

INSIGHT AND THE TRIVIALIZATION OF HISTORY

Philip McShane

Paul? In the Garden of Jesus, not a new or second Adam: an InWithTo new creation that yet was there, Bigbang Class-ping. Now in Your garden, Guarding, Double Big-Banged, I tune thornily—and tend and guard and bind and greet.¹

1. A First Start

Elizabeth; Equation; Eschaton

So I begin with these three E-words, alphabetically ordered—for the last beginning time I hope²—my essay for this volume that

¹ A little fiction here hear: Lonergan puzzling about Paul, and echoing Rilke. I am thinking of the broad context fermented forward by the brilliant Albert Schweitzer, with his *Quest for the Historical Jesus* of 1906 and his Paul-quest of later years. I have his 1931 *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: Adam and Charles Black) open before me, at the final chapter, “The Permanent Elements in Paul’s Mysticism,” and you might muse about the geohistorical heuristic that could connect Paul, him, and Lonergan as you read a few quotations. The chapter starts: “Paul vindicated for all time the rights of thought in Christianity” (376); “Paul is the patron-saint of thought in Christianity. And all those who think to serve the faith in Jesus by destroying the freedom of thought would do well to keep out of his way.” (377)

² Yet beginnings can take private creative wings, weaving neuromolecules towards their final rest in Jesus’s Eschatological minding, radiant in its ever-beginning. So, for example, there was, at one stage in my planning, a Joycean project echoing the essay *Disputing Quests 7*, “Self-Control in the New Testament and in the Economics of the Positive Anthropocene Age” (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/disputing-quests> accessed on 15 December 2016) with its *Proverbs 25:28* beginning, “An open town, and without defenses: such is the man lacking self-control.”² It was to weave forward in a four-part Gospel of Atyou, Arc, Look and Dawn. Might the parts have weaved through *Insight, Method, Logic* and *Phenomenology*, as they geared up for the positive Anthropocene

celebrates the sixtieth year of *Insight's* public appearance. Quite spontaneously that sentence brought to my mind the first sentence of Eric Voegelin's last volume on *Order and History*. "Where does the Beginning Begin? As I am putting down these words on an empty page I have begun to write a sentence that, when it is finished, will be the beginning of a chapter on certain problems of beginning."³

I am faced, we are faced, with certain problems of beginning, of stepping away from a settled trivialization of the stunning climb of *Insight*. Might I help us along by drawing a parallel? At the end of Book One of that great but flawed effort of Joan Robinson (written with John Eatwell), *An Introduction to Modern Economics*, there is the statement, "It is time to go back to the beginning and start again,"⁴ and Book Two begins the gallant but faulty venture into "Analysis."

Age? We are, at present, in the negative Anthropocene Age. Is it really going to last for another seven millennia? That depends on you. See the final note here, note 87, on the problem of axial scholarship. That quaint four-part gospel of mine ending with Dawn could be greeted by Yawn, as the International Florida Conference of 1970 greeted the first section of *Insight's* chapter 17, and the drive of chapter 19. On that greeting see McShane, *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Nova Scotia: Axial Publishing, 2006) 83-86. See the complementing reflections in the next note.

³ Eric Voegelin, *In Search of Order*, vol. 5, *Order and History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987) 13. *Insight* can be viewed as a central component in a massive sublation of "the search for order," be it ontic, like Voegelin's, or phyletic, like the searching expressions of the Hebrews or the Hindus. But that is a much deeper issue that goes quite beyond the short hinting in this little article about the missed meaning of the book *Insight*. The missed meaning is a topic of *Disputing Quests* 7 and possibly later essays in that series (the series is available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/disputing-quests> accessed 15 December 2016). That deeper missed meaning is also central to the missing "third volume"—on the dynamics of religious cultures—mentioned at the end of the Preface of my *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2016). See further, notes 20 and 40 below.

⁴ Joan Robinson and John Eatwell, *An Introduction to Modern Economics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) 51.

Starting again, in that zone, is still there as a challenge. Yes, Lonergan started economics again, in a much deeper sense, forty years before that little text appeared. He started with what might be considered the equivalent of Book Two of *An Introduction to Modern Economics*. He was shockingly successful, but remains an evolutionary sport. I have made another start in the area, an offensive offense titled *Profit: The Stupid View of President Donald Trump*.⁵ The offense, I would claim, is in the tradition of Plato's dealings with Dionysius II, yet I would claim a better contextualization of the effort. It is a stumbling step beyond "academic disciplines"⁶ into a "third way, difficult and laborious"⁷ that clambers beyond "effete"ness⁸ and "bears fruit,"⁹ "on the level of one's age," with a Normal Law distribution of success.¹⁰ But that statistical success lives in an emergent probability of patience. As Lonergan and I struggled, in the autumn of 1977, towards finding a presentation comfortable for him in his 1978 new beginning of lecturing his economic view, he delighted in his penultimate decision, "I am going to present the manuscript to them twice." A little later he remarked, "You know Phil, this is going to take 150 years."

What if he had been talking then of his bigger *Insight*-typescript of 1953 and a later representation? The talk would certainly have carried him away from his *Understanding and Being CWL 5* talking of August 1958: but how? In 1966 he paced his room on the sixth floor of the old Bayview Regis as he

⁵ Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2016. The book appeared immediately after the November 8, 2016, American Presidential election, and is available for purchase on Amazon. Perhaps it will finally seed an effective answer to Lonergan's request to me of 1968 to find an economist, one, obviously, capable of cutting through the nonsense of two centuries of pseudo-science.

⁶ Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003) 3.

⁷ *Method in Theology* 4.

⁸ *Method in Theology* 99.

⁹ *Method in Theology* 355.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 351. Normal Law? : a discomfoting question here of a grip on the equation: see Section 19 below.

reflected on beginning *Method in Theology* and his edgy comments to me included “I cannot get all of *Insight* into chapter one.” When I hurriedly indexed *Method* in December 1971 I had that in mind as I watched the book flow, and delighted in his pages—I was working from galleys—286-87. It was decades later that I got the massive joke that danced out of his fingers after his listing there of kataphatic climbing-strains and differentiations. I place the full-flying crazy paragraph at the end of this section. It runs from line 18 to 23 of page 287. My hope is that as you read it now there is a leap of the neuromolecules of your good will towards sensing the meaning of “what is lacking is knowledge of all that is lacking, and only gradually is that knowledge acquired.”¹¹ Gradually, yes, think ontically, but here I point phyletically to the transition from the negative Anthropocene Age to the positive Anthropocene Age that, with your help, could blossom before the tenth millennium. So, we face the fingering of that paragraph to let our molecules lift us beyond the rareness mentioned in the early forties by Lonergan: “theologians, let alone parents, rarely think of the historical process.”¹²

Thus, the paragraph below ends this first new beginning of mine: the question it raises is there, pleading with you to pause, to anticipate a “come about.”¹³ Let us hold it in boldface:

Such differentiation vastly enriches the initial nest of terms and relations. From such a broadened basis one can go on to a developed account of the human good, values, beliefs, to the carriers, functions, realms, and stages of meaning, to the

¹¹ *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick Crowe and Robert Doran, vol. 3 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992) 559.

¹² “Finality, Love, Marriage,” *Collection*, ed. Frederick Crowe and Robert Doran, vol. 4 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988) 47.

¹³ *Insight* 537, eleven lines from the end, pointing to a core contemplative challenge.

question of God, of religious experience, its expression, its dialectic development.¹⁴

2. A Second Start

Let me try another beginning, recalling that the present article's title at that time of beginning was "*Insight and the Trivialization of 'the Greatest of Works.'*"

There is a sense in which finitude, "the greatest of works,"¹⁵ is trivial. What do I mean here by *sense*? I mean something quite shockingly remote from you, unless you have been reading *Insight*, as I have, for sixty years. In *The Interior Lighthouse* I have written of *Insight* as a book of common prayer and introduced the topic of its place in seeding a tradition of kataphatic contemplation.¹⁶ The key to your reading this creatively is a prior sense, a sub-sense of the *sense* that is the fifth word in this essay, "beginning." That is the sense of personal adult growth. Within that sense is the Faithfilled sense of the place of belief in that growth, where now the context is the fourth section of the 20th chapter of *Insight*, "**4 The Notion of Belief.**"¹⁷ But now we are in deep shit: for there is a prior climb to understanding that section in a manner that gives you adequate "self-control"¹⁸ in reading and living the section as a serious

¹⁴ *Method in Theology* 287. I write of the boldfacing later: see note 38 below.

¹⁵ *The Triune God: Systematics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007) CWL 12:491.

¹⁶ I refer to my website essay, *HOW* 13, "The Interior Lighthouse," available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/how> (accessed 15 December 2016). A context is the series of five essays on "Foundational Prayer" *Prehumous* 4-8, available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/prehumous> (accessed 15 December 2016).

¹⁷ *Insight* 725-40.

¹⁸ This is the huge and intricate topic of *ekrateia* and *demo-crateia* that haunts Lonergan's article on "Mission and the Spirit" in *A Third Collection*. The beginning of the essay poses the question of being-in-the-world adequately; it ends with the word "self-control." I repeat the point, with the full reference, in note 20 below. Here I would have you

thinker: you need to have read, as climbing instructions taken seriously, the “sixty three articles in a row”¹⁹ that turns the commonsense notion of belief into a relevant self-control of “being-in-the-world: your self-understanding has to be not only of yourself but also of your world.”²⁰

My mention of *deep shit* reminds me, in my effort here and your struggle with it, of the story Liam Neeson told in an Irish television interview, laughing about himself. He spoke of a morning walking in New York’s Central Park after a live performance by him on Broadway. An Irish horse-cabby shouted “howrya Liam?” To Liam’s courteous reply he gave an answer that brought laughter to Liam then and in the interview. “I saw your play last night. It was shite.”

Three points to be mused over here. First, there is the context of my essay. It is the context of what I call *Loneragan’s 1833 Overture*: lines 18 to 33 of *Method in Theology* page 250. It may not be your context as you read here or as you contribute to this volume. Secondly if it is not, firmly and positionally not, then your thinking, your play, is likely to be shite. Thirdly, are you laughing like Neeson? “Adequate self-knowledge can be reached by man only at the summit of a long ascent.”²¹ “The concrete being of man, then, is developing . . . it tends to be shouldered out of the busy day . . . It is in this context that the profound significance of satire and of humor comes to light.”²²

connect “self-control” with the problem of “self-interest” raised on the first page of Loneragan’s 1944 typescript on “Circulation Analysis.” See *For a New Political Economy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998) CWL 21:232, line 2.

¹⁹ *Grace and Freedom* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000) CWL 1:94.

²⁰ Loneragan, “Mission and the Spirit,” *A Third Collection*, edited by F.E. Crowe S.J. (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985) 23: the first sentence, twisted a little by me. I would have you note that the article calls you to climb to the meaning of its last word, “*self-control*.” Ibid. 33. See further, note 40.

²¹ *Insight* 558.

²² *Insight* 648-49.

Likely you are not laughing. You are among the majority of Lonergan students who miss the climb that was evident to Lonergan: the climb he undertook gallantly in 1954 to reach an effective perspective regarding the place of *Insight* in history, in the greatest of works.²³ So, you write in the old context, and your writing is in the accepted world of “academic disciplines”²⁴ You continue in old ways despite Lonergan’s turn of the page insistence that the new way is a “third way, difficult and laborious,”²⁵ “in which all workers in all fields can find in transcendental method common norms, foundations, systematics, and common critical, dialectical and heuristic procedures.”²⁶

3. A Third Start, of Elementary *Assembly*

There looms, now, another simpler start of my essay and your effort, a start from the end word of page 249 of *Method in Theology: Assembly*. We assemble *CWL* 3, we gather ourselves to move forward, but now most simply we do so for our own climb towards some familiarity with *Insight*. So, envisage with me a leap beyond the first 17 lines of *Method* 250, to a vague personal, even totally private,²⁷ ontic echo-chambering of that work. My own climb will be added in the fourth and later starts, but think now of you finding the book *Insight*, a solitary accident or a lecturer’s nudge. I have heard some great stories of such a first encounter, leading to solid dedication to something soon recognized as an almost impossible task. I have heard honest

²³ See Patrick Brown’s essay on that undertaking of 1954 in *Seeding Global Collaboration*, edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2016) 45-79. Their Introduction to the volume is of central relevance here.

²⁴ *Method in Theology*: the last words on page 3, the first page of chapter 1. I keep repeating these references to the beginning of *Method*: perhaps I’ll thus get the next generation to pause over them. “Repetition is the mother of convention.”

²⁵ *Method in Theology* 4.

²⁶ *Method in Theology* 24.

²⁷ Not then some risky public thing, “at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay all his cards on the table.” *Method in Theology* 193.

stories of a finding that led to a wise backing off: the stuff, even of the first chapter, was recognized as way out of the personal ballpark. That, indeed, may be our story now as you tell it to yourself in this new context of my odd dozen starts. If you are sharing this start, then I would have you go from the last word of page 249, *Assembly*, to the first word of line 18, “horizons.” With modesty and humor of course.

4. Page-pausing as Fresh Startling

The previous start was already a page-pause, a pause on the great dense challenge of Lonergan’s perspective on future heart-sharing. It has yet to become fresh and startling, a delay I find quite sad, quite understandable, yet quite disgusting. Our truncated culture is a reality of the air we breathe. I have been looking now at my six-page Introduction to a few of Lonergan’s articles and reading freshly and startledly the beginning: “an introduction should help the reader not to miss the point.”²⁸ A few lines later I write: “What then is Lonergan getting at? The uncomfortable answer is that he is getting at you and me.” I ended the previous ‘Start’ in the mood of the failure of *Insight* to ‘get at,’ but omitting stories of that failure by so-called experts. The problem seems to be that the uncomfortable answer is turned into intellectual comfort food: this being too easily illustrated by the omitted concluding rambles of the previous section. I muse now over the fact that page-pausing has to resemble high-grade step-by-step classroom pedagogy, best of course if it is one on two or three. In sixty years of reading *Insight* I have spent considerable time on particular pages: perhaps you might find the resulting nudges attractive, alluring? But the problem will be, whether you are getting at yourself. “One has not only to read *Insight* but also to discover oneself in oneself.”²⁹ I think now of the

²⁸ Bernard Lonergan, *An Introduction to the Thought of Bernard Lonergan*. Three papers from *Collection* with an Introduction by Philip McShane (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973) 7.

²⁹ *Method in Theology* 260.

single paragraph about, (about)^{3,30} which I spent at least a year writing, available as 41 Essays titled “Field Nocturnes.” I expect that you find this notion, this implicit invitation, distressing. But let us pause and perhaps be startled by the first ten words, “study of an organism begins from the thing-for-us.”³¹ Does it not take an effort, even a discomforting startling start, to get to the core of the whole book: “... begins from the me-for-me”? The organism, your nearest neighbor needing fullest love,³² is print-catching Helen-fully, culturally accepted as “chemical and physical processes,” but is the end of the print-lift of your **what** a what-invention of neuromolecular patterns that evolves so so slowly, “not without labor, the philosophic concepts of matter and form”:³³ that grasps the grasp of “insights that grasp conjugate forms systematizing otherwise coincidental manifolds of chemical and physical processes.”³⁴ This achievement is simply not part of the culture of contemporary Lonergan studies. So you perhaps find in horrified freshness now, “me-for-me,” that you have missed the meaning of the two occurrences of “relates” in the final paragraph of the seventh chapter of *Insight*. “To this end the present chapters on common sense are contributory. May we note before concluding that, while common sense relates things

³⁰ I have used the symbol “(about)³” in the past decade or so to invite a heuristic bent towards a complex consciousness of e.g. “the discernment of discernments of discernment,” be the base discernment that of Plato or of Ignatius of Loyola or of Keynes. Might I not bracket this entire article thus, projectiling this particular discernment into a geohistory that fringes on a flight of fancy regarding and guarding the mystical body, “the quite new telling of the old story. The revisiting is to lead, so so slowly, to a new front-thesis on the mystical body, that front thesis eventually to be integrated in the sublated genetic systematics of all such theses through the ages.” Philip McShane, *The Road to Religious Reality* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2012) 38.

³¹ *Insight* 489.

³² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica Ia IIae*, q. 25, a. 4.

³³ *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, ed. Frederick Crowe and Robert Doran, vol. 2 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997) 38.

³⁴ *Insight* 489.

to us, our account of common sense relates it to its neural base and relates aggregates and successions of instances of common sense to one another.” How, then, did you read “to this end”³⁵ in the two different paragraphs?

5. Page-pausing in one’s molecules’ story

My suggested page pause in this fifth new beginning is a contemplative walkabout *Insight* 722, or its previous incarnation as *Insight* 700.³⁶ A very serious reader of my book, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, informed me that the last sentence of this page 722(700) is the most quoted piece, in the book, of Lonergan’s writings. It is as well, then, to quote the sentence here. It ends a paragraph about good will being joyful.³⁷ Is it not, perhaps, worth putting in boldface?³⁸

“But good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.”

³⁵ The beginning of the last paragraph of *Insight* 269; line 22 of *Insight* 489.

³⁶ The new edition providentially adds two lines to your reading at the top of the page: “of God above all and in all so embraces the order of the universe as to love all men with a self-sacrificing love.”

³⁷ I would suggest meshing, in contemplative joy and rescued sadness, this paragraph with the bottom paragraph of *Insight* 648 that speaks of “the concrete being of man” “in the tranquility of darkness, in the solitude of loneliness.” The contemplation can of course be moved into such a fuller context of chapter 19 of *Allure*, “The Well of Loneliness,” leading you to sing freshly Horatio Spafford’s words, “it is well, it is well with my soul.”

³⁸ Boldfacing was/is a technique that I developed in the 41 *Field Nocturnes* (available at: <http://www.philipmcsane.org/field-nocturnes> accessed 15 December 2016) to jolt the reader into the strange realism that is the truth of our being. Might I not boldface this entire article? But then the psyche of the normal reading of lines 2-7 of *Insight* 411 would play reductive tricks with the new boldfaced pattern. Think of a completely **boldfaced** *Insight*.

The reason why this is weaved round *Allure* is valid here. Eventually it weaves round, and is weaved round, my later fourteenth start. But perhaps there is a wonderful invitation to the heights of kataphatic collaboration in linking that boldfaced sentence with the end of page 233 of *Allure*, where I quote Lonergan's reflection on the meaning of the name *God*: "God is not an object."³⁹ So one finds the contemplative call to an X mansion quite different from any of Teresa's mansions. The call leads you through section 9 of the nineteenth chapter of *Insight*, to find, in the fourteenth place, yourself as secondary intelligible in the creative Trinitarian subjectivity as you four will the sacrament of the present moment and the present millennium and the Eschaton.

6. Beg In A Gain

The previous start is perhaps too madly unfair. Yet perhaps also an encouragement. It reminds me of my time teaching a first-year university course in mathematical physics. There was the accepted steady grinding along through elementary problems. But occasionally a question would flash forth and it was evident that a sense of distant views was called for, could be cauled gracefully. So, we could leap to the wonders of "the principle of least action." Thus there emerged the positive aspect of *haute vulgarization*.⁴⁰

³⁹ *Method in Theology* 342.

⁴⁰ I would have you note here, startlingly, the relation of negative and positive *haute vulgarization* to the long-term historical dynamics of the negative and the positive Anthropocene Age. On negative *haute vulgarization* see *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1958-1964* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996) CWL 6:121, 155. The "Anthropocene Age" is now a legitimate designation of an evolutionary period. I introduced its divisions in the book *Profit: The Stupid View of President Donald Trump*. Its beginning as a period is variously defined. One can associate the negative Anthropocene with what I have earlier called the axial period. The new names and divisions give a better heuristic perspective on the slow climb of humanity. A help there is the focus in *Allure* on the dominance so far, in humanity's pattering towards the future, of initial meanings.

But now I point to a fresh start on the first page of chapter one of *Insight*, and a pause over the humility of Descartes and Lonergan. Might the pause and the ingesting of realistic scientific humility enter the well of your soul to lift you to seriousness about Archimedes' 'Eureka!' at the end of that page? Might you read the third word on that page—the second word is *Elements* (are you **in** your elements now?) and the first word is “**1**”—“In” in the mad fresh ethos that haunts my book *Allure*, so that help is assumed in this absolutely supernatural enterprise, and there is really room in the Inn?

The fresh start certainly can be helped by sharing my dalliance with Archimedes in section 2 of *Cantower 27*, “Atoms in Motion.” And my hope is that such a struggle would lead you to follow through with the paralleling in those essays—*Cantower* (27-31)—of the first five chapters of *Insight* with the first five chapters of *Feynman's Lectures in Physics*.

But I am, you will notice with either comfort or discomfort, moving Lonergan's enterprise in *Insight* into the full context of “the greatest of works.” That full context is that of a Clasp that sweetly, quietly, molecularly, puts adore in the In, the Inn. It can become explicit in the innkeeper, the inkept, the incauled, becoming toweringly craving, letting Grace loose in unspoken words: “Grace, Grace, Grace, attune us to the Allure of the Scent of a Nomen.”⁴¹ The Scent is the galactic infestation of Jesus, no second Adam He.

7. “And Start Again”⁴²

⁴¹ *Allure* 223,199-200.

⁴² At this stage, in my strategy of giving 21 starts, I realized that I was looking at the essay growing to perhaps three times more than the recommended length of 7,000 words. I had still to fill out the central block of starts. What to do? It occurred to me that there was a gentle providence in this: the starts that were merely named so far in the text—7 to 17—might they not be followed up by you and me in later ventures, such as a continuation of the current website series, *Disputing Quests*? So, I decided that those starts would best be indicated by giving merely the title with a guiding footnote.

I quote, in this heading, the last three words of the first book of *An Introduction to Modern Economics*, p. 51 There are those, certainly,

8. “The Present Section”⁴³

9. “The Mystical Body of Christ”⁴⁴

who do not like, are really not up to, the fresh effort to read “me-for-me,” but still wish for a “being-in-the-world” that lifts them to resonate with Lonergan’s strange push: “self-understanding has to be not only of himself but of his world.” The key strangeness here is the odd notion of **my** self-understanding of **my** world. It points to a peculiar twist of the myness of world and the worldness of my. It is a strange concretion of the seemingly solitary pointing to the task “On Being Oneself.” (The title of the tenth chapter of *Phenomenology and Logic*, the second half of Lonergan’s first lecture on Existentialism in July 1957).

⁴³ In this-here start and footnote my guiding is towards you reading “the present section” as boldfaced **you**. I developed the point in *Allure*: “I am the present section” (228), as I encouraged contemplation of the sentence “The present section, accordingly, is concerned exclusively with the formulation of the notion of God” (the last two lines of *Insight* 680). Does this not give a fresh start to reading *Insight*? In note 14 of *Allure* 239 I list the dozen occurrences in *Insight* of “the present section.” Does this not, indeed, give you a dozen fresh starts?

⁴⁴ Here, indeed, is a magnificent fresh start with a problem that screamed to Lonergan as he finished *Insight* in the late summer of 1953. Where might I treat “the mystical body” (*Insight* 763-4) in the new theology? Does it not change the climb of the man and the book for you? The answer does not emerge explicitly for him, but there it is screaming creatively and triumphantly at you, in the word *Comparison* on line 6 of *Method in Theology* 250. There is always to be a new emergent “front-line thesis on the mystical body, that front-thesis eventually to be integrated in the subluted genetic systematics of all such theses through the ages.” (Philip McShane, *The Road to Religious Reality* 38: see also 13, 18-21). But the leap to this view requires a shocking serious effort to remedy the related defect by sublating Lonergan’s fresh beginning on *Insight* 484: “To remedy this defect, 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, attention must now be directed to genetic method.” Indeed!

10. “Image and Emergence: Towards an Adequate *Weltanschauung*”⁴⁵

11. An Alluring Start⁴⁶

12. “Metamusic and Self-Meaning”⁴⁷

⁴⁵ This is a fresh start that dates from 1969, when I wrote the paper of this title for the First International Lonergan Conference of Florida 1970, two volumes of which I edited (there were six planned, but financing ran out). It weaved forward through needs of botany to the need for therapy in theology. Lonergan remarked to me about its start-potential during one of our conference chats about my editing the papers: “It just opens up area after area.” Well, it opened nothing. It is a road not yet traveled by Lonerganism. The paper is available as chapter one of *The Shaping of the Foundations* at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/published-books> (accessed 15 December 2016).

⁴⁶ This eleventh of 21 starts is not only central in number but in significance. The fresh start is simply my book of 2015, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, which weaves Jesus into *Insight*, and, in its twenty chapters not only parallels the chapters of *Insight* but weaves into chapters 6-14, chapter by chapter, the eight chapters (6-14) in *Method in Theology* that deal, all too lightly, with the eight functional specialties. I would also note that there is a further lift of freshness in paralleling this 11th essay with the eleventh of twenty-one *Posthumous* essays (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/posthumous> accessed 15 December 2016). *Posthumous* 11 is titled “Allurexperiences”: it invites you to lift all your experiences, including the “craving” (“Finality, Love, Marriage,” CWL 4:49) of sexuality, into “the common movement in that body of Christ which takes over, transforms, and elevates every aspect of human life.” *Ibid.* 27.

⁴⁷ The title is that of the second paper that I presented at the 1970 Florida Conference, available now as the second chapter of *The Shaping of the Foundations*. It pointed to the need for functional collaboration in the field of musicology. Lonergan had talked me through the structure of collaboration in the summer of 1966, but I was not prepared, in 1969, for the sudden shock of seeing the shelves of books on musicology in the Bodleian Library Oxford in this fresh light. Yes, a fresh start for the Cosmopolis of *Insight*, still standing in the wings.

13. Seminars as a Beginning⁴⁸**14. The Interior Lighthouse**⁴⁹**15. “Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling”**⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Obviously, there could be a new beginning if the usual annual gatherings turned their attention to accepting the terrible challenge of getting *Insight* into the full context of functional specialization, as the book *Allure* suggests. But here is a suggestion that was already tried. Thus the effort is illustrated by the series of 39 essays, 27 of them mine, titled *FuSe*. The intention was to run e-seminars of three months length, running (2011-2015) for four years or more, moving through the functional specialization involved in general categories and then special categories. The seminars faded through lack of participant energy as we faced the foundational issues of general categories. Still, the essays are available: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/fuse> (accessed 15 December 2016). Indeed, the first ten essays (*FuSe* 0-9) on functional research are now available in *The Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* 9 (2016) 3-73, <http://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/jmda> (accessed 15 December 2016). Might not some enterprising group in the next generation break away from conventional Lonergan gatherings to make a fresh gallant start on the road to the positive Anthropocene of later millennia?

⁴⁹ The title is of the recent essay *HOW* 13, available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/how> (accessed 15 December 2016). It points to a shift from the apophatic poise of Teresa of Avila's *Interior Castle* to the kataphatic poise of *Insight* view as a guide to contemplation. This would lift global prayer and reflections on our ultimates to a seeding of the positive Anthropocene Age.

⁵⁰ This is the title of my Epilogue to the volume *Seeding Global Collaboration*, edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2016) 221-245. The Epilogue weaves the title around the challenge of the display of words on page 48 of *Method in Theology*.

16. Backfiring and Beatitudes⁵¹

17. “The Dialectic of My Town, Ma Vlast”⁵²

⁵¹ In the past decade I have talked and written about a backfire strategy, thinking positively of gun-firing flaws in relation to the eighth functional specialty. I have written, in that context, about fruitless preaching of the beatitudes, and the general skipping of serious withdrawal, *die Wendung zur Idee*, in both the study and the presentation of scriptures, Christian or others. It is an issue that is being carried forward in my present (2016-) website series titled *Disputing Quests*. Now I pose the curious question of the backfire of the beatitudes into a descriptive start of a full systematics of the meaning of profit. There is, of course, the other direction of the cycle: following the muddled research of a start on the new economics to arrive at a quite new precision and scientific sublation both of the Marxist slogan “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” (see note 22 at the end of Part Three of *Profit: The Stupid View of President Donald Trump*. I would note that this book subtly avoids any simple definition of *profit*) and of Christian slogans about preferential options. And there is the relevance, to this backfiring, of the many meanings of smallness. “One will never be able to come to an end of the subject of smallness” (Leopold Kohr, “Why Small is Beautiful: The Size Interpretation of History,” 9th *Annual Schumacher Lecture*, 1989.) “Progress cannot wear blinkers; so, if we have stressed the excellence of the exchange economy, we must also be at pains to determine its defects. A fundamental defect lies in the innocent first step of the solution, in which those who are willing to contribute for little or no return are brushed aside, to make the exchange system an exclusive club for business men.” (*For a New Political Economy* CWL 21:35). A little more on all this in my final footnote 87 below.

⁵² This is a type of fresh start that I recommend: a week’s walkabout in your own town poised, in your beauty of smallness. (See Philip McShane, “The Global Economy and My Little Corner,” *Divyadaan* 21 (2010) 245-256. See further, regarding the context of this article, notes 75, 76 and 87 below.) The title is from my essay, *Quodlibet* 8 (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/quodlibets> accessed 15 December 2016), written during a week’s walkabout in Dublin after the dreadful week’s pounding flow of 30-minute papers supposedly celebrating the centennial of Lonergan’s birth in 1904. Some papers were, of course, outstanding, like that on functional collaboration given by Fr. Ivo Coelho, whose appeal, yes, remains in the wings.

18. Elizabeth

In these next three starts I return, turn, turn you, to the three words which I listed at the beginning: *Elizabeth*, *Equation*, *Eschaton*. What had I in mind when I wrote them? The start with Elizabeth was quite random—but is anything random? I happened to be reading, at the time of writing, about the oratorio *The Legend of St. Elisabeth* by Franz Liszt,⁵³ whose extravagant music I had played in the 1940s. There are other Elizabeths in my life: how about you? This Elizabeth was a contemporary of Aquinas, so she was weaved spontaneously in me, by me, into the geohistorical heuristic that I have written of elsewhere.⁵⁴ That weaving is an on-going part of the metaphysics described so neatly in the last four lines of *Insight* 416. The life-climb is to make that metaphysics a luminous molecular lean-forward—a crisis here of the actuality of “implementation”⁵⁵—resonance of “character,”⁵⁶ a possession of “all we know”⁵⁷ not just as it “lurks behind the scenes,” but as it reaches out to say hello to an oratorio or an orphan of an

⁵³ “Liszt kept a marble statue of St. Elisabeth on his desk in his apartment at the Music Academy in Budapest,” Elgin Ronayne, “The Legend of St. Elizabeth: The True Story of Her Life,” *The Liszt Society Journal* 40 (2016) 15. The author includes a print of Liszt’s study corner in the Music Academy from the journal *Magyar Salon* of 1886, where there is visible a statue of St. Elizabeth on his desk.

⁵⁴ For example, see *Question* 36 “An Appeal to Fred Lawrence and other Elders,” available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/questions-and-answers> (accessed 15 December 2016). The heuristic complexifies a systematic genetics by adding a geography, giving thus a better control of ongoing, overlapping, merging, etc., contexts written about by Lonergan in *Method in Theology* and elsewhere.

⁵⁵ Fred Crowe and I enjoyed joking each other about flaws in our indices of, respectively, *Insight* and *Method*. The central flaw of his first indexing of *Insight*, only partially corrected in the second, is omitting the abundance of references in the book to *Implementation*. My *Method* index, done hastily with pen and paper, to meet a publisher’s deadline, is, well, far from adequate.

⁵⁶ *Method in Theology* 356, line 12; *Magna Moralia*, paragraph one.

⁵⁷ *Insight* 303.

original thinker. I recall vividly, nearly forty years after the event, a conversation with Lonergan about Dante's Beatrice, and the "Hello" involved. He remarked, in his peculiar up-reaching rhythm of talk, waving his right hand in the air: "That's what life's all about: saying hello!"

So I think of another Elizabeth, saying hello to an original woman. "When Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the baby moved within her. Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke in a loud voice, 'You are the most blessed of all women, and blest is the child you will bear! Why should this great thing happen to me, that my Lord's mother comes to visit me? For as soon as I heard your greeting, the baby within me jumped with gladness.'"⁵⁸ Might you not find a strange parallel here to you in a possible fresh greeting of Bernard, on an Emmaus or a Damascus Road leading to a freshening of the sick Anthropocene Age?

19. Equation

Equation is a word that occurs many times in *Insight*. There is, for instance, "the context of Clerk Maxwell's Equations,"⁵⁹ and now I pose, as source of a fresh start, an "embarrassing"⁶⁰ question that "will not be mentioned in polite company."⁶¹ What does the word *equation* mean for you as you read about Maxwell, or indeed about emergent probability and its equations, or as you halt over the implicit equations of The Position?⁶² Here, whether you are just puttering through this volume or actually saying hello to Lonergan in his 1833 Overture, you need

⁵⁸ *The Gospel of Luke* 1:39-44.

⁵⁹ I discuss the place of Maxwell's equations in *Insight* on pages 175-8 of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan, His Life and Leading Ideas* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2010).

⁶⁰ *Method in Theology* 299.

⁶¹ *Method in Theology* 299.

⁶² The Position is expressed in literary and elementary fashion, in lines 6-12 of *Insight* 413. Its adequate "axiomatic" (*Phenomenology and Logic*) in a later culture will contain axiomatic equations of intentionality, infinity, incompleteness, etc.

surely to pause, checking whether you have ever seriously been “bitten by theory”⁶³ or whether you are really “lost in some no man’s land between the world of theory and the world of common sense.”⁶⁴

We meet here, perhaps say *hello* to, the central crisis of Lonerganism. I recall a remark of Lonergan in my first week of conversations with him in Dublin, Easter 1961. He talked of the Catholic tradition locked in common sense, its teachers and scholars, “big frogs in little ponds.” I was enormously fortunate in coming to *Insight* in 1957 after graduate studies in general relativity and quantum electrodynamics. But most of his followers then, and even since, are not so fortunate. “What on earth is to be done?”⁶⁵ We are back, perhaps, to the fresh reading of *Insight* 722, to the challenge of a repentant hello to atoms and molecules that “sweep us to the love of the invisible” (A Christmas Mass Preface). Here we need massive patience, kindly nurturing of “the aesthetic apprehension of the group’s origin and story that can become operative . . . especially in a crisis.”⁶⁶ Elder’s need to speak encouragingly to later generations of the need to remedy the entrapment in the common sense of “academic disciplines”⁶⁷ that has blocked these last 40 years from Lonergan’s “third way . . . difficult and laborious.”⁶⁸ Here it seems useful to recall another beginning, briefly mentioned

⁶³ “Exegesis and Dogma,” CWL 6:155.

⁶⁴ *Philosophical and Theological Papers* 1958-64, “Time and Meaning,” CWL 6:121. The no-man’s-land is very deceptive. It can be the land of richly patterned initial meanings, abundant correlations, as sweeping as the work of Arnold Toynbee. The discomfiting challenge to break forward was posed by Lonergan in the 1970s when asked how much science a theologian should know. His reply: “well, he has to be able to read Lindsay and Margenau.” On that book and Lonergan, see *Op. cit.* note 59, 171-75.

⁶⁵ I throw in here a related comment from Lonergan, writing to a superior in 1935. The 12-page letter is reproduced in full in the book referenced in note 59 above at pages 144-54. The remark is on page 154.

⁶⁶ *Topics in Education*, CWL 10:230, in a lecture on art.

⁶⁷ The last two word on page 3 of *Method in Theology*.

⁶⁸ *Method in Theology* 4.

previously in note 2 above: *Lack in the Beingstalk* and its Epilogue, “The Intussusception of Progress.”⁶⁹ Why not, indeed, quote the Epilogue’s beginning?

When love with one another so
Interanimates two souls,
The abler soul, which thence doth flow,
Defects of Loneliness controls.⁷⁰

Obviously, I am saying Hello, Greeting you. Who are we that so greet? How are we handicapped by the axial air, in which “the social situation deteriorates cumulatively”?⁷¹ The cancerous professor of English in the film *Wit*, a John Donne expert magnificently portrayed by Emma Thompson,⁷² has that high moment of revelation (for Donne, not wild delight, but movement of soul out of body) in which she bewails in her solitude the tone of her previous conversation with her nurse and the disemboweling hold of the abstract. “We are discussing life and death and not in the abstract, either. We are discussing my life and my death. And I cannot conceive of any other tone. Now is not the time for verbal thought-play. Nothing could be worse than a detailed scholarly analysis of erudition, interpretation, complication. Now is the time for simplicity. Now is the time for, dare I say it, kindness.”

And finally, there is the kindness, the embrace, “the **equation** of atman and Brahman.”⁷³ The embrace is *buddhi*

⁶⁹ Philip McShane, *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway* (Nova Scotia: Axial Publishing, 2006).

⁷⁰ John Donne, “The Ecstasy,” lines 41-44. (The note in that text of mine adds, “my context is the question raised by Aristotle: the asymmetry of friendship.”)

⁷¹ *Insight* 254.

⁷² She wrote the screenplay for the 2001 film with Mike Nichols, the director, from a play by Margaret Edson.

⁷³ George Thadathil, SDB, “The Person: An Eastern Confluence with the West,” *Divyadaan* 17 (2006) 308.

(intellect) with the mind as reins.⁷⁴ Western economics has so far rejected that intimacy and that equation and that embrace and that minding. But India has a larger view of time.”⁷⁵ And, indeed, do India’s strange reincarnational cyclic reachings not open our dull Western temporal mindings to the stranger neurocyclic realities of Eschatological Thought? What then of the gloriously redeemed billions of personal equations of the Eschaton, integrally grasped personally?

20. Eschaton

My second last start simply invites us to ask, with full, if limping, contemplative W_3 seriousness, where is this kindly light called *Insight* leading, what is our best thinking of “terminal value” in the display of *Method in Theology* page 48?⁷⁶ I enlarge on this start here merely by quoting two previous footnotes: [A] note 6 of *Disputing Quests* 1, “The Disputed Location of Disputing Quests”; [B] note 24 of *Cantower* 33, “Lonerger and Axial Bridges.”

[A] Here it seems useful to simply add some scribbles I sent to a colleague in September 2016 regarding a follow up on the essay, *HOW* 11, “Into the Neurodynamics of Jesus.”

⁷⁴ Thadathil, 308. See the longer version of this note in my article, “The Global Economy and My Little Corner,” *Divyadaan* 21 (2010) 255-56.

⁷⁵ I quote here the conclusion of my article referred to in the previous note. That article concludes a volume of *Divyadaan* edited by me entitled, “Do You Want a Sane Global Economy?”

⁷⁶ Recall the reference to Schweitzer in note 1 above, with the issue there of a geohistorical grip on the climb to the meaning of finitude. I am not recommending a plunge into those puzzlings of Schweitzer but his confused brooding on eschatology needs sublatting into the full heuristics I am recommending. He nudges towards “the recognition of the eschatological character of the Preaching of Jesus and of the Teaching of Paul, though it may pose the question of the Hellenization of Christianity” (*The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, ix). It poses the question of the contemplative science of the destiny of Christianity.

Various Beginnings, BL text from Rome. (see beginning of my *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human*.) 2002 *Cantower* project + Rahner's lecture (*Theol Stud.* 2000, 3-15: lack of eschatology. See *Cantower* 33, note 24.). Your beginning now perhaps, questions of terminal value and enlightenment and happiness within broad cosmic destiny. Paul Davies *Last Three Minutes*. Terminal values: *MIT* 51. Relate to *Insight* 18, 1.3. Relate to *CWL* 10 TED, source of *MIT* 48 spread. Relate to contemplative climb HOW 13, and of course, HOW 11. Back to *Cantower* project, to *Cantowers* round 117. On to *Contra Gentiles* IV, 83-88, re Thomas messing with old cosmology; [I leave you to think out (i) 83, no food, O.K.; sex? Think out neurodynamics; (ii) the judgment stuff and the punishment stuff, towards a rescuing of all]; on to 97, however: door-opening, "the entire bodily creation will be changed", + "no plants or animals". *CG* IV, 97 {5}, which leads on to endnote 86, p. 125 of of EJBH. [Neurodynamics of memories of pets to be handled.] Cosmic negentropy and neurodynamics of the resurrected Jesus, "that he might fill all things" Eph 4¹⁰, quoted in *CG* IV, 87 re 'place': articles that follow need note 13, page 13 of *CWL* 18). And add energy = material prima. Two useful numbers 10⁸⁰ and 10²⁵, recalling Eddington number of cosmic protons: 1.5 by 10⁷⁹; then number in brain. More re neurodynamics and chemo-needs of 'isolated' brain, e.g. oxygen, spinal fluid, etc. [Google: "is it possible to keep a brain alive detached from its body?" but the question needs a much broader context]. Crown of the positive Anthropocenic. "With these eyes" (Job 19:26-7), *CG* IV 84 {14} but put in the broad context of the previous brackets: full contemplative achievement of "so it comes about" (*Insight* 537, 11 lines from end): existential dimension of 'seen' street molecules e.g. in autos, tied in with *Insight* 722, end lines, sublated into Notional Act of Claspings, etc. [enlarging bottom of W₃ and also meaning of "+" at top]. The destiny of these molecules of mine. Kim Noble pointer: 50+ year old woman/painter with 100+ personalities. Jesus: 100 billion+ persons in the Eschaton. Again, memory problem e.g. re Old Jerusalem included in New Jerusalem e.g. the remembering of the donkey of Palm Sunday. The integrally-minded in the non-Noah's ark (cf. *CWL* 18) of

divine minding: but Trinitarian. The core holding contemplative climb up through the 26 places in chapter 19 + on through q. 27 *Summa*. Relate to “God not an object,” [MIT 342] and connect to “originating values and terminal values can coincide” (MIT 51). The whole perspective gives a mighty lift to the ‘characterization’ of the historical causality of Christ (see *Allure*, 244, note 36: add note 44 on page 246, an everlasting ‘Hello’), to St. Paul’s and St. Patrick’s perspective on Christ’s presence, to Crowe’s efforts in *History of the Word*, to Sacrament of the Present Moment stuff. Also think of the new twist on ‘this is my body.’ Finally back to re-read *Insight* 544, line 13: “the universe can bring forth its own unity in the concentrated form of a single intelligent view.” Think all out in the contemplative of you being one of the secondary intelligibles of the 14th place, [*Insight* 683], you being thus practically Thought of lovingly, in the subjectivities of God, as thinking here-now the full Eschaton that includes the positive opposite of God, energy, as meshed with God through Incarnation, Sonflower-blossomed.

I am talking here of the tower reach, functional prayerful cycling, but there seems increasingly [e.g. science + fictions like *Voyager* etc.] a pastoral-outreach culture-context. The whole thing gives a quite new and rich perspective on *Romans* 8’s groaning cosmos. All the molecules etc since the big bang yearning for, bent on being in, the minding of the Second Person and that Person + 100 billion persons in a final dynamic of Agonbite of InWithTo. [But now the contemplative problem of *HOW* 13 weaving into common sense: this seems to me to be the central problem of present culture, in and out of the Tower of Theology: adult growth in Kataphatic contemplation: see the appendices in *Allure*.] Can give a popular better grip on ‘where we are all going’, a grip on the sensed world, an optimism about the ‘salvaging’—Christoffering, [recall Christoffel tensor stuff: *Lindsay and Margenau*, 362] of physic-chemical. Pet problem and ‘garden’ context have to be handled: need for virtual reality stuff and neurochemistry of memory.

[B] Shortly after I wrote the above⁷⁷ Rahner gave his last address, recently presented in English (Karl Rahner, “Experiences of a Catholic Theologian,” *Theological Studies* 61 (2000) 3-15). He spoke with humble realism about the state of theology, its relation to the sciences and to questions of eschatology. The points he raised have preoccupied me in the two decades since, and I would hope to bring the questions of science and eschatology into a fuller focus gradually—it is a central aim of these *Cantowers*. I return to issues of Rahner’s eschatological reflections briefly in *Cantower XXXIX*, but I would draw attention here to this area as a clear instance of the failure of theology to take up the challenge of fundamental Christian questions in the context of modern astronomy. “It needs to be said why and how this Jesus is the only One to whom we can entrust ourselves in life and in death. What kind of answer can we give to this question?” (Ibid. 7).

21. The Trivialization of the Greatest of Works

“In the twenty first place . . . every created agent is an instrument in executing the divine plan.”⁷⁸

I shall be brief on this huge topic, indeed silent beyond the previous note, the topic of my essay, **you**, “the unit action of man”⁷⁹ or woman. I looked back for useful nudges to my writing about the Roman origin of the usual meaning of trivial

⁷⁷ I was writing about “courageous searching for a post-medieval theology.” *Cantower* 33 “Lonergan and Axial Bridges (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/cantowers> accessed 15 December 2016) contains the article I wrote for the periodical *Compass* in 1984 to celebrate Lonergan’s 80th birthday. He died a few weeks before the birthday.

⁷⁸ *Insight* 686-7. Keep in mind the context of chapter 19 of *Allure*, and the contemplative climb to being swept as agent into the subjectivity of the divine creativity.

⁷⁹ Lonergan, “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” in Michael Shute, *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research: Texts and Commentary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010) 43. See the fuller text quoted here at the conclusion of my essay.

and found myself refreshingly distant from the rich then-meaning of a particular paragraph, written 20 years ago, which I shall quote shortly.⁸⁰ It is in a section titled *Tongue-tied*, which is followed by one titled *Mos and Nomos*.⁸¹ That title hints at a shift from Roman to Greek consciousness. But might I not now relate it to a shift from the negative Anthropocene Age to the Positive Anthropocene age? Might not the molecules of tongues pattern a caring of *nomos* in that positive age, weaving and stumbling in the concrete emergence-schemes away from the trivialization that belongs to axial times, and to Lonerganism in particular,⁸² towards a self-luminous progress, “and finally, I am not certain if I speak wildly, out of the very progress itself to produce a mildness of manners and temperament which will support and imitate and extend the mighty power of Christian charity.”⁸³

The positive Capital Trivialization of history is the luminous weaving into molecular global self-consciousness of a massive transposition⁸⁴ of the seeded meaning of Claspings Cherishing

⁸⁰ It is on page 119 of my *A Brief History of Tongue: From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes* (Halifax: Axial Press, 1998).

⁸¹ *A Brief History of Tongue* 125-33. One might well associate the two words with my two meanings of trivialization. A pointer to a particular earlier contrasting is suggested in the paragraph at note 50 of *Method in Theology* 98.

⁸² The origin and persistence and “splinters” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18:252) of the *mos* and *moss* of Lonerganism is a complex issue to be faced by later generations in meeting the demands of The 1833 Overture.

⁸³ Lonergan, “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” in Michael Shute, *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research: Texts and Commentary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010) 42-43.

⁸⁴ Perhaps, elementarily, you might begin to think of this shift as a transposition of Assertion 18 of *The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12:513. The State—think nationalisms—of Grace is to become a Globe of Grace way beyond the simple pointings of footnote 119 of that page. For a help-filled page of reading in *Insight* poise on the phrase “future / of mankind” that carries you from *Insight* 252 to 253. Luminous “destiny” (*Insight* 253 and *Method* 292) is to leap away “from granting common sense a hegemony” (*Insight* 253) and then, THEN, the radiance of the “absolutely supernatural” (*Insight* 747) paradoxically

Cauling Craving Christing that pirouettes round the radiance of Everlasting Love. What more to say? It seems best to end abruptly with my own paragraph, followed by the reach towards the TriVial Pursuers expressed by Lonergan, in vague hope, in the conclusion of his mighty 1936 essay.

Then the rhythms of all the human tongues of history are no longer tied to touch-sight-taste-tone but find their place, along with traces of ancient radiations, in the aggreformic emergentist heuristic of our material finitude. And just as the symbolic expression of a wave equation reaches out to the waters of Danube and Hoang-Ho, *Ma Vlast* and *Old Man River*—and to that first mighty poemword, *riverrun*⁸⁵—so a full compact expression in Artic Brail reaches out to the details of spacious finitude.⁸⁶

Charity is an eternal fire of optimism and of energy, dismayed at naught, rebuked by none, tireless, determined, deliberate; with deepest thought and unbounded spontaneity charity ever strives, struggles, labours, exhorts, implores, prays for the betterment of the unit action of man, for an effective rule of sweetness and light, for a fuller manifestation of what charity loves, Wisdom Divine, the Word made Flesh.

The Sovereign Pontiff has proclaimed the Kingship of Christ. Do you know his kingdom?

“In the last days the mountain and of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say: Come, and let us go to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths. For the law shall come forth from Sion: and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge the Gentiles and rebuke many people, and they shall turn their swords into ploughshares and their spears into sickles. Nation shall not lift

“brings God too close to man” (ibid.) in “the glory and the freshness of a dream” (*Insight* 556) climbing to an eschatological sharing, by more than 100 billion of us, in the ever-fresh neurodynamics of the eternal dawn-dreaming Jesus.

⁸⁵ The first word of Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*.

⁸⁶ *A Brief History of Tongue* 119.

its sword against nation: neither shall they be exercised any more to war.” (Isaiah 2:2-4).

Is this to be taken literally or is it figure? It would be fair and fine, indeed, to think it no figure.⁸⁷

ABSTRACT

The title of the article is nicely ambiguous in that it points to McShane’s dealing with two aspects of *Insight*: the drive that leans us towards a full theology of the Trinity; the danger that is present of the

⁸⁷ The conclusion of Lonergan’s “Essay in Fundamental Sociology” referenced at note 79 above. And might we face together here now, now hear, now sniff, now taste and seize, the axial possibility of ending in conventional scholarliness? We near the end of my brief ravings about beginning again. Are you now closer to weaving your molecules into The 1833 Overture? Do you sniff the two meanings of *trivia*? Do you sniff better [1] the failure of *Insight*, the problem of the X of Cosmopolis, the shocking remote answer of global functional collaboration; [2] the drive of your molecules, all molecules, towards being, Trivially, within the shared neurodynamics of Jesus? Might you now read freshly that dream of Lonergan about **how** “cosmopolis has to protect the future” (*Insight* 265) in the present negative Anthropocene Age and, in the positive Anthropocene Age, generate a global vortex of care “that bestows on intelligence the fullness of life” (Ibid. 751). You might again recall the seeding challenges mentioned in note 51. But think concretely about Lonergan’s aspirations and dreams, say, in the context farms and arms and pharma, or in the context of the fashion runway that is, the faith runway that is to emerge. “‘I don’t design clothing,’ Ralph Lauren once remarked, ‘I design dreams.’ The business side of the fashion industry that is based on those creative dreams is now valued at close to four *trillion* [italics in text] dollars globally—about two per cent of the world’s gross domestic product.” (Linda Fairstein, *Killer Look* [New York: Dutton, 2016], in her “Acknowledgments” 379). How are we to effectively weave the beatitudes into the rag trade? And how, how, how about about about that as a beginning question? Might you, in your small corner, collaborate in designing dreams?

book's towering stand being shrunken. The two aspects are developed in 21 points. The points are not forward-moving but rather indications of approaches towards developing the fuller theology and pointers to strategies of avoiding a trivialization of the meaning of this central achievement of Lonergan. The two aspects merge in an answer to Lonergan's puzzle (*Insight* 763) regarding the mystical body.