Lord in the one Spirit. The ideal unity is the fruit of Christ’s prayer: “. . . may they all be one . . .” (John 17, 21).²⁵

It would be pretty daft to think that he was, in that typing, hunched back to his third paragraph of the book: or would it? “A third way, then, must be found.”²⁶ Where would – or will - that way bring us, when – not if – it is found?²⁷ It will lift individual wayfarers into being effective political characters who will bring outbursts into the global mall that will lift, slowly, slowly, slowly, slowly the flattened earthlings of our axial times into “the effective rule of sweetness and light.”²⁸ That the individual wayfarers can not do it alone: that was evident to the 29 year

and felt along the heart; / And passing even into my purer mind, / With tranquil restoration: - feelings too /Of unremembered pleasure: such, perhaps, / As have no slight or trivial influence /On that best portion of a good man's life, / His little, nameless, unremembered, acts / Of kindness and of love. Nor less, I trust, / To them I may have owed another gift, /Of aspect more sublime; that blessed mood, / In which the burthen of the mystery, /In which the heavy and the weary weight / Of all this unintelligible world, / Is lightened: - that serene and blessed mood, /In which the affections gently lead us on.”

²² See the previous note.

²³ *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1972), 367.

²⁴ “Essay in Fundamental Sociology” pivots on his attention to the dynamics of the real and ideal unity. Why not pause over an appealing appeal? “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 of action of man, for the effective rule of sweetness and light, for the fuller manifestation of what charity loves, Wisdom Divine, the Word made Flesh” (*LEER*, 43).

²⁵ *Method in Theology*, 367.

²⁶ *Method in Theology*, chapter one, paragraph 3.

²⁷ The next line of the quotation given in note 24 raises the question, “Do you know His Kingdom?” Into that question I mesh my oft-repeated basic question about history, His Story: “Do you view humanity as possibly maturing – in some serious way – or just messing along between good and evil, whatever you think they are?” In the *Divyadaan* essay mentioned in note 11 I push towards the distant reality of humans becoming characters of craving for the Kingdom, thus luminously praying, with effective commitment, “Thy Kingdom Come.” The luminosity is to be of the Tower People, but weaving through the global sensibility.

²⁸ *LEER*, 43.

old.²⁹ That the genesis of the third way would involve some structure of re-cycling: that too was obvious to the 29 year old.³⁰ But what might the dynamics of that re-cycling be? Collaborative yes, but how?, how?, how? how? The 59-year-old hunched over that in the summer of 1953,³¹ and a week or so later asked about the source of the needed *ethos* that would radiate its answers.³²

There followed the multilayered mess of 1954,³³ yet at its end Lonergan was getting a grip on the characters needed and on their emergence as theo-logging. So there emerged his m'aider, m'aider, m'aider, m'aider³⁴ letter to Fred Crowe, with its baffling expression of the lightning rods, the light housers, of a future humanity. Here you have it, from my hunchback of Notre Dame's own little typewriter.

²⁹ “Intellectual achievement is the achievement of the race, of the unity of human action; the individual genius is but the instrument of the race in its expansion” (*LEER*, 20-21).

³⁰ Seeking “a statistically effective form for the next cycle of him action that will bring forth in reality the incompleteness of the later act of intellect by setting it new problems.” (*LEER*, 20).

³¹ He was writing the final pages of *Insight*, with more than thirty mentions of the problem of collaboration.

³² In the Epilogue of *Insight* he raised the question of the treatise on the mystical body and its role. See *CWL* 3, 763-4.

³³ One aspect of the mess was the general consensus of colleagues that he would get little serious time in Rome for his work. See his letter to Eric O'Connor of July 1952 (Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010, 156) about his hopes for more time to push on with his two-volume project, *Insight* and *Faith and Insight*. The threaten move “leaves me with a long row to hoe yet” (*ibid.*) to finish *Insight*.

³⁴ I am strategically linking Lonergan's quiet reach to Crowe with my broader SOS reach, May 1st 2018, of *Vignette 8*, “Mayday! Mayday! Mayday”. The distress signal was invented by senior Officer Frederick Stanley Mockford at Croydon Airport in London in 1923, the French *m'aider*, to be repeated thrice to avoid mistakes. My fourth *m'aider* above symbolizes a distress signal about the fourth stage of contemplation, lifting forward my appeal about “Foundational Prayer” made in the five essays of that title, essays 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 in my website *Prehumous* series.

The Method of Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ as n approaches infinity. For the rest: ordo universi. From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities ~~in~~ developing in relation to one another and in relation to God, i.e., metaphysics as I conceive it but plus transcendent knowledge. From the viewpoint of religious experience, it is the same relations as lived in a development from elementary intersubjectivity (cf Sullivan's basic concept of interpersonal relations) to intersubjectivity in Christ (cf. the endless Pauline[suv- or]sun- compounds) on the sensitive (external Church, sacraments, sacrifice, liturgy) and intellectual levels (faith, hope, charity). *Religious Experience : Theology : Dogma :: Potency : Form : Act*

It is best to add immediately a fresh-typed version of his plea:

The Method of Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ as n approaches infinity. For the rest: ordo universi. From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God, i.e., metaphysics as I conceive it but plus transcendent knowledge. From the viewpoint of religious experience, it is the same relations as lived in a development from elementary intersubjectivity (cf. Sullivan's basic concept of interpersonal relations) to intersubjectivity in Christ (cf. the endless Pauline [suv- or] sun- compounds) on the sensitive (external Church, sacraments, sacrifice, liturgy) and intellectual levels (faith, hope, charity). Religious experience : Theology : Dogma :: Potency : Form : Act.

What sense do you make of this, in your first double-reading? Fred Crowe failed to make sense of it and a decade or more later sent the letter to me to see what I might make of it. We had been in touch since the early 1960s and he knew my background. The focus of our attention was on the oddity, $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$. It was not in Fred's ballpark, but was part of my home zone of mathematics.³⁵ Indeed, I now recall the odd coincidence that when Lonergan was writing his letter in 1954 I was working in that zone, and a little earlier I had spent a considerable amount of time battling against a theorem about the irrationals, a battling which illustrates a bent I shared with Lonergan: a conviction about making sense, about order, about explanation.³⁶ As to the battle with the irrationals, I leave that to the previous footnote, and turn briefly to the

³⁵ Indeed, curiously, such series were part of my mathematic studies of that year of 1954.

³⁶ My poise was a stand against inverse insight. One of my efforts, at the time, to order the decimals appears in *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations* (Exposition Press, 1974), 26. Available online at philipmchane.org.

oddity in Lonergan's letter, "proceed to the limit as in evaluating $[1 + 1/n]^n$ as n approaches infinity."

I give you a brief turn around that oddity by quoting **the center of the text** I wrote as an insert in Patrick Brown's magnificent treatment of the recycling of this letter. The brief turn follows some further present musing on Lonergan's previous climbing, then off we go into the full adventure of the Brown insert between two starry lines, ***** , reaching between and beyond your two starry eyes:

What we cannot easily doubt is that he was at some new high beyond these previous reaches. He was thinking of, or in, the *Imago* as it blossomed in his own mind and is to blossom in the theological community he was envisaging. That was his hope, within which there was an old conviction regarding the emergence of effectiveness.

What then might he have meant by n ? Certainly it was a number. Was it a number relating to time or to people doing theology? Were these people, a core of all God's people, the "manifold of unities" he went on to write of? That would seem included. And what of x ? For someone in his ballpark he was clearly talking about that curious function whose rate of growth was equal to itself: the function e^x , with $de^x/dx = e^x$. If so, there is the effort to communicate a view of theology, of the understanding of mysteries in this life - why not in the next? - as growing at the wondrous pace called *exponential*.³⁷

But that is not obvious if one is not in his ballpark.³⁸

You are facing the challenge of delving into you own ballpark, perhaps as it trails along through the suggestions and questions in the previous quotation. If you are familiar with my *Vignette* series then you know that that quotation is a version of my stand in and on the second objectification of *Lonergan's 1833 Overture*. If you have delved into the subsection titled "Eschaton"³⁹ of *Vignette 17*, then you will find that the question, "why not in the next?" is answered by me in a rhetorical "Why indeed not?" But let us stay more narrowly focus on what Lonergan

³⁷ See note 53 below. It is a simple matter of differentiating the series term to find a growth rate equal to itself.

³⁸ Here ends the piece taken from the previous McShane interlude. See pages 116-20 below.

³⁹ The section previously appeared as section 20 of "Insight and the Trivialization of History", *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education* 28, no. 1 (2017). The note was in fact originally a piece of an e-mail correspondence.

wrote. In my quotation I raised the question of the n people in relation to the “manifold of unities”. Back we go, then, to the piece in Lonergan’s letter that mentions that manifold. “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.” We are back with the problem of effectiveness manifested in the shocking inclusion, in his view of metaphysics, of “implementation.”⁴⁰ If there is no “fruit,”⁴¹ no “statistically effective form for the next cycle of human action,”⁴² no “cumulative and progressive results,”⁴³ then the n people are “a class closed in upon themselves with no task proportionate to their training. They become effete.”⁴⁴

Here I am referencing all over the place⁴⁵ and over the life-effort of my hunched brother. For I am now, myself, in the frame of hunching in Vancouver in my 87th year. And it is as well to note that that frame of hunching includes Lonergan’s pitch to me of the summer of 1966, of the shift, ten and a half years after that letter to Crowe, to being able to identify a fundamental containing invariant manifold of the n people. His pitch to me included our common⁴⁶ ground of the poise of *Insight* and the problems left dangling there, a poise and problematic too massive to pause over here.⁴⁷ That pitch left me, that summer in the Bayview

⁴⁰ *CWL* 3, 416, at the end.

⁴¹ *Method in Theology*, 355: “theological reflection bears fruit”: in the shifting both of concrete living and of contemplation within and without of the Tower of Able.

⁴² *LEER*, 20.

⁴³ *Method in Theology*, 4.

⁴⁴ *Method in Theology*, 99.

⁴⁵ In the new context of $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$ words like *place* and *situation* are lifted into a refined theoretic. The topology of the eight situation rooms of cyclic collaboration are to be components of the cyclic expansion. Giving indications of that would be a massive distraction here (but check notes 61 and 113 below). Think of Lonergan’s comment on the goings-on of the Council of Ephesus: “Thus, geographic separation, which hindered easy and frequent communication, was added to the difference between schools of thought” [*The Incarnate Word. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan [CWL 8]*, trans. by Charles C. Hefling, Jr, ed. Robert M. Doran and Jeremy Wilkins (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 209]. The new topological heuristic becomes a new control of meaning. Think of the integrating lift it gives to the meaning of ongoing, overlapping, etc. contexts.

⁴⁶ Consider notes 33-34 above as related to this. This essay is an appeal to check your own commonness as you poise over $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$. The commonness grows, as mine does in my trailing after Lonergan, but for a scientific community, including its initiates and students, the commonness is that of a shared standard model. That is what $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$ points to in theology.

⁴⁷ One obviously reads *Insight* differently in the context of the new standard model. That reading is a task of the future. However, I add a single

Avenue Regis College, memorably poised in walks in its grounds, reaching to past and future in imagination, in a fantasy of its effectiveness, of the efficiencies of implementation. And now, forty-two years later, I can write, in an echo of Bernie to Fred, this key piece of my letter to you:

The Method of Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$ as it approaches the Eschaton, the final stage of ordo universi, "the greatest of all works." (CWL 12, 491). From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities developing in relating the nine genera of situation rooms in a cumulative and progressive relating in and to God, i.e., metaphysics as Lonergan conceived it plus transcendent knowledge concretely contextualized. From the viewpoint of religious experience, it is the same relations as lived in a development from elementary intersubjectivity (gradually going continually "**4-poise**" beyond, in geohistoric refinements - $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$ - Sullivan's basic concept of interpersonal relations) to intersubjectivity in Christ (cf. the luminous selves-explanatory future "**4-growing**" of *CWL 12, The Triune God: Systematics*, 436-521) on the sensitive (externalities: spooky-minding meshing asymptotically, ascetically and esthetically, with cosmic "order's dynamic joy and zeal" [*Insight*, end words of ch. 20's 13th place]) and spooky⁴⁸ levels ("**4-growing**" identity of georeligiosity). $\mathbf{H}\Sigma$ {Religious experience: Geotheologging : \mathbf{C}_9 :: Potency : Form : Act.}

This is my face to you now, facing you as Lonergan faced Crowe in 1954: these are the faces facing you, Jack and Jill, in my subtitle. The

simple illustration of a "road not taken". There is, at the end of the dense paragraph (p. 602, Thirdly) on pure formulations, mention of the interpreter with the universal viewpoint addressing an audience "that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint." Think of this in terms of its seeding of the topic of the divisions of labor identified by Lonergan in scientific functionality in 1965.

⁴⁸ "Spooky": a word of the beginning of section 3, "The Supernatural" of "Mission and the Spirit" [*A Third Collection (CWL 16)*]. Its meaning will be given a massive psychic lift in the later positive Anthropocene. Think of the change of meaning of "cool" in the past century. There is to be some very cool stretching of the molecules of imagination here. *Spooky* would come to point to the best of human living: *The Perfume beyond the Veil*, to steal my wife, Sally's, book-title. See the next two notes. The cool stretching is, of course, symbolized by the eventual global cherishing of the symbol of the standard model of progress, $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$.

issue is you now taking the measure, the *Nomos*,⁴⁹ of your facelift or frown in your own humble version of the second objectification mentioned in Lonergan's 1833 Overture. Do either of the two faces in my title ring a bell, any little bell, for you? I don't think my Inscape Lighthouse Bell reaction to Lonergan's face - I am thinking of the cover and content of my *Futurology Express* - would help you at the moment, but I insert that reference now for later ringings in your molecular head. So, yes, skip on now, if you prefer, and read what follows the star-lined section. Skipped or not, your present reading is twisted by little touches of my linguistic feedback,⁵⁰ even now as I ask you to sometime spell your name in the alphabet soup of my "Minding Reality"⁵¹ and to seek your mibox in the soup song of *Vignette 22*, "Mibox,"⁵² a Catch 22 of reading self-correctingly your face and mine in $\{M (W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$.

Interlude by Philip McShane

"Our spontaneous expectations are not remotely geared to the reality to be understood." The trouble, at this stage in our axial times, is the proximate gearing. That proximate gearing is a neurodynamic reality of the first world, caught in, trained into, an arrogance of initial meanings meshed richly together to disguise a stuntedness of culture that bows

⁴⁹ The next footnote talks rather crazily about patterns of feedback, but here I think of a punsome linguistic feedback caught in the title of 2 chapters that treat of the full feedback that was Lonergan's hope at 29, thematized in 1969 in his "Functional Specialties" *Gregorianum* article: "A Rolling Stone Gathers *Nomos*". The 2 chapters of mine (*A Brief History of Tongue*, ch. 3 and *Economics for Everyone*, ch. 5) point to the need for the full functional feedback dynamic in linguistics and economics. In the mature positive Anthropocene, the *Nomos* and "no moss" will be sculpted into a general effective psychic poise.

⁵⁰ The general point is made in *Method in Theology* 88, note 34: "At a higher level of linguistic development the possibility of insight is achieved by linguistic feedback, by expressing the subjective experience in words and as subjective." Note 7 above hints at enlargements. Think of sculpting as an objectification of the subject for the sake of sight, and see how it might be weaved e.g. into poetic feedback. (See *Vignette 18*, "Ontic and Phyletic Growth, where the third poem on page 2, about a statue, ends by asking, "Is that you?").

But what of a large statue that looked at you like this: $\{M (W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$? "Is that you?" It does not work too well. But might it slowly - I think in terms of millennia - mediate new cities and new citizens?

⁵¹ "Minding Reality" is the first of five articles on the converging of our efforts to establish the *nomos* talk about in the previous notes. See note 111 below.

⁵² "Mibox" refers to the diagram on page 41 of my *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*. It is given a fuller context of meanings in *Vignette 22*.

before technical competence in talk and technology. So, for instance, that proximate gearing could happily carry on with me talking here of, say, the daily growth of a young elephant as compared to the daily growth of an infant flea. Yes, there is a huge difference: the elephant adds the weight of pounds of adult fleas. Growth, yes, is a function of the starting point of the growing. See: are we not making progress towards understanding exponential growth, even enjoying looking at the equation, $d/dx (e^x) = e^x$? Even thinking of Lonergan's acceleration of growth between the end of *Insight* and the letter? And in that thinking miring ourselves in present deceits and conceits?

Our existential challenge, primarily ontic but also phyletic, in this stage of human history, is to begin to get a sufficient grip on our own meaning of our **what**, to generate in these coming centuries a culture that lives molecularly in the luminous regarding and guarding of the lack that is internal to infant humanity's cosmic puttering, recognized now, in this accepted Anthropocene Age, in its cosmic destructiveness. So, we are invited by Lonergan to gradually graduate, step up as a species, late in his book of invitations: "Most of all, what is lacking is a knowledge of all that is lacking and only gradually is that knowledge acquired."

Pat Brown's masterly presentation of the problem of interpreting Lonergan's short piece from 1954 nudges me towards brevity here: indeed, frankly, towards silence. Where does one begin when the bulk of present theological readers is not competent to read intelligently about the meaning of velocity, much less the velocity of the function e^x where e is the endless number 2.71828... ? The oddness of the velocity of e^x is that it is a repeat of e^x , and this is quite obvious from the usual expression for e^x ,⁵³ once one knows that $d/dx (x^n) = nx^{n-1}$. But what is that knowing? My experience of trying to help grade 11 and 12 schoolkids is that the present texts are dedicated to memorization as opposed to understanding, so the kids don't know that $d/dx (x^n) = nx^{n-1}$. Do you?

Here I note a curious wandering in my interlude. Pat obliquely points to the problem of the unpreparedness of present historians for Lonergan's briefly-expressed push in Method. That is the nudge behind these initial paragraphs of mine. So, immediately here, I turned to a pivotal component of understanding the text: the meaning of e^x and its velocity. But in doing that I jumped over problems of getting to e^x from the relevant piece of text, "evaluating $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ as n approaches infinity." Central to the jump is knowing, in a comprehending sense, that $[1 + 1/n]^{nx} = e^{nx \log(1 + 1/n)}$.

How far back, or forward, have I to go to bring you to a preliminary glimpse of this? Have you any memory of logarithms, indeed perhaps even a rote memory of "the logarithm of a number is the index of the power to which the base must be raised in order to equal the given number"? So, the 'log' of 1000 to the base 10 is? : well, $10^3 = 1000$.

⁵³ $e^x = 1 + x + x^2/2 + x^3/2.3 + x^4/2.3.4 + \dots + x^n/(2.3.4.5\dots n) + \dots$

$\text{Log}_{10} 1000 = 3$. Got it? The little 10 simply names the base. In the text, the base, for Lonergan, is e . But how do we get to the equality mentioned? Might I push on with pedagogy? So, perhaps we could pause over the conditional, if $A = e^B$, then $\text{Log}_e A = B$. What might you say of the Log of A^5 ? Can you figure out—get help if not!—that $\text{Log}_e A^5 = 5B$? Next, notice, grasp, the simple jump to claiming—omitting the subscript e that designates the base—that $A^5 = e^{5B} = e^{5\text{Log} A}$. You have only to intelligently substitute $[1 + 1/n]$ for A , and nx for 5 and you grasp that you have arrived at the suggested equality. Are you genuinely, or vaguely in a genuine way, with me so far? Yet, what I have written so far here is all too dense to be decently pedagogical. So let me break off, break away, take off the brakes, take the baton as a functional historian, and locate Lonergan's "coming into perspective."

My perspective is a lean-to genetic one, a best present operable grip on 'method in theology.' It is a geohistorical heuristic of "Faith seeking understanding" that holds integrally Genesis and the Upanishads, the Zulus and the Zoroastrians and the Zen, and reaches hopily and hoppily towards the eschatological seeking that is continuous yet startlingly discontinuous with the reach of "elementary intersubjectivity (cf. Sullivan's basic concept of interpersonal relations) to intersubjectivity in Christ," literally in the neurodynamic presence of all of us in the molecular delight that began with the billion-molecule mind of the infant Jesus.⁵⁴

Into that perspective there arrives—let's pretend—freshly the paragraph of Lonergan sent to Crowe in 1954. My functional task is to luminously and effectively⁵⁵ fit this "coming into" into the present fullest geohistorical genetics. Not a task strange to Lonergan: there it is the minding of his typing, summer 1953, of what I call 60910.⁵⁶ It fits in too, with my perspective on his struggle, later that summer, with locating the treatise on the mystical body.⁵⁷ It fits in, further, within the perspective that blossomed out of his next ten and a half years of battling towards the differentiation of what he sketched in *Insight* earlier that same summer. There "are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint

⁵⁴ There is a vast and subtle literature on the prenatal and infant mind. Does it not have a place in the search for the historical Jesus? And are not His resurrected adult neurodynamics central to a serious eschatology?

⁵⁵ The first effectiveness is the successful exchange with Pat Brown here, but I would note that effectiveness is, in Lonergan's view, of the essence of both metaphysics and functional collaboration. The feeble statistics of actual implementation was a driving force in his eventual identification of Cosmopolis as a functional division of labour.

⁵⁶ 60910 refers to the paragraph at the turn of page 609 of *Insight*.

⁵⁷ His struggle is expressed in *CWL* 3, 763–64. My solution to his problem is to be found in *The Road to Religious Reality* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2012), 18–22. It also solves the problem of the precise meaning of *Comparison*. See *Method in Theology*, 250.

and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint.”⁵⁸ Further, the grip on effectiveness, a needy Faithfilled reality of Lonergan’s psyche, luminous there certainly since the mid-1930s, has a blossoming fullness, within the full present perspective, of a street-reaching meshing of the promise of money with the Promise of the Covenant.⁵⁹ “For the rest: ordo universi,” indeed.

My breakaway of those two paragraphs is like present summaries of Wiles’ handling of Fermat’s Last Theorem. Indeed, is there not a sweet parallel between Fermat’s marginal scribble and Lonergan’s paragraph? But best that I should break-back now to the struggle towards a precise interpretation of the text that fits in with the obsolete ‘academic disciplines’ approach. We pause over the likely meaning Lonergan had for “in evaluating $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ as n approaches infinity.” Had he in mind precise meanings of n and x when he wrote thus? Or was his view-bent simply a matter of illustrating a procedure to the limit, a growth in theology that was a generally accepted vague business? General vague business does not seem to square with his stand on “coming into perspective.” Despite the year of teaching, or even because of it, he was in the high context of the unfinished climb talked of in the final chapter and epilogue of *Insight*. He seems in this 1954 text, to be coming to, pushing on to, a perspective, and indeed, giving the impression that he had arrived at some new height. Was it for him something of a definitive height? There is that impression from the affirmative bluntness of the text there, and from the manner in which he continued the text, down to the final scribbled comparison. Whatever his discovery, he places it unhesitatingly in the context of “ordo universi,” and the scribbled second last word is a shout about the intelligibility of that ordo: “form.”⁶⁰ Was he thinking of cosmopolis and of collaboration? Was he thinking of his problem regarding the missing treatise on the mystical body? Was he thinking of his conclusion to his systematic treatise on the Trinity?

What we cannot easily doubt is that he was at some new high beyond these previous reaches. He was thinking of, or in, the *Imago* as it blossomed in his own mind and is to blossom in the theological community he was envisaging. That was his hope, within which there was an old conviction regarding the emergence of effectiveness.

⁵⁸ *CWL* 3, 602.

⁵⁹ A help here are the essays in *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy and Education*, vol. 21 (2010), “Do You Want a Sane Global Economy?,” particularly my own two final essays there, “Edging towards a Later Global Economy,” 233–244, and “The Global Economy and My Little Corner,” 245–256.

⁶⁰ The shout is amusingly identifiable as something easy to hear. It is conveyed in a generic fashion in the final paragraph of *Insight* chapter 5, which begins with the phrase, “The answer is easily reached (*CWL* 3, 195).”

What then might he have meant by n ? Certainly it was a number. Was it a number relating to time or to people doing theology? Were these people, a core of all God's people, the "manifold of unities" he went on to write of? That would seem included. And what of x ? For someone in his ballpark he was clearly talking about that curious function whose rate of growth was equal to itself: the function e^x , with $de^x/dx = e^x$. If so, there is the effort to communicate a view of theology, of the understanding of mysteries in this life—why not in the next?—as growing at the wondrous pace called exponential.

But that is not obvious if one is not in his ballpark. Is it obvious if one is in the ballpark presupposed by this volume as a slim heuristics? I do not think so: it would need a fattening of the heuristics bringing us into Lonergan's explanatory world. My *per se* functional interest here, however, coincident with Brown's effort, is some precise fattening of the heuristics of the emergent sub-group of functional historians, of the larger community to be identified as C_{ij} , of the full community of common sense.

So my final comment here returns us to the two paragraphs of my outreaching **boldfaced** above. Let you reread them here, but now identified as within the present situation,⁶¹ identified in the paragraphs beginning my interlude, identified as my backfiring to Brown, identified as positive haute vulgarization. How Now Brown Brow do you read these paragraphs and Lonergan's, how do you pick up and pass on an invitation to re-cycle Lonergan's little pointing?

Thus I leave the topic, hand it back, backfire it, to Brown, as he moves to talk further of the problem of functional handing-on.

Well now: whether you skipped that McShane reflection on Lonergan's face and face-off of 1954 or struggled through it, you should be happy to know that McShane's musings that follow here, on McShane's poise or face-off are, methinks, more palatable. The palatability, of course, is deceptive. First there is the change of poise-content that sits in the word

⁶¹ The word 'situation' here can be taken to symbolize the massive difficulty of the transformation envisaged by Lonergan. It sits as an eight-fold nudge on page 358 of *Method in Theology*. *Allure* chapter 16 points to a lifting of that final chapter into a "coming into perspective" of a hierarchy of eight situation rooms with a complex topology that would ground a global effective "situation ethics." Efficient? That new complex structure represents "The Principle of Least Action" for future effective progress, and in using there the title of Feynman's 19th chapter of his *Lectures in Physics*, volume 2, I am bringing in a disturbing analogue of the difficulty of the project, a difficulty the prevalent commonsense perspective simply rejects. This is a massively difficult chapter in Feynman's apparently introductory work. You may recall a previous analogue from Husserl's early work in my chapter 3 on "The Calculus of Variation" in *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Halifax: Axial Publications, 2006).

from in the initial title. Secondly, however, there is the poise lurking in that sitting of *from*. It is the poise that leans us into a hope for genetic interpretation, the central crisis zone of present Lonergan studies. Were I to push that leaning beyond faint hope into a seriously symbolized fantasy of fulfillment I would be pitching, tarring, a considerable fresh bump into the present cycle of *Assembly*, indeed, to continue the bump metaphor, not a bump but a massive ladder-lift in the height of the road. I am moving in a lower suggestiveness, in the style seeded by “the nun’s story”⁶² and in the sad context added by “The None’s Story.”⁶³ What I do, or rather continue to do, is to give, artily and heartily, vague ontogenetic hints to nudge you on: again, think of “the nun’s story” and the nature of positive *haute vulgarization*.

What might I say to help you along towards a slim initial glimpse of $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$? \mathbf{W}_3 is perhaps familiar to you: it has been around since the Concordia University Lonergan gathering on his *Hermeneutics* of the 1980s.⁶⁴ The **4** relates to the fourth stage of meaning but in a complicated way that would add bundles of complexities in a much larger article than this.⁶⁵ So it seems best to focus on that piece of the face of my mind that is $\mathbf{M}^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}$. We’ll come to the **M** later:⁶⁶ first let us

⁶² The nun studying physics was introduced in *Vignette 5*, “Going on to Intervene,” and I return to the character of her psychic poise on and off during the *Vignettes*. She was a student in my honors class of 1959-60, the pre-notes of which are available on my website (*Website Articles*, 7 and 8). She had no fear or dread about the future climb or its present form of exercises such as appear in my notes. In particular, she recognized positive *haute vulgarization*. That, sadly, is the central difficulty of most of my present readers, who live in a poise of negative *haute vulgarization*, where I mean not just popular presentation but the entire gamut of present theological discourse, a massive cover-up of initial meanings. See below, note 116. For Lonergan’s view on such incompetence, see *CWL* 6, 121, 155. For a discomfiting personal glimpse, check what you can say about *probability* in talking about Emergent Probability.

⁶³ See *Vignette 20* of that title.

⁶⁴ The gathering led to the volume Lonergan’s *Hermeneutics. It Development and Application*, edited by Sean McEvenue and Ben Meyer, The Catholic University of America, 1989. It had, sadly, little to do with Lonergan’s massive creativity.

⁶⁵ A helpful sketch is available in *Vignette 15*, “A Convenient Naming of Stages of Meaning.”

⁶⁶ I left the text here just so. “Later”? At an early stage I was optimistic about detailing **M**. What might I say here, as a wrap up in this, my final footnote? Why not wrap this feeble final pointer round some of the other footnotes, starting with footnote 108: “might you think now in strange intentionality-creativity of *The Iris of Jesus*?” Indeed, might you come with me in my present project of reading in that I-risk iris poise (see notes 12, 66, 77, 78, 83, 84, 86, 96, 108, 116) those “63 articles in a row” of Thomas mentioned in *CWL* 1, *Grace and Freedom*, 94? But what more can I say about **M**, my Markov sphere that points to detailed “cumulative and progressive

attend to the three, θ , Φ , and T . Think of a sphere, indeed think of the usual spheres giving the image of the world. Next, think of locating someplace on the sphere for someone in terms of latitude and longitude. Then you are set to get the meaning of θ and Φ . Is that not fine and dandy?⁶⁷ So we are left with the superscript T , and you have probably already surmised that it refers to time, thus locating fully e.g. someone. “I am going to be in New York, New York, on March 17th 2020”. But how do we handle T 's imaging? Count from the center of the sphere, picking a convenient date for the ‘flat’ surface. The ‘flat’ is just a convenience: don’t let it bother you, no more than you would bother giving the sea-level for the flow of New York’s St. Patrick’s Day parade.

Next, think of the lines of latitude and longitude carried out by your imagination, or a bit of doodling, of a sequence of larger concentric spheres. O.K.⁶⁸ Next, shift the time, T , on the surface of the first sphere, to say, our usual A.D. zero. Then we, at present, are “out” 2000⁺ measures of T if we are thinking in years. Let us move back in time and think of the Council of Ephesus⁶⁹ as “out” 431 measures.

You would agree that this is not a difficult move back in time, nor is it difficult in space: the clue there is in the previous footnote to Ephesus:

results”(*Method in Theology*, 4) whose “fruit” (*ibid.*, 355) is to be an effective reach towards global redemption in the maturity of the positive Anthropocene? There is a plethora of detail involved: see, for example, the older details of *Prehumous 2*. The newer details? Check footnote 111 below. But now I am thinking of the entire Iris-take, I risk take, that I place as my second objectification in Lonergan’s 1833 Overture: $\{M(W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$. I find myself alone there, disarmingly, alarmingly. The “hump” (note 79 below) on the road of minding reality is too threatening for present ineffective putterings in philosophy, theology, futurology. Is the silence an effort to render my poise ineffective in the religiosity of the 21st century? But it certainly has it home in ignorance and cosyness.

⁶⁷ The redundancy is often ironic. What of us here now? I pose a serious question, to be illustrated in the next note. It brings to mind a question asked of Lonergan in the late 1970s in a Boston Workshop, “How much physics need a theologian know?” “Well,” said Lonergan, “he should be able to read *Lindsay and Margenau*”: a text he had used as a regular reference in *Insight*. Later (note 82) here we meet G_{jk}^i , an expression that throws you into the context of its fifth chapter, though it refers to a Trinitarian view of Space and Time. The God of *Insight 19.7* is elusive, even prior to bowing before Their Threeness. Puttering around in theology with the God of Abraham or the God of present philosophers and theologians is something of an insult to Them.

⁶⁸ Here I touch on a simple instance of a limitation of imagination. I have found, in presenting this beginning poise, that even a cultured theologian can stumble badly here. Yet it is a beginning to the simple geohistorical control of meaning of contexts.

⁶⁹ **Ephesus** was a Greek city on the coast of Ionia, three kilometres southwest of present-day Selçuk in İzmir Province, Turkey. No problem then in getting its θ , Φ .

find Θ and Φ for Selçuk. But what I want from you now is a “dread”⁷⁰-nought⁷¹ cruise into the “existential gap”⁷² that is likely here in our face-off. Jack and Jill⁷³ have a problem with Phil: his face may ring no bell! No pullet’s surprise here, nor even a no-bell prize: we are, oddly, in a parallel universe to Joyce talking about art, about a basket, about winning the cigar.⁷⁴

But, first, return to the issue raised some few paragraphs back, the issue of a glimpse at or of $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\Theta\Phi\mathbf{T}}\}^4$. Glance, glare, now, again and a gaining, at what I risk calling *this basket of being*: $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\Theta\Phi\mathbf{T}}\}^4$. Again, we are back with the nun’s story and the none’s story. In the culture of seriousness of my student nun’s what-question is a luminous quest for a glimpse of a peak. It is a peek at a peak to be climbed in the years ahead. In her beginner’s poise I could illustrate the climb from, say, a second year course, by talking of an expected change of view of daylight and night-lights after the study of such baskets of the partial understanding of electricity as

⁷⁰ All along here I would ask you to ponder the absence of dread for serious initiates in a developed science. Yes, there is the usual uneasiness about achievements, but commonsense’s dread of serious thinking is not part of the psychic poise of those serious about the topic. Add the musings suggested by the next notes here.

⁷¹ A little reminder of those famous ship, the *Dreadnoughts*: like bows and arrows, great in their day. Our topic all along here is up-to-date historical dynamics. “To put it bluntly, until we move onto the level of historical dynamics, we shall face our secularist and atheist opponents as the Red Indians, armed with bows and arrows, faced European muskets.” (CWL 17, *Philosophical and Theological Paper 1965-1980*, “Questionnaire on Philosophy: Response, 366).

⁷² CWL 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 281ff.

⁷³ I refer here to the Jack and Jill of “Cognitional Structure,” *Collection. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan [CWL] 4*, eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto; University of Toronto Press, 1988), 216-17 where the problem is critical positioning. Here, however, the focus is on a positioning regarding a standard model, one that occurs in every respectable science. There is a more refined analysis – geohistorical, or at least genetic - of intellectual conversion involved in the balance of the two foci.

⁷⁴ How parallel? I have e.g. parallel the pairs of books: *Insight* and *Ulysses*; *Method* and *Finnegans Wake*. I did this first in my *Plants and Pianos* of 1971 for my two Florida papers on botany and cyclic musicology: the book became the first two chapters of *The Shaping of the Foundations* (1976), now available on my website. Joyce, of course, is brilliant. But I pose the odd question: how far beyond amazingly densified initial meanings did he climb? This is a massively complex issue. On initial meanings, see note 116.

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 E_x}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 E_x}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 E_x}{\partial z^2} \right) = \frac{1}{c_0^2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 E_x}{\partial t^2} \right)$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 E_y}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 E_y}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 E_y}{\partial z^2} \right) = \frac{1}{c_0^2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 E_y}{\partial t^2} \right)$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 E_z}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 E_z}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 E_z}{\partial z^2} \right) = \frac{1}{c_0^2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 E_z}{\partial t^2} \right)$$

I could have shifted to graduate reaches and lay out sets of equations about particle groupings, and she would still have delighted.⁷⁵ Might she indeed align herself with Wordsworth?

To them I may have owed another gift,
Of aspect more sublime; that blessed mood,
In which the burthen of the mystery,
In which the heavy and the weary weight
Of all this unintelligible world,
Is lightened: - that serene and blessed mood,
In which the affections gently lead us on.

And may I now say, and may you smile at the saying, that you likely do not align yourself as yet thus when you glimpse now this *them*: **{M (W₃)^{0ΦT}}⁴?**

Gather round, then, your glimpse of a smiling Bishop Michael Curry speaking at the wedding of Meghan and Harry, a glimpse at them and at Them. You are a very strange one if the two glimpses of love that

⁷⁵ Think of the shift from listening first to Beethoven's *Für Elise* and then moving into one his last Quartets. LOL: think now of this essay as my second-last quartet (see note 11 above), myself weaving in "Double You Three"! Perhaps relevant here is a phone conversation with Lonergan in the Autumn of 1977. I had left him in Boston early in the day with a copy of Beethoven last quartets, the phoned him from Halifax asking him what, of course, turned out to be a silly question, "what do you think of them?" His reply: "I don't think; I feel". How does this last second-last quartet of mine make you feel? Of course, while being a second-last quartet, I am pushing you to feel it like a transitioning phrase in a symphony – I think of Proust's little cherished musical phrase from Venteuil's Sonata - indeed, in an unfinished symphony: the "doh -oh, me, fah, ^{so so}" that sneaks into the beginning of the second movement of Bruckner's 8th Symphony and whelms the work on. Might we be on the edge of the second time of the temporal subject, when "it is possible for temporal subjects, whether through symbolic representation or technically, to understand their intellectual nature along with that nature's intrinsic norms, and because they understand it, to affirm and approve it, and because they approve it, to embrace it by their own will and to intend to follow its norms"? (CWL 12, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 407).

I have now mentioned were psychically aligned. But might a seed be sown?

{**M** (**W₃**)^{0ΦT}}⁴ a glimpse of love?!!

We shall return later to a more precise meaning for **M**,⁷⁶ but let you now think of it as the capital beginning of Mediation.⁷⁷ Even the good Bishop Curry, while apparently siding with the song “Love is all you need,”⁷⁸ allows that this is not true, that mediation is a factor in its reality and growth. **M**, then, in my face-off becomes a plausible component.⁷⁹ You surely aligned yourself with that in reading the first sentence of the Introduction to *Method in Theology*: “A Theology mediates between a

⁷⁶ I left this promise as I wrote it, though the return now is to be yours later, in some communal cherishing of my discovery over fifty years ago of Markov, who originated my **M** as a non-spherical matrix of evolution. The relevant beginning of page 237 of my *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, (Gill, Macmillan and Notre Dame, 1970) which is very precise in its pointings, a centerpiece of the meaning of that chapter eleven, “Probability-schedules of Emergence of Schemes.” Now I have especially in mind the heuristics of the countervailing schemes to all present corrupt social structures, answering Lonergan’s plea for “effective intervention” (CWL18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 306) in “empirical human science” (*Insight*, 766, 768). But now, open your eye- and aye- risk to the notes to follow.

⁷⁷ I ended the previous note with the seeds of a pun or a pun-zone. But the seeding is a massively central seeding. What is involved, symbolically, is a sublation of two sections of Lonergan’s writings (1) his essay “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer”; (2) *Method in Theology*, chapter 12, “Systematics”, section 2, “Closed Options”. Were I to pick a symbolic text for the seeding I would OM in on “and in His eyes I have found true peace” (end of *The Song of Songs*), with the twist of “in his Irises”. I would seek to get you into this fresh twist “into an intentionality analysis” {the beginning of the section named in (2) here} by renaming the venture as “into an iris analysis”. It nudges us away from strange mythic notions of intentionality analysis and into a challenging precision of generalized empirical method. A context of good nudges is Jeremy Wilkins, “What ‘Will’ won’t do: Faculty Psychology, Intentionality Analysis, and the Metaphysics of Interiority”, *Heythrop Journal* LVII,(2016), 473-91.

⁷⁸ The reference is, of course, to a song of the Beatles, but I would have you think of the geohistory of the aesthetics of love, and face the new face of it that is in the iris analysis mentioned in the previous note. Might I stir your imagination by claiming that the name for that iris analysis in its fullness is {**M** (**W₃**)^{0ΦT}}⁴: indeed, then, more than a glimpse of love!

⁷⁹ But **M** or {**M** (**W₃**)^{0ΦT}}⁴ is a hump on the road of thinking out human progress. It is not at present plausible. It was “Lonergan’s Dream” (See *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, p. 163, titled “The Tower of Able: Lonergan’s Dream”. Neither Lonergan’s hump nor my face, {**M** (**W₃**)^{0ΦT}}⁴, rings a bell at present.

cultural matrix and the significance and role of religion in that matrix.”⁸⁰ My little face-off, Jack and Jill and you, is about that, (about)³ that, (about)⁴ that.⁸¹ It is a push within the hunch-forward of my brother huncher, Bernard, who, when he was, with some reluctance – “not because I had nothing else to do”⁸² – writing his long letter on Jesus to his students, came up with the blunt and uncompromising suggestion that we need to try to face-off adequately with ourselves and others in the matter of being friendly with Jesus. “What a friend we have in Jesus.”⁸³ Are you looking to be and to have and to radiate a comprehensive Hello to this everything-embracing friend?⁸⁴

This comprehension of everything in a unified whole can be either formal or virtual. It is virtual when one is habitually able to answer readily and without difficulty, or at least ‘without tears,’ a whole series of questions right up to the last ‘why?’ Formal comprehension, however, cannot take place without a turning to phantasm; but in larger and more complex questions it is impossible to have a suitable phantasm unless the phantasm is aided by some sort of diagram. Thus if we want to have a comprehensive grasp of everything in a unified whole, we have to construct a diagram in which are symbolically represented all the various elements of the question along with all the connections between them.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ One may now read *Matrix* as pointing to my sublated Markov matrix. Of course, there are nudges towards sophistications in the film world’s *Matrix*.

⁸¹ The bracketing has been a convention of mine for decades. One may associate the layering and sophistications with progress through the 4 stages of meaning.

⁸² *CWL* 7, 3.

⁸³ I name an old hymn here, but add my twist to the name by punctuation: “what? a friend? we? have? In? Jesus?” Are we somehow the iris of his eye? There is of course the plant genus, Iris, with its three petals and its three dropping sepals of widely varying color. There is a genetics of any single iris, be it in the eye or in the soil. Perhaps now your eyes and ayes seize a larger pointing in the “from” of the title?

⁸⁴ The next two notes point to the embrace of Jesus symbolized in $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{0\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$ in the strange symbolism that places his “I”, his “i”, his iris, his irises, in the i of G_{jk}^i , a “Christoffer symbol” of Divine Relativity. In that “i” of the Field (*CWL* 18, 199) there is to be a luminous and self-luminous appreciation of the rich multi-causal presence of Jesus to you there and me here, converging contexts. See note 10 on page 238 of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*. On the causality of Christ see there notes 56, p. 170, note 36, p.244, note 44, p. 246.

⁸⁵ *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ. Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 7 [CWL 7]*, translated by Michael G. Shields, eds. Frederick E. Crowe, Robert M. Doran, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 151.

I am relevantly distracted here about this challenge, “to construct a diagram,” by the memory of helping a professor of theology weave his way along through the teaching about Jesus going through and beyond Nicea. My suggested diagram was simple and he found that it carried him and his students through to and beyond the muddles of the seventh century. The suggestion was to use his arm as image, upper arm as divine nature and horizontally-poised lower arm as human nature. Then move on to consider the elbow bone, and still later get mileage out of identifying the wrist, the hand, the five fingers. So: there are freshways of talking about those five transcendentals that He shared with us. “Be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be adventurous, be responsible,” a trouble spot of later Councils. And now, too, the professor could talk better to his students about I Cor 2: 16 and Phil 2 ; 5 : “we are those who have the mind of Christ”; “in your minds you must be the same as Christ Jesus.”⁸⁶

You might well follow up that paragraph of my distraction to search for a self-luminous grip on whether you are moving to be a reader in the nun’s ethos or in the none’s ethos. *Haute Vulgarization* is in the eye and Aye of the beholder somewhere in the spectrum between pure positive and pure negative.⁸⁷

That your pause to search your self-luminosity is of huge significance comes out when I switch your thinking about positive from a local *haute vulgarization* to thinking about it in terms of the cosmic task, “aided by some sort of diagram,”⁸⁸ of “distinguishing the successive stages of this, the greatest of works.”⁸⁹ Then you are nudged to **find yourself** in the negative Anthropocene Age as longing, with Jesus, for the emergence of the positive Anthropocene Age in these next millennia, “a manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God.”

“**Find yourself?**” That is what this entire odd letter is about. As well as, if you like, me being at the end of my wits I am at the end of the

⁸⁶ Think simply of the five-finger exercises that are spontaneous in common sense, but that can rise through theory and interiority to that strange fourth level of focus interest, yes, in the Field - referred to in an earlier not but why not quote? - “the field is the universe, but my horizon defines my universe” (CWL 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 199) – indeed, might we not soak into the mandate, “look at the irises of the field”? Might we not change the world, as Michael Jackson sang, by looking with fresh seriousness at the irises in the mirror?

⁸⁷ CWL 7, 151.

⁸⁸ In the full heuristic the adequate diagram is luminously appreciated as neuromolecular patterns harmonious with the dynamics of **what?** So one sublates massively e.g. Lonergan’s comments on symbolisms in “A Note on Geometrical Possibilities,” CWL 4.

⁸⁹ CWL 12, 491.

hunchbacked Bernard's *Collection*, asking you to find how you are placed in relation to his final words there.

What will count is a perhaps not numerous center, big enough to be at home in both the old and the new, painstaking enough to work out one by one the transitions to be made, strong enough to refuse half-measures and insist on complete solutions even though it has to wait.⁹⁰

It has to wait, this not numerous center. How numerous? At a recent conference where that topic came up there were moments when it seemed a claim of most of the hall. But de facto, even though there are some tunings into my madness of $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\mathbf{T}}\}^4$, my run after Brother Bernard has been a solo run. But ask yourself about yourself as the "character"⁹¹ of being "painstaking enough to work out one by one the transitions to be made"? And then there is the problem of being at home in the glossy filth of this spinning spineless negative Anthropocene Axial Period yet living actively in the dream and the seeding of the positive Anthropocene. But now I go on, nursing forward my heuristics of the transitions to be made, to refuse half-measures and insist on $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\mathbf{T}}\}^4$ as the heart of those needed transitions of the next seven millennia. I have no arms and I am trying to ring a bell with the skin of my teeth. I will soon be a dead ringer for my brother. Does my face, $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\mathbf{T}}\}^4$, ring even a little bell, wring a little belle's mind?

I am talking about both the pragmatic reach of Jesus, and Lonergan's pragmatic reach. Both reaches are, literally, at the heart of my face-off with you, with theology. Do you see it, seize, there embraced in the middle: "Double You Three!" In its fullness it is a prayer leaping out of the self-explanatory sublation of Lonergan descriptive and scriptural climb through "The Divine Missions": "Double You Three, in me, in all, Claspings, Cherishing, Cauling, Craving, Christing."⁹² It also echoes the appeal of Bishop Michael Curry, but here it is bracketed by round and curly brackets, bringing in a

⁹⁰ "Dimensions of Meaning," *CWL* 4, 245.

⁹¹ *Method in Theology*, 356. Those familiar with my writings and this referencing will know the density of meaning involved, associated with the beginning of the *Magna Moralia*. The present article lifts the demands on Tower characters considerably. A further lift occurs in the *Divyadaan* article mentioned in note 11. See there, around note 66, where I expose Aristotle's folly in cutting down Socrates' craving for effective science (*Magna Moralia*, paragraph 14).

⁹² The five Cs are related to Lonergan challenge in *CWL* 12, 473, top. The drive is to be towards a communal Lighthouse luminous spirituality of Their Presence. See "Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling", my Epilogue (221- 45) to *Seeding Global Collaboration*, edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy, Axial Publishing, 2016).

mediation that is a **four-play**. “We await common cognitive agreement,”⁹³ but is this, $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$, not the face of it? Of **it**?⁹⁴

Let there be no doubt how and where I pose this question. I am poised, and poisoning you, in *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*. McShane is “at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay all his cards on the table,”⁹⁵ face-up. Might you show a better face?

Are you poised, in some luminous mesh of the two canons of explanation that are native to your whatness,⁹⁶ to call my bell-ringing a bluff and better my bet on God’s futurology?

But before we muse further on that, and on my painstaking workout of the transitions to be made in stone-ground seed of the positive Anthropocene, let us raise again the question of the beauty of $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$, of

this morning’s minion, king-
dom of daylight’s dauphin,
dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon,
in his riding
Of the rolling level underneath him
steady air, and striding
High there, how he rung
Upon the rein of a wimpling wing
In his ecstasy!⁹⁷

Hi there! HOW, he rung: or did he? How, now, do you feel?⁹⁸

⁹³ Quoting the final sentence of *Method in Theology*.

⁹⁴ There is a tragic need of religious leadership to rise to a common effective agreement about deep human loneliness. I recall, not for the first time, Lonergan’s witticism to me as we taxied through Dublin in 1961 “the Church is the bark of Peter: The Pope is the captain, the clergy are the crew; the laity are in the hold”. Only this year did I pick up on the clue and write *Vignette 19*, “The Cargo Pants”. We are the cargo, and buried in each our lives by slum spirituality and theology is *Psalm 42*: “My soul pants for God, the God of Life; when shall I come to see the face of God”. The pilgrim face of God leans into IT and its recycling into “Father McKenzie darning his socks in the night when there’s nobody there; nobody cares. Ah, look at all those lonely people”

⁹⁵ *Method in Theology*, 193.

⁹⁶ Our challenge is to think our whatting into the Iris of history, the Irises of Jesus’ eyes and aye: “The emergence of humanity is the evolutionary achievement of sowing what among the cosmic molecules. The sown what infests the clustered molecular patterns behind and above your eyes, between your ears, lifting areas – named by humans like Brocca and Wernicke - towards patterned noise-making that in English is marked by ‘so what?’” (The beginning of chapter one, “Sow What,” of my *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.)

⁹⁷ I quote from G.M.Hopkins’ *The Windhover*.

You are a Home OF Wonder, a “Well of Loneliness”⁹⁹: might you bring forth the well of your soul in the second and third objectification for which Lonergan asks in his *1833 Overture*? Join Lynch in Joyce’s ring of meaning, eyes on my basket of being. Stephen is musing over beauty: “Aquinas says: *ad puchritudinem tria requiruntur, integritas, consonantia, claritas*. I translate it so: Three things are needed for beauty, wholeness, harmony and radiance.”¹⁰⁰ Let us move on through Stephen’s musings: they add further twists to our context.

In order to see that basket, said Stephen, you mind first of all separates the basket from the rest of the visible universe which is not the basket. The first phase of apprehension is a bounding line drawn about the object to be apprehended. An aesthetic image is drawn for us either in space or in time. What is audible is presented in time, what is visible is presented in space. But, temporal or spatial, the esthetic image is first luminously apprehended as selfbounded and self-contained upon the immeasurable background of space or time. You apprehend it as one thing. You see it as one whole. You apprehend its wholeness. That is *integritas*.

- Bull’s eye! Said Lynch, laughing. Go on.

- Then, said Stephen, you pass from point to point, led by is formal lines; you apprehend it as balanced part against part within its limits.; you fell the rhythm of its structure. In other words the synthesis of immediate perception is followed by the analysis of apprehension. Having first felt that it is *one* thing, you fell now that it is a *thing*. You apprehend it as complex, multiple, divisible, separable, made up of its parts,

⁹⁸ This, obviously, is not a rhetorical question. It is the question of this near final Quartet; it is the question made exercise-precise by the next note.

⁹⁹ “The Well of Loneliness” is the title of chapter 19 of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*. A central twist in it is a reading of the phrase “the present section” as you in your loneliness and concerns. The phrase “the present section” occurs eleven times in *Insight*. It is quite a shock to shift one’s reading thus. “It is not only to read *Insight* but also to discover oneself in oneself” (*Method in Theology*, 260).

¹⁰⁰ I am quoting from *A Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man*, but not giving references, since there are so many editions. The text is about 40 pages from the end in most editions. In note 74 above I posed the problem of Joyce’s brilliant horizon. This piece here is high-level stuff, but from a confused horizon. But Joyce’s efforts e.g. on thinking out the artistic ‘thing’ would bear serious comparison with Lonergan’s venture in talking of “unity-identity-whole” (*Insight*, 271ff). Might one take this triplicity to be covered by the first two of the Joyce-Aquinas view of an art object, while the artistic element brings in *claritas*? The art-object is, of course, rarely a thing. The notion of thing in common usage covers all ‘nouncing.’

the result of its parts and their sum, harmonious. That is *consonantia*.

-Bull's eye again said Lynch wittily. Tell me now what is *claritas* and you win the cigar.

And now we poise, like Stephen, over the issue *claritas*. He writes of Shelley, Luigi Galvani, Lessing, as he weaves towards talk of narration. "The personality of the artist passes into the narration itself, flowing round and round the persons and the action like a vital sea." But I have only skimpily named the narration, here named, "{M (W₃)^{0ΦT}}⁴", elsewhere named "a ruddy gem of changeful light,"¹⁰¹ and more oddly a paralleling name like *Shakespeare's Journey in Joy* that leaps forth from Kavanagh's reading of Pericles' astonished "music of the spheres."¹⁰² Brood over Kavanagh: Pericles shuffles and suffers forward until his ears are clean enough to hear the divine harmony to which others are deaf. More than two hundred years later Mathew Arnold describes the sea thus:

Listen! You hear the grating roar
Of pebbles which the waves draw back
At their return, up the high strand,
Begin, and cease, and then again begin,
With tremulous cadence slow, and bring
The eternal note of sadness in.¹⁰³

Well, that's not the note of Shakespeare's *Pericles*. There is incest, attempted murder, disease, famine, lust; there is bereavement, and unendurable grief. And there is patience, music, harmony and redemption. There is no sadness.

¹⁰¹ "a ruddy gem of changeful light" is from Sir Walter Scott's poem about the Bell Rock Lighthouse, picture at the beginning of my book *Futurology Express* (Axial Publishing, 2013). The image inspired both the book and the push that followed to get people serious about the practice I consider to be the becoming of *The Interior Lighthouse*. There is the other connection with my present effort of bell-ringing. The Bell-rock Lighthouse was built on the Inchcape Rock, and there is Robert Southey's poem about "putting a bell on it to save lives." "The Abbot of Aberbrothok / Had placed that bell on the Inchcape Rock; / On a buoy in the storm it floated and swung, / And over the waves the warning rung." (I am quoting page 3 of the Preface to *Futurology Express*). Do I ring a warning bell for you, over the waves of Lonerganism?

¹⁰² Shakespeare's *Pericles* V. i. 228. Kavanagh's reflections, from which I quote immediately are from a radio talk in Dublin, reproduced in my *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway*, (Axial Publishing, 2006), 56-65.

¹⁰³ One critic's view sums up Arnold's *Dover Beech*, a "honeymoon" poem after Arnold's marriage, thus: "*Dover Beach* fundamentally seems to be about a withdrawal into personal values. Historical pessimism moves in swiftly as a tide."

I have named freshly, and narrated without sadness,¹⁰⁴ in a Shakespearean climb that is a feeble trailing after Brother Bernard's Windhovering, a Cosmopolis that was an X in *Insight's* chapter seven. This ruddy gem of changeful light is to meet the practical necessities named there, repeated here in its core hope after my question to you.

My question is – we are poised at the end of Lonergan's 1833 Overture, you and I alone, with the Hunchback lurking – do you have a *moi intime* view, sad or joyous, lurking behind the scenes of life's and history's tides that would replace my weave forward from Lonergan's broad sense of a necessity born of divine and human freedom?

What is necessary is a cosmopolis that is neither class nor state, that stands above all their claims, that cuts them down to size, that is founded on the native detachment and disinterestedness of every intelligence, that commands man's first allegiance, that implements itself primarily through that allegiance, that is too universal to be bribed, too impalpable to be forced, too effective to be ignored.¹⁰⁵

I trail feebly after Lonergan's Windhovering “mastery of the thing,”¹⁰⁶ adding details to his longing for effective humans sciences to be embedded in us, “our whole host and its great pilgrimage,”¹⁰⁷ through an effective theology of *The Symphony of Jesus*.¹⁰⁸ What of those details now, as we face each other? I have summed up those details in the expression of my face, the strange basket of being that is **{M (W₃)^{0ΦT}}**⁴. But if you are sincere in your reading thus far you must find some expression on your face, in your face, of your face, about my key pointing re guarding that summing, that word of the Word, that print-word that I would have mesh into our molecular minds in future's town and gown. Even if you do not aspire to being a leader in weaving the

¹⁰⁴ But yes, there are oscillations, as when I ended my *Vignette* series with the last lines of *Ulysses* and then added a final footnote: “The last five lines of *Ulysses*. So, happily, but in the sadness of ‘The None's Story,’ (*Vignette* 20) ends my *Vignette* series.” The seventh gift of the Holy Spirit is to humbly sense the stumblings in our pilgrimage.

¹⁰⁵ *Insight*, 263.

¹⁰⁶ Again, Hopkins' *Windhover*.

¹⁰⁷ I am recalling here the lead into the Epilogue to *Wealth of Self* (1974), “Being and Loneliness”. It was a few lines from Herman Hesse, *The Journey to the East*, London, 1970, 12. It was in this epilogue that I began sketching symbolisms such as are needed in an effective scientific theology (see 106-108, 113-14) in a way that disturbed Fred Crowe: “Do we have to learn mathematics to do theology?”. I now nudge back with Lonergan: is the Queen to be “merely a constitutional monarch”? (*CWL* 18, 126).

¹⁰⁸ The topic of my *The Road to Religious Reality* (Axial Publishing, 2012). But might you think now in strange intentionality-creativity of *The Iris of Jesus*?

future of humanity. I place my expression in that terrible hello, and its context is the genetic perspective that haunts my title, lurking there in the little word *from*. My hello is a summary and a summons. Where do you go from here? The phyletic growth of humanity needs your ontic growth in an age when such growth is unknown, way less than the 1% that Maslow wrote about: “less that 1% of adults grow.”¹⁰⁹ It is a dreadfilled step to go against the busyness of the present town and gown axial drifting, solidly effective even if you are a dedicated student or professor of theo-logging in some world religion.¹¹⁰ We spear and spice our attention into world religions elsewhere,¹¹¹ but here we have been poised over a peculiar reading of the summons of Jesus to grow in relevant wisdom, age and grace. I continue the invitation now in the memory of two previous invitations of mine, precisely fifty years apart: the first from the second chapter, “Ultimate Concern,” of the little book *Music That Is Soundless* of 1968,¹¹² the second from the conclusion of the concluding *Vignette* 24 of that series 2018 series. The second invitation is made, so differently, after the long armless climb, made from the convinced *moi intime* detailed hope of effectiveness placed a paragraph down here.

I pause, pausing you thus, a full stop before the next you who read. You expect, or not, in this next paragraph down, to rise in your neuromolecules to some spectral greeting, the ontic core of my facing-you-now $\{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$, inviting you to enter as I invited the nun, in a shared positive ethos, to enter later years of climbing to an

¹⁰⁹ Abraham Maslow, *Towards a Psychology of Being* (New York 1968), 204.

¹¹⁰ Right through the articles mentioned in the next note I had hopes of dealing in detail the historic challenge to the great Sikh movement started by Guru Nanak. Vancouver is one of the great Sikh centers of the world and also there is the relevant fact of a Sikh leader in present Canadian politics. How might the rich tradition of seeding scripture blossom into “an Iris of relevance”? For Christians there is the terrible false empiricity of scripture studies that I have ranted about steadily in the past decade. See my website series of 27 essays on *Interpretation*, as well as the particular essays, *How 5*, “Searching for Avila, John, Stein, Lonergan, Moi Intime, Etc. Etc.” and *Disputing Quests* 10: “Paul’s Epistles and Functional Systematics.”

¹¹¹ There are five articles on the topic to appear in 2018-2020 in *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education*: “Minding Reality,” “The Coming Convergence of World Responsiveness,” “Steps towards Effectively Converging Religions,” “Converging Religions to Effective Historical Intervention,” “Converging Religions into being INTO Love with Jesus Etc.”

¹¹² The chapter of fifty years ago is, of course, an altogether lighter appeal. Near the end I quote Lonergan’s pointings to “Openness as fact ... as achievement ... as gift” (“Openness and Religious Experience,” *CWL* 4, 187). The challenge posed now is altogether more discomfiting. I have reached some disturbing precision regarding religious experiences divine bent towards converging world religions, as is noted in the previous footnote.

intussusception of the complex symbolic needs of physics.¹¹³ Was Lonergan inviting Crowe, and you, to climb, when he wrote his $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$? Certainly he would have considered his advance in 1954 to weave forward from the other summer summonses of 1953, summonses he never doubted, summonses he knew he had to complete, come health or class slaughter. Might you take note – how much note might the might of your chained what wish to take? – of the central summons of those summer summonses attended in that late note, that late hello, from my final Vignette that I now repeat.

My hello regards the hart-longing of *Insight* for a genetic perspective. It is with that intent that Lonergan moves in the late stages of chapter 15 (484) “to reveal the heuristic significance of the notion of development, and to prepare our statement of the integral heuristic structure that we have named metaphysics.” Please, please, go back now to the conclusion of *Vignette 21*, and my challenge of rising to an adequate Prescription for a serious effective lift of global care. “Notice my minimalist plea. Forget about functional collaboration as a suggestion. Think of the claim that, whether you are dealing with the scriptures of Luke or Luther or Lonergan, the writings of Hegel or Husserl or Heidegger, the live-styles of Hens or Hawks or Hydrangeas, the oddities of Jeremiah or Jesus or Janáček, you need a genetic perspective.” (thus concludes that *Vignette on Scriptures*; thus indeed concluding the appeal of this series: might some of my colleagues come out in the open and claim me to be in error?)

¹¹³ Recall note 107. My paralleling of the needs of theology with those of physics will, I surmise, bring forth critical derision from the worlds of philosophy and theology. How, might I ask, can theologians be in serious effective dialogue with people who take seriously Roger Penrose, *The Road to Reality. A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*, (Vintage Books, 2006). Lonergan asked theologians to take *Foundations of Physics* (Dover, 1957) by Robert Lindsay and Henry Margenau seriously. It is not an easy book to replace. I find Ian Lawrie, *A Unified Tour of Theoretical Physics* (CRC Press, 1990) useful. And Lawrie’s book allows me to make a final pitch about symbolism. On page 41 he asks, “What is the Structure of our Space time?” That is normatively the theologians’ question, and yes, one needs “fibre bundle” (42) thinking to push forward with my Markov sphere. Indeed there are to emerge and develop cumulatively, in future topologically-effective situation-theology, parallels to Lawrie’s chapters 8 and 10: engineering thermodynamics and quantum computing are to be sublated into a theodynamics.

The New Testament, or other world scriptures, are to be located here genetically – think of the genetics of an iris, the Iris, the pilgrim eyes and the eschatological iris neurodynamics of Jesus – as seeds to sepals.

But now comes the massively painful element in my summons to you and to my elder colleagues. I am paradoxically calling not for a genetic effort but for the embrace of a brutal discontinuity. “What on earth is to be done?”¹¹⁴ There is at present neither an aesthetics nor an ethics nor an ascetics, and certainly not an apokataphatics, of effective explanatory symbol-salvaging theology.¹¹⁵ How luminously and effectively might the invitation to a cliff-hanging embrace of that discontinuity be for you, for my colleagues? When writing of being armless in my bell-freeing climb, I mean that the ethos, the culture of reception, of the summonses of Lonergan led and leads to a brutal – if well intentioned - misreading of his summonses e.g. serenely and piously gliding over its own condemnation in chapter seven of *Insight* to the extent of rigidly sustaining general bias, in a glibness of settled initial meanings.¹¹⁶ I could enlarge on this in a swing-back and round this essay, “the inception of a far larger one,”¹¹⁷ adding particular heuristic details of the innards of $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$, such as the massive

¹¹⁴ Quoting here from the conclusion of a ten-page 1935 letter of Lonergan to his Provincial Superior. The letter is reproduced in full in Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas* (Axial Publishing, 2010), 144-54. An ontic appeal in a Jesuit community that strangely parallels my phyletic appeal to the global community for discontinuity, facing a hump in the bumpy road of global caring.

¹¹⁵ This is an extraordinary claim, and can only be understood in so far as one reaches, like an evolutionary sport, a glimpse of the hump in the bumpy genetic road paradoxically from the other side of the hump. Lonergan uses the word ‘merely’ at the end of his essay “Healing and Creativity in History,” which I shall quote now. “Is my proposal utopian? It asks merely for creativity, for an interdisciplinary theory that at first will be denounced as absurd, then it will be admitted to be true but obvious and insignificant, and perhaps finally be regarded as so important that its adversaries will claim that they themselves discovered it” (*A Third Collection*, 107). But does it not bring to mind another final paragraph, that which ends chapter 5 of *Insight*, which begins, “The answer is easily reached”? (*CWL 3*, 195).

¹¹⁶ This essay, and the *Divyaadan* essay of note 11, give an initial meaning of an item-change in the menu of doing theology, of converging religions, of reflecting on religious experience. “An accurate statement on initial meanings would be much more complex” (*CWL 3* 567, note 5).

But might there not be a belling-ringing Bell-curve fostering trail-breaking by taking that very menu problem seriously in simpler omnidisciplinary zones, like reading an ordinary menu iris-wise? (see notes 12, 66, 77, 78, 83, 84, 86, 96, 108 above). The issue is to move from Thomas’ initial meanings in his “sixty-three articles in a row” (*CWL 1, Grace and Freedom*, 94) to liberate the meaning of adventure in that finger-exercises of our psyches and Jesus’? (see note 86 above, and the text there) Are there those willing to join me in that adventure, moving thus feebly towards a 2020 iris vision of *CWL 1*, towards opening a non-fictional Star-Gate Iris for the future of humanity?

¹¹⁷ *CWL 3*, 754, line 1.

countervailing isomorphic pressure that is to emerge, in Bell-curve effectiveness, to patiently cleanse sick social theoretics and its concomitant sick situations. But what is the point of pointing thus at the present time, and at my present age, telling a none's story? Might you go tell it to the mountains, "Try again. Fail better,"¹¹⁸ yet sow seeds of later global brightness? Sow present seeds of a personal effective Interior Lighthouse? I was lucky to be led up the steps of The Interior Lighthouse hunch-backed by Bernard Lonergan. Are you interested in sharing that terrible luck? Does my face ring a Bell Curve? Am I, perhaps by the skin of my teeth and yours, a dead ringer for you, brother, sister?

"At that moment Quasimodo was really beautiful. He was handsome – this orphan, this foundling, this outcast. He felt himself august and strong. He looked directly into the face of the society from which he had been banished and over which he now exercised so much power – that human justice from which he had snatched its prey – all those tigers, now forced to gnash their empty jaws, those judges, those executioners - all that royal strength, which he, the most lowly, had broken with God's strength."¹¹⁹

Philip McShane, a frequent contributor to this journal, has been championing Lonergan's achievement in functional specialization for almost fifty years. His prodigious written output – it includes at last count 28 books, numerous articles, and many web series - may be explored at [Philip McShane](#). His most recent books include *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History: Teaching Young Humans Humanity and Hope* (Axial Publishing, 2015) *Profit: The Stupid View of President Donald Trump* (Axial Publishing, 2016) and a third edition of *Economics for Everyone: Das Jus Kapital*.

¹¹⁸ The full quotation from Samuel Beckett's short piece of prose entitled *Worstword Ho!*, his second-to-last work ever published, is: "Ever tried. Ever failed. No matter. Try again. Fail again. Fail better."

¹¹⁹ Victor Hugo, *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, Buccaneer Books, New York, 349.