

Cantower XXI**Epilodge****December 1st 2003**

The shift from ‘Epilogue’ to ‘Epilodge’ pleases me as capturing the manner in which this essay complements the Epilogue of *Insight*. The most immediately evident turn is from word, *logos*, to lodge, (leafy, native)¹ home. One aspect of that turn is the incarnation of the intellectual pattern of living, or as I have revised that phrase, the intellectual pattern of loving. One might associate that with the little gem of Voegelin, “Reason: The Classical Experience”,² but within the context of ***Cantower IX***: it involves issues of harmonious development and identification. These issues are pushed here to the geo-historical level, cutely caught in the change of title by the shift from ‘gu’ to ‘dg’: from ‘guiding you’ to ‘destiny guiding’. So, “the larger work” of the first page of the Epilogue, addressed by the solitary writer to you, becomes the larger work of destiny’s invitation to global leisure and to Aristotle’s finest way.³ But I am already anticipating the first section. Let us pause with a swift overview.

Section 1 tackles the question of the full ‘larger work’. The second section moves from this described context to one core challenge within humanity’s reachings: the challenge of the turn to the idea, to thinking, to kataphatic contemplation. The third section lifts this further into the context of “personal relations”, a topic commented on in the first note of Lonergan’s Epilogue. The final section places this reflections in a full

¹The ‘leafy’ part comes from the Indo-European base.

²Eric Voegelin, “Reason: The Classic Experience”, *The Southern Review*, X(1974), 237- 264.

³The relevant passage is section 7 of *Nicomachean Ethics*, X, very much worth serious brooding. It obviously relates to my **Tomega Principle**. A key thing to notice is my pragmatic twist, contemplating “Where are we going?”

contextualizing meaning of the phrase "being, at home in transcendental method"⁴. The challenge of that full contextualizing has, of course, been with us from the beginning and, in its fullness, is the challenge of the final 24 **Cantowers**, but I like to think that I caught something of an initial reach in the second **Cantower**, the bracketing poem of which I repeat here. It will be seen, or read, to intimate the reach of this epilogue to the first movement of my **Cantower** concerto.

*Sun, flower, Son-flowered,
Speak to us of growth
Seed cauled, cribbed,
Kabod, yet confined,
Crossed with dark earth,
Light-refined,
Rill open-ends a trill
Annotaste of Throat.*

21.1 "The Inception of a Far Larger Work"

In that phrase Lonergan was quite evidently referring primarily to a larger block of print. Primarily? Well, not really: on "a realist account of full terms of meaning"⁵ the primary work was to be his own climb. What he had in mind when he rushed to the conclusion in 1953 is not our concern here, but we know for certain that he didn't have the strangely simple but brilliant answer that emerged for him in 1965: "link up the pieces functionally". My five-word expression of his achievement should strike you - or rather, not strike you, but be quietly recognized - as doctrinal. It is a simple

⁴*Method in Theology*, 14. The comma is my own odd addition.

⁵*Method in Theology*, 76.

descriptive policy statement, an elementary metadoctrine. The quiet recognition I speak of is worth a pause. It took me decades to recognize the book *Insight* as doctrinal rather than either foundational or systematic. It pretends, of course, to be pedagogical, and mildly apologetic. These first 21 **Cantowers** perhaps help to make the point that it is not pedagogical?

The question mark is yours: this seems an unnecessary additional statement: what else is a question mark? The non-necessity of the addition shall be a normative feature of the third stage of meaning.⁶ Indeed, I may note now another broader aspect of that later normativity, which relates to the “scientific moment” introduced as a topic in **Cantower IX**.⁷ The broader aspect is the aspect of positional luminosity as opposed to *voraussetzunglosigkeit*. The move is towards a fuller psychic presence of one’s stand. One’s stand, of course, is present and operative: gradually making it thematically and skin-present is a core task of this late stage of the axial period. I shall say more of this as we move through the present section.

The question of pedagogy is, of course, relative, tied in with the word *adequate* that recurs in chapter 17 of *Insight*.⁸ The compact expression of *Insight* may well turn out to be adequate by 2050. I have been making this point implicitly for over fifteen years, using as an analogy the history of physics-texts. In particular, I chose as parallel to *Insight* a text which I was fortunate to have been using in 1955-6, when I was doing graduate work in mathematical physics. The text - indeed, I think, the very edition that I had then, and the edition I have at present - is *Theoretical Physics* by George Joos.⁹ I do

⁶The context is the discussion of cultural ethics in *Cantower XVIII*.

⁷In section 6.1.

⁸*Insight*, 17, section 2.4, *passim*.

⁹Blackie and Sons, London, 1951. Written with the collaboration of Ira M. Freeman. First published 1934; reprinted many times, with this second edition appearing and being reprinted in 1951. I will refer to it below as Joos.

not ask you to check out this text, but I do wish for pensive pausing on the general analogy, a pausing which is particularly of the **character** of this section, a pausing, a self-scientific moment, towards admitting, if only to oneself, one's stand on method. My analogy is, in fact, to be identified as a descriptive stand on method. It is the contemporary equivalent of Thomas use of *sicut*: instead of Thomas focus on content, the focus here is on method. The difficulty both for Thomas' contemporaries and for many of my own is that the analogue was, and is, quite strange. Being up with the science of one's times is a matter of enormous cultural luck.

And that is what makes all this foundational pushing of Lonergan's "the inception of a far larger work".

Let me continue with my analogy. Joos' 853-page book is slightly longer than the old *Insight*, slightly shorter than the new. You do not need to know much about physics, or even science, to know that it comes out of a long tradition of teaching and texts and journals. It can be regarded as a sort of graduate handbook, at least for that time. "The aim of this book has been to bring the reader to an intermediate level of attainment in the main branches of theoretical physics from which he may be able to proceed, with the help of special literature, to the field of research."¹⁰ But it presupposes the undergraduate work. So, to recall the example I regularly choose as a parallel, chapter five is 26 pages, dealing with the dynamics of a single particle. The student, and the teacher, at an earlier stage of education, both know that this is a matter of working at various detailed books, being stuck for hours and even days on paragraphs and exercises. Think, now, of a similar length of *Insight's* text: say, the pages of chapter 17, section 3, on the dynamics of interpretation. Does the parallel give you pause?¹¹ Does it bring you closer to the view that *Insight* is indeed a doctrinal

¹⁰Joos, v.

¹¹I do not wish you to be distracted into details here, but at a later reading you might brood over the fact that the dynamics of a particle is intelligible context; the dynamics of interpretation is a

book?

And perhaps it is worth noting that from the point of view of the author it is doctrine - or metadoctrine - as emerging from a dialectic and foundational climb; from the point of view of the reader it is, well, wherever the reader is at. The difficulty can be to get the reader to glimpse where the reader is at. Later, in ***Cantowers XXIV - VI***, we will have more to say on this, but I would note that the difficulty in mathematical physics - certainly when I was teaching it - was minimal. Both my first year students and my graduate students knew where they were at, and that was pretty-well lost at the beginning of each class and ready to tackle another slope of mind-bending exercises.

If you are with me here there is no need for elaboration. The book *Insight* is compendious: I recall Charles Hefling Jr. comparing it to a cello tutor. You don't become a cello player by reading through a tutor. But follow up the lack of approach-problem in my students of the late fifties. They were in a culture, an *ethos*, favorable to doing physics properly. There were texts of various levels of difficulty around in abundance. In the case of *Insight*, however, in contrast to Joos, there was no tradition of texts or tolerance. You may, indeed, object to this parallel, or anti-parallel: philosophy of science and philosophy were well established in the 1950s and the Thomist revival was alive and reaching for better health. Now I could well combat that objection: doing philosophy of anything, much less of science, without a luminous focus on the primary data is really somewhat silly. But let us not go that way. Let us - or rather you! - go back simply to the table of contents of *Insight*. Yes, it does rather resemble Joos. It does warrant undergraduate texts in a spectrum of areas, texts with luminous focus and

higher dynamics breaks into levels. Also you may recall, from ***Cantower IX***, my comments on the volume *Lonergan's Hermeneutics*.: it didn't get seriously into those pages at all. Finally you might reflect on the broader culture: the higher dynamics has levels of muddle that the dynamics of particles **seems** to escape. But I emphasize the word *seems*: later ***Cantowers*** will attempt to reveal and correct massive hidden muddles in the field of physics. There was a start in ***Cantower XII***.

abundance of exercises. Where are they? In four decades of teaching in this area I have come across texts presenting Lonergan's view: they are pretty consistently doctrinal, indeed selectively reductively doctrinal. They are nothing like the undergraduate texts that prepared students to face Joos.

Might we now immediately turn to the evident meaning for us of "the larger work"? The larger work is the provision of not just texts but also a culture of character that would prepare students to brace and embrace *Insight*. Most evidently, the larger work is the work into and in the embrace of functional specialization. That entry is the ground for an optimism regarding a shift of statistics of achievement, of preparedness.

Nor is there any point in me going back over this: I have been weaving webs of persuasion since the first ***Cantower***, indeed since I first worked towards the essay on musicology presented at the International Lonergan Florida Conference of 1970. The dynamics of implementation are now, of course, somewhat clearer to me: best presented perhaps, in clear, summary, yet pedagogical fashion in the third chapter of *Pastkeynes Postmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*. And the manner in which the text *Insight* is vortexed into that larger work has also been aired fairly continuously, especially through the present series of essays. Standing on its own, it is a clear and present failure. Recycled, it becomes, in a new integral context, a thing of beauty, unity, efficiency.

Still, there seems some value in talking a little of *Insight* outside that context and that later ethos: for, I would hope, there are, even now, those who would wish, who are perhaps gracefully driven, to read the book properly. If you are such a person, then you are undertaking a life's work. It is the life's work especially of future foundations-persons, a ground of the fantasy that is the defining characteristic - that word *character* again! - of that specialty. A central battle in your struggle will be your battle with the persuasiveness of the present culture regarding the adequacy and richness of description, the topic of ***Cantower XXIII***. But it is worthwhile, perhaps, to point you

towards that battle as you meet it in the frontispiece in Aristotle's claim: "The faculty of thinking then thinks the forms in the images".¹²

Lonergan's Preface and Introduction asks you to pause descriptively over the word *understanding* or *thinking*. I ask you to pause heuristically over the word *image*. If you are going to drive forward in adequate expansiveness, then you had best be armed with the beginner's heuristic suspicion that the word refers to a layered reality of photons and molecules and nerves. Otherwise not only will you deceive yourself but you will alienate the genuine searchers of what might be regarding as a secular and anti-philosophic world: you will go forth ignorantly peddling a slogan about "insight into phantasm".

I am, of course, inviting you to take seriously my three words of metaphysics - W1, W2, W3 of ***Cantowers XVII and XVIII***. Your reading and your thinking should be transformed by that seriousness. You will be called to shelves and journals in the library other than those of philosophy and theology. And your calling will be a calling home, contemplative in the fullest sense. But that is a further topic. Of course, you will be called in lower-level pragmatics, to write a thesis, to write articles. I can only offer my sympathy and support: I can perhaps repeat Lonergan's advice to me when I was battling in Oxford, "give the fellow what he wants: its only a union card". But in Oxford I was lucky: I was not forced to survey parts of Lonergan's work, like so many unfortunate Lonergan theses-writers. I had the opportunity to read for months some few paragraphs of *Insight*. You have to make your own luck or make the luck of your students.

Perhaps, in concluding this section, I should go back to physics for an analogue of the type of work involved both in reading *Insight* and in shifting present culture. Again, there is no need to rush out and buy the parallel text, though that may not be

¹²I am quoting the translation by J.A. Smith in vol. 2, 686 of *The Complete Works of Aristotle* edited by Jonathan Barnes, Princeton University Press, 1995.

true for those of you who are reaching for adequate foundations. The text I parallel to *Insight* is the third volume of *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*.¹³ These lectures are Feynman having a shot at undergraduate teaching and, in this volume, he is the discomforting zone of quantum theory, giving his own peculiar pedagogy of the zone. My first paralleling comment is directly with *Insight* as another volume three. Can Feynman's volume be read without the background of the previous two volumes? That is hard for me to judge, since that stuff was part of my undergraduate and graduate life. I would say that volume three would make a little sense - he really does tackle the subject well even for a high-school beginner - but, no, volume three is tough work even with a background in physics.

What of the volume three that is *Insight*? The divergence is already, perhaps, obvious. The previous two volumes are not parallel to Feynman I and II. The parallels to Feynman I and II need to be written. But then, alas, on the view I am presenting here, the parallel to Feynman III is also missing. Where is it to come from? Might you contribute, by taking deadly - or lively - serious the challenge of paralleling successful science, by reading a few paragraphs of *Insight* in as full a contemporary context as possible so as to 'build back' a tradition of missing pre-texts?

My suggestion raises all sorts of questions regarding the changes of culture involved in the implementation of both hodic method and generalized empirical method: the possibility of a new world of luminous texts in all areas, from kindergarten to graduate living. So I had best conclude, pointing to the straight parallel between the lectures of Feynman and Lonergan's *Insight*.

Perhaps sometime in this century there will emerge a competent Feynman of generalized empirical method, willing to teach - and being allowed to teach - the method as a general undergraduate culture. Then there could emerge a three-volume

¹³Produced by Richard P.Feynman, Robert B.Leighton and Matthew Sands for Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1965. Many reprintings. I refer to it below as Feynman III.

text, vastly different from *Insight* in its structures of linguistic feedback, but still demanding a level of thinking that discomforts the culture of descriptive philosophy. And that new Feynman - I would hope, a fine woman - might well end the effort with an epilogue much like the short epilogue of Richard Feynman, which I add here: it ends, nicely, twining round the key point of the last page of *Insight's* Epilogue, the "potency in the realm of intelligence" that is the reluctant human heart. And it leads on nicely; for I have been talking to you for two years, but I'm not going to quit: there are eight more years to go. Still, my apologies and my hope could be echos of Feynman's.

"Well, I've been talking to you for two years and now I'm going to quit. In some way I would like to apologize, and other ways not. I hope - in fact, I know - that two or three dozen of you have been able to follow everything with great excitement, and have had a good time with it. But I also know that 'the powers of instruction are of very little efficacy except in those happy circumstances in which they are practically superfluous'. So, for the two or three dozen who have understood everything, may I say that I have done nothing but shown you the things. For the others, if I have made you hate the subject, I'm sorry. I never taught elementary physics before, and I apologize. I just hope that I haven't caused a serious trouble to you, and that you do not leave this exciting business. I hope that someone else can teach it to you in a way that doesn't give you indigestion, and that you will find someday that, after all, it isn't as horrible as it looks.

Finally, may I add that the main purpose of my teaching has not been to prepare you for some examination - it was not even to prepare you to serve in industry or the military. I wanted most to give you some appreciation of the wonderful world and the physicist's way of looking at it, which, I believe, is a major part of the true culture of modern times. (There are probably professors of other subjects who would object, but I believe they are completely wrong.)

Perhaps you will not only have some appreciation of this culture; it is even

possible that you may want to join in the greatest adventure that the human mind has ever begun”.¹⁴

21.2 An Apology for Minding

I use the word ‘apology’ here in its usual sense of ‘speaking in defense’ you might think of a work such as Newman’s Apology and certainly I would wish you to think of Aristotle’s plea for the more excellent way, or Thomas’ reflections on the contemplative way. All these apologies are for a life style, a love style. You have noticed that from the character of Feynman’s Epilogue: his taking a loving stand on “the greatest adventure”. Is it noticeable in Lonergan’s Epilogue? The problem of such noticing is a cultural problem, one that is not sufficiently pressured by Lonergan’s writing stance and style. Perhaps I might intimate that problem by saying that it is a problem of mere interest as opposed to molecular orientation. It is a problem that is present in Feynman’s short Epilogue: he too apologizes but only in the suspicion that he caused hate for physics. Still, there is an undertone in both Epilogues that invites, that could carry the reader beyond “some appreciation of the wonderful world” of the author, to an involvement, the sort of thing expressed by Stephen McKenna, “this is worth a life”. And perhaps this recollection of Stephen McKenna is worth pausing over here in relation to the **recollection** of self.

I am thinking of James Joyce’s recollection of recollecting, “Mallarme, don’t you know, he said, has written those wonderful prose poems Stephen McKenna used to read to me in Paris. The one about Hamlet. He says: *il se promene, lisant au livre de lui-*

¹⁴Feynman’s short Epilogue is on p.21-19 of the third volume of his lectures. As we shall see at the end of the second section here, the Epilogue is relevant to our own future *Cantower* efforts to lift this ‘major part of the true culture of modern times’ into its fullest context. I shall be inviting you to spend time and energy especially on this third volume, which deals with Quantum Physics.

meme, don't you know, reading the book of himself ".¹⁵

Now I must immediately add that my invitation is stratified. There are, I hope, some mad enough to take the invitation Mollywise, "heart going like mad and yes I said yes I will yes." .¹⁶. But for the majority the invitation is more a matter of rising to admiration without resentment. And there is a whole spectrum of possible lives in between. Only you can discern your niche in the galactic spread.

Into my pausing head rolls the jingle, "Lives of great men oft remind us, / We can make our lives sublime, / And departing leave behind us, / Footprints in the sands of time." My pointing is to the cultural shift of praxis that would give **reminding** a massively fulsome meaning. One can read Augustine or Cervantes with interest, even with deep scholarship, but never rise to the oddness of Flaubert, "La Bovary, c'est moi!"¹⁷ Recently, a certain madness led me to acquire a fresh English translation of Proust,¹⁸ and I began again to meet the man in his cork-lined room. For me it is a new threshold, a fresh searching of my room, a room filled, in radiant silence, with music and molecules. But what is it to read Proust?

I have in hand David Ellison's book, *The Reading of Proust*,¹⁹ where one must note the genitive as being both subjective and objective. How, for instance, did Proust read

¹⁵James Joyce, 1986, 153. I must apologize for missing accents here and there. My computer isn't up to that refinement.

¹⁶The concluding words of Joyce's *Ulysses*, and of Molly's famous soliloquy.

¹⁷I recall, too, from somewhere, the strange remark of Flaubert, that he knew *Don Quixote* by heart (from his mother) before he had learned to read.

¹⁸Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time*, translated by C.K.Scott Moncrieff and Ternace Kilmartin; revised by D.J.Enright, The Modern Library (paper back), 6 volumes, 1998. This is the edition I shall use throughout the rest of the *Cantowers*. I shall refer to it simply as e.g. Proust IV.

¹⁹John Hopkins University Press, 1984. To be referred to below as Ellison.

Ruskin?²⁰ And indeed I might go on to suggest the question, Is there a parallel there to the madness in which Lonergan read Aquinas, “years reaching up”?²¹ Ellison writes with massive erudition, but how does he, did he, read Proust, how does the academy read Proust?

Ellison ends his book by compactifying - no doubt elusively for you now, but still worth quoting to tone you in - the core of the thesis of his book. “Reading, for Proust, involved two mutually contradictory postulations: the movement of appropriation whereby the self, in its efforts to embrace the meaning of the textual events, extends beyond the confines of its subjective prison in a search for referential verification (autobiography); and the cycle of dispossession whereby the self’s stability is undermined by the disseminated multiplicity of unreadable signs (fictional allegory). The *Recherche* is the space in which these opposing constellations collide, the imaginary locus of the reader’s impossible choices.”²²

The quotation, as I say, may help to tone you into a sense of the deep axial

²⁰This is, indeed a central topic in Ellison. Chapter 2 (30-60) is titled “Ruskin and Proust: The Complexity of Influence”; Chapter 3 (61-95) is titled “Proust Reads Ruskin”.

²¹*Insight*, the conclusion of the Epilogue. To this one might parallel Proust’s “stilts beneath my feet” at the conclusion of his great work (Proust, VI, 531). My gift to Lonergan on his 70th birthday was a mug with such a Proustian quotation on it. It had, of course, subtle interpersonal meaning, such as would enter into a fictional autobiography of the Proust type and would be woven in and round about like “the little phrase” (see note 30 below). A note in a *Cantower* is not the place to point in this novel direction, but it shall be bubbling around in these next *Cantowers*. Might you imagine a six-volume work of a third-stage Proust taking off from such a gesture as Proust wished to take off from, “the garden bell at Combray - that far-distant noise which nevertheless was within me - a point from which I might start to take measurements” (Proust, VI, 530), taking the *nomos* of Lonergan and his absence of friends. When I first began to introduce Proust to my readers (the mid-1970s, *The Shaping of the Foundations*, chapter 4), I drew a parallel between *Swann’s Way* and *Lonergan’s Way*. In that work I was also introducing the notion of foundational fantasy, but my fantasy of such fantasy and such an effort of “creativity and criticism”(Ellison, 47-60) is/was quite beyond the 45-year-old me, with years still to reach up.

²²Ellison, 185.

schizothymia, and its scholarly and philosophic overlay, that is a challenge to your bones and body, your “interests”. It gives you a further nudge, perhaps, towards the reach of my apology for minding, a reach certainly that meshes with Lonergan’s “apologetics”²³ when that apologetics is held in the full embrace of the “multiplicity of unreadable signs” that is his Epilogue or indeed his *Opera Omnia*. Have you met the man “dominated [Proust and Joyce would relish the sexual overtones of the word!] by the desire to understand”,²⁴ as Proust met Ruskin? Might you go further and meet the axial problem lurking in Ruskin and Proust, in Ricoeur and Derrida?²⁵ Might you mind global literature and function as a help towards lifting it beyond the sicknesses of present readings and interpretations?

So we wind round the **Cantower** problem, the self-exigence that groans out “to embrace the universe in a single view”²⁶, to “be embraced in a single, coherent view”.²⁷ The groaning is, when fulsome, a discerning²⁸ groaning for a next step within the

²³*Insight*, 732[754].

²⁴*Insight*, 731[753].

²⁵Ellison draws the work of Ricoeur and Derrida into the related problems of metaphor, deconstruction, heuristic, etc. See the index under those authors.

²⁶*Insight*, 417[442]. The sentence from which I quote is the **Tomega** principle I refer to regularly.

²⁷*Insight*, 742[763].

²⁸Obviously one can be reminded here of Ignatian discernment, but I am thinking in the present context more of the sublation of the problem of criticism and creativity as, for example, found in the struggle of Ruskin, a problem of a real life of failed conversations and solitary reaching that underlies the writing and speaking hinted at in note 35 above. The hint places the reflections on ‘contemplating the room’ of section 4 here in much fuller context. But the reflections there point to the challenge both for you and for me, at our different places and ages. For you the challenge is to find the genuine calling heights in your own volume I, *Swann’s Way*. For me it is the challenge of an efficient (Topics in Education, 160) and beautiful ending in volume 6, *Time Regained*. I have chosen a lesser task than discerning the history of 20th century meaning, the task of pointing to the “bridge”(*Insight*, chapter 5,

concrete symphonic rhythms of finality, in your room, now. The winding is yours, and the groaning needs the limit-moment, the “little phrase” of Proust²⁹, the epiphanies of Joyce³⁰, Caussade’s sacrament of a present moment.³¹ In such a moment one reaches for one’s future, perhaps even for the Dark Tower.

Lonergan wrote once of “the theologian as a moment in history.”³² If you can pause over our journey now - or Then³³ - through twenty one **Cantowers**, you can perhaps sense the call to an excellence in that moment, a luminous self-luminosity that is “a luminous darkness of circumstances.”³⁴ So, the grandeur that is really you, may

beginning) to a third-stage culture. “In my awareness of the approach of death, I resembled a dying soldier, and like him too, before I died, I had something to write. `But my task was longer than his, my words had to reach more than one person”(Proust, VI, 524).

²⁹The “little phrase” haunts the book, haunts Swann. “Expanded his soul... An impression of this order, vanishing in an instant, is, so to speak, *sine materia*..... his memory furnished... something that was no longer pure music, but rather design, architecture, thought, and which allowed the actual music to be recalled”(Proust, I, 295-6). “And so it is not wrong to speak of hearing a thing for the first time. If one had, indeed, as one supposes, received no impression from the first hearing, the second, the third would be equally “first hearings” and there would be no reason why one should understand it any better after the tenth. Probably what is wanting, the first time, is not comprehension but memory” (Proust II, 140: see further, in note 46 below, the quotation from pages 142-3).

³⁰See Morris Beja, “Epiphany and Epiphanies”, *A Companion to Joyce Studies*, edited by Zack Bowen and James F.Carens, Greenwood Press, Connecticut, 1984, 707-726.

³¹Jean Pierre de Caussade was a French Jesuit of the early 18th century. The providential moment is a key perspective in his *Abandonment to Divine Providence*. We will see, in these two **Cantowers** the possibility of sublating his view into a new and larger view of “the minding moment” that we are called to be.

³²I quote from Batch V.7 (in my original cataloguing of 1973) of Lonergan’s scribbles and notes of the Roman years.

³³A topic in **Cantower V**: “Metaphysics Then”.

³⁴I am recalling a previous similar call that would round the works of Ortega y Gasset, available in English in the Website archives. It was first published in Spanish, “Asia Una Oscuridad Luminosa de la Circunstancia. *Insight* despues Cuarante Annos”, *Universidad Philosophia* (32), 1999. It is

burst out in harmonious circumstance, out and into one's molecules, and the Call could be like the Col de la Faucille for Ruskin, a grandeur that "opened to me in distinct vision the Holy Land of my future work and true home in the world. My eyes had been opened, and my heart with them, to see and possess royally such a kingdom".³⁵

To be possessed by that kingdom, that tower, is to heart-feel the **Tomega** principle that was introduced in **Cantower IV**. It is to reach beyond the sincere yet axial-bound searchings of people like Candace Pert³⁶ and V.S. Ramachandran,³⁷ beyond all the petty pretensions and cripplednesses of present field and subject specializations, to a view and a self-view of adult growth that, really, is quite obvious while still being presently quite unacceptable and unaccepted.

What more might I say here? My **Cantower** project took shape 14 months ago in a pause after finishing *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway*. In the concluding "Bacchuspiece" to that work I wrote of becoming a stranger to myself of the previous week, the previous year. I wrote there of self-investigation, but now my meaning for that is quite beyond the writing self of the Bacchuspiece, nor could I make it "clear" to that younger self, much less to the younger you. But for you there is the questioning of hardening of heart and minding raised by the strange people of Patrick White's novels, Theodora³⁸, or the hero of *The Tree of Man*: "his body was hardening.... there was no

available in the Website Archives in English: "Towards a Luminous Darkness of Circumstances. *Insight after Forty Years*".

³⁵John Ruskin, *Praeterita*, 167.

³⁶Candace Pert, *Molecules of Emotion. The Science Behind Mind-body Medicine*, with a foreword by Deepak Chopra, a Touchstone Book, Simon and Schuster, 1999. Discussed in **Cantower IV**.

³⁷V.S. Ramachandran and Sandra Blakelee, *Phantoms of the Brain, Probing the Mysteries of the Human Mind*, William Morrow and Company, New York, 1998. See sections 2 and 3 of **Cantower IX**.

³⁸The wonderously strange lady of *The Aunt's Story*.

obvious sign that his soul too might not harden.”³⁹

My invitation to you is not towards a reaching for an Everest of minding - it may not be your mountain - but to slowly sense in pragmatic reach and tolerance the unrest in humanity that in our axial times bubbles forth in evolutionary sports, in Cezannes and Lonergans that begin each day backus-packing for another effort to glimpse Mt.St.Victoire or Mt.Horeb.⁴⁰ In our times it bubbles forth in the **Cantower** possibilities and probabilities of functional specialization. Into that bubbling I have been trying, in these twenty-one essays, to weave the initial **tomega** effort of *Insight*. The essays to follow - 22 to 26 - will add to that weave a context for your reaching, your blessed on-going finding of the “scientific moment” of your personal stand.⁴¹

I would like to think, to expect in beautiful efficiency, that my own efforts from there on would be of consequence in your reaching. It is a fresh beginning in many senses. The book *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minds* ended on the first page of *Insight*. So, we might begin again to soak up our place in “The Empirical Residence”.⁴² I return to the simplest of zones, the zone of things of physics.

I have noted throughout these **Cantowers**, indeed throughout my rambling career, the massive needs in all zones of desiring and inquiring. The best I can do, it seems to me, in this final decade of my dark pilgrimage, is to begin, by way both of contribution and of paradigmatic illustration, the process of functional specialization in physics.

³⁹Patrick White, *The Tree of Man*, Penguin, 42.

⁴⁰Mt.Horeb, “The Mountain of God”(Exodus 3:1), I take as a generic symbol for Lonergan’s quest. As those familiar with Cezanne know, early morning back-packing to paint Mt.St.Victoire is more than symbolic of Cezanne.

⁴¹The notion of “scientific moment” was introduced in section 6 of **Cantower IX**. We will get back to it in some detail in **Cantower XXV**, “Redoubt *Method* 250”.

⁴²The title of **Cantower XXXIV**.

This new beginning has two other aspects that you may find both amusing and enlightening.⁴³ The first looks to the past: I view myself, in 2002-2005, repeating, recycling, my undergraduate work in physics of the years 1952-5. It brings to mind a favorite proverb from the Zulu tradition: “The *isisusu* wedding dance is always appreciated by being repeated”.⁴⁴ It is, to say the least, an interesting Proustian repetition,⁴⁵ reliving in generalized hodic empirical method, a wedding dance *ad amorem invisibilium*⁴⁶ braced and embraced by Sonflower exigence. In 1955-6 I moved to graduate work, mainly on quantum electrodynamics, before meeting the author Lonergan during philosophic studies. It was in 1959-60, while lecturing on mathematics and physics, that the plot was hatched by myself and my Jesuit Superior,

⁴³Aspects? Perhaps where we are at here, right through here, is at my end of the central note of that strange central chapter of *The Redress of Poise*, “Turners, Strategists of Survival: The Legacy of Lonergan”. I was thinking, at the time, both of the painter Turner and of his contemporary, the black revolutionary Nat Turner. Our human problem is that the “moment” is a biographic openness in both of us to history, which breaks us both out quite beyond “aspect” to being, or what Lonergan calls “the field” in *Phenomenology and Logic*.

⁴⁴I am quoting from the translation by H.C.Lugg of Mageme M. Fuze, *The Black People and Whence They Came*, University of Natal Press, 1979, Prologue. See further *Lack in the Beingstalk*, 4, note 10; 111, note 2; 151, note 6.

⁴⁵See note 30. There is “the little phrase” in Proust. There is the “little book *Insight*” in the enlarged memory of fifty years. But how communal is that enlarged memory? “The reason why a work of genius is not easily admired from the first is that the man who created it is extraordinary, that few men resemble him.... It is his work itself that, by fertilizing the rare minds capable of understanding it, will bring them increase and multiply. It was Beethoven’s quartets themselves (the 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th) that devoted half a century to forming, fashioning and enlarging the audience for Beethoven’s quartets.... if the work were held in reserve, were revealed only to posterity, that audience, for that particular work, would be not posterity but a group of contemporaries who were merely living half-a-century later in time”(Proust II, 142-3). The thesis of the *Cantowers* is that we are merely living half a century later, that the fertilization can occur only through global hodic recycling. Lonergan’s late quartets in cumulative omni-disciplinary implementation will massively recontextualize his earlier “little book”.

⁴⁶I am recalling a favorite quote of mine from the Preface of the Christmas mass: like the Nativity, particle physics can sweep us “to the love of invisible things”.

Fr. Ronnie Burke-Savage, to import him to Ireland for eight lectures.

And that brings me to the second aspect of this beginning. On my first walk with Lonergan through the streets of Dublin, in Easter 1961, we spoke of cosmology, and he remarked that you could get quite a consistent cosmology out of Thomas. Now the problem we face is that Thomas' consistent cosmology is meshed with a dated science, and there has been no serious attempt, for instance, to envisage resurrected copulation since.⁴⁷ Might we not reach for a cosmology that would critically sublimate the muddled struggles of this last century?

So it is that the focus of these next years is towards this critical sublation, that I might have an initial shot at thematizing resurrection-times⁴⁸, in a thematizing dance that anticipates that final wonderful new beginning. And the recycling of 1960 in 2010 will not, thank God, resemble that first tasting of theology, when our first-year theology class was mentally brutalized by muddled commonsense eclecticism. In rebellion, in that first year of theology, I wrote "The Contemporary Thomism of Bernard Lonergan"⁴⁹ and upon reading it, Fr. Courtney Murray, then editor of

⁴⁷Thomas did not envisage organic intimacy in everlasting life. (See *Contra Gentiles*, IV, 83, where he has some interesting pointers on the matter - we will come back to them in the final *Cantowers*). One might throw the issue into a fresh context by recalling a central thematic pillar of Proust. "The text [Ruskin's *Praeterita*] is organized around one central polarity that is also a thematic pillar of the *Recherche*: the contrast between the intimate quietness of private contemplation and the exterior movement and discovery of travel. For Ruskin, to travel is to extend the purely abstract thought one possesses into the concreteness of the visible universe, which itself contains in various modes of availability or secretiveness the confirmation of the mind's intuitions"(Ellison, 40). Does this have something to say to the placetime of organic intimacy? Intimacy may be closest in the apparent separation of solitude; is there an absolutely supernatural molecular intentionality that is superior to the presence of angels to one another? (On such angelic presence, see *Summa Theologica* I, q. 56, a.2, ad 3m.)

⁴⁸I would note that the eschatological reflection, in the Christian tradition, must pivot on the difficult inclusion of the theology of Christ's resurrection and ascension. He is not hiding in a cloud but somehow radiant in a Eucharistic empirical residence.

⁴⁹Published in *Philosophic Studies*, Maynooth, Ireland, 1961.

Theological Studies, asked me to produce a readable presentation of the *Verbum* articles.⁵⁰

The general discomfort I caused, including the discomfort of the professor who was due to teach the course on the Trinity in the final year of theology, made it convenient to ship me to Heythrop College, Oxfordshire, for that final year, in which I spent most of my time writing “Insight and the Strategy of Biology,”⁵¹ was thrilled to find the writings of Lonergan, while a student of philosophy in Heythrop, in *The Blandyk Papers*, and doubly thrilled to receive from Lonergan the two volumes on the Trinity.⁵² The well worn-torn copy of the systematic part became my central book of meditation: but that, perhaps, is the central story of the final two sections of this Epilogue.

21.3 Up Close and Personal

“Personal relations can be studied adequately only in this larger and concrete context”.⁵³ To this quotation I add the context of Lonergan’s reflection on a similar need regarding Christian philosophy: “What then is needed is a qualitative change in me, a shift in the centre of my existing from the concerns manifested in the *bavardage quotidien* towards the participated yet never in this life completely established eternity that is tasted in aesthetic apprehension”.⁵⁴

What is this concreteness, what is this aesthetic apprehension? I would point in three directions.

⁵⁰“The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God” appeared in *Theological Studies*, 1962.

⁵¹Published in *Spirit as Inquiry*, edited by F.E.Crowe, Herder and Herder, 1964; available now on the Website in *Lonergan’s Challenge to the University and the Economy*.

⁵²*De Deo Trino I, II*, Gregorian Press, Rome, 1964. To appear soon in English in the *Collected Works*..

⁵³*Insight*, in footnote 1 of the Epilogue.

⁵⁴Lonergan, in a review in the *Gregorianum*, 1955.

Evident here, I would hope, is the context of Hopkinesque self-tasting, especially as it is sublated into a transformed Joyce-Proust aesthetic of the interpersonal. And I would note the need for a massive shift towards the interpersonal, biography speaking to biography in history, in matters both cultural and spiritual.

Most evident, I would crave, is my secularism. The original title for section 2 above was “An Apology for Secular Minding”, but it would have complicated the reading there. Now, as we move to reflection on the Most High Thing, I would paradoxically emphasize my secularism. I think that I can best make my point here by recalling a reaction to some quite secular reflecting of mine. The occasion was a lecture at a Boston College workshop in the early 1990s: I was speaking of my experience of walking the Cabot trail in north Cape Breton, pausing to be in the presence of a leaf. A questioner accused me of mysticism. I was not talking about mysticism. I was talking about a very secular habit of thinking, a habit that has haunted my invitation here right from the beginning: recall my talk of listening to the sunflowers, asking them How do you do?⁵⁵

On the level of scholarship I tire of people writing about a mystical wisdom that would somehow enlighten our pilgrim way: certainly it lifts Faith, but mystical light is at core inarticulate, like Ignatius’ recalled visioning the Trinity.⁵⁶ On the level of

⁵⁵See *Cantower II*: “Sunflowers, Speak to us of Growing”. Chapter three of *Lack in the Beingstalk* places this in a fuller context, merging the world of The Little Flower with that of the little flower of *The Little Prince*.

⁵⁶I won’t gain popularity here, I know, by faulting Christian Zen movements in this matter. But that is a much wider topic. There is a global longing for meaning: it is being shabbily satisfied in various unthinking Ways. But as to the benefit of pausing with a mantra or bent legs: there is no argument there. Catholics and Arabs pause with beads. I think of one of my favorite ladies, Catherine of Sienna, with her mantra, “Sweet Jesus, Jesus Love”. Good on her! But she was also, like Theresa of Avila, a quite practical woman.

In the next *Cantower* I give offense, and perhaps I must risk giving such offense here. There are those who are enthusiastic about the work of my fellow-Ulsterman, William Johnston. His most recent work is “*Arise My Love*”: *Mysticism for a New Age*. (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2000). He shares a

homily, I tire of preachers telling us to ask God for light. We have God-given curiosity: we should grow up and use it to be adult-personal with Them. Who are You and we, and how do we merge, how do we become “Songs of the Adorable”?⁵⁷

But the simple issue is the issue of thinking. And I would be so bold as to say that thinking is to be, in the third stage of meaning, at the core of all ways: the Dogen Way, the Little Way of Liseaux. There is human openness as fact, and there is the secular openness that I emphasize here, and “openness as gift is the self entering into personal relationship with God”.⁵⁸ But “these three are linked”⁵⁹ and the middle link is central even to a choice of its sidelining.

Less evident is the precise road of that questing, that seed of ultimate exigence. It is for each person to discern thinkingly their thinking track. That the thinking and the thinking track is to be hearty surely need not be repeated at this stage: we have had our fill of fragmented nominalist rationalism. Might, for example, my climb of chapter 7, “Grace: The Final Frontier”, in *The Redress of Poise*, give a lead to you, to anyone? Might I hope that it become a heart beat of the *Sargawit*, the foundations-person? So I wrote obscurely of the first of the absolutely supernatural imitations of Trinitarian reality: “To the *Sargawit* it is darkcored Christ-all clear that this infinite gift to finitude of the

common tendency to see mysticism as a key to our present ills. Bluntly, I would say that the key to our ills is not the *Canticles* (though they are the core of the contemplation I write of) but the tough-love footnote to the parable of the unjust steward: “the children of this world are wiser than the children of light”. The present and axial crisis is a crisis of minding.

⁵⁷“Song of the Adorable is the title of two sections (1.4 and 5.4) of *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*. The two sections deal, respectively, with the presence of Arjuna to Krishna and our presence, as melody, to “the Cosmic Artist of Nazareth”(Process, 128). The two chapters seek to bring out the dynamics of authentic secular religiosity e.g. by paralleling a summary of Molly’s final soliloquy in *Ulysses* with a summary of John’s Gospel. The problem is to take seriously the random address of the “mouth almighty”.

⁵⁸Lonergan, “Openness and Religious Experience”, *Collection*, 1988, 187.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, immediately following in the text..

Personal human identity of *Proclamans* is matched, factually isomorphic with the contingent truth, by a finite act of relating that is a substantial gift of that obediencial nature, an axial grace of history”.⁶⁰ Obscurely? We are back at the analogy with physics: a statement of third-year university physics is obscure because it demands three years of thinking. Do you expect that the Family of God be more obvious to us than the families of particles? However inevident and “shrouded in mystery”⁶¹ our individual “vertical finality to God”⁶² is, molecule-mounted thinking is the common road.

But I deviated, in the previous paragraph, into the problem of thinking that haunts my own Christian tradition. Back then to that less evident seed of ultimate exigence as it is found in all traditions and in each person: Jew, Muslim, Hindu, whomever. Then the seed manifests itself in a spectrum ranging from the searching violence of dissent to the tranquil pursuit of enlightenment, from the adolescent joy of common music to the dangling conversations of later years. What more might I say in this recall of Lonergan’s Epilogue and his postponement of reflections on personal relations?

There is a context for light on this business of “personal relations” in the peculiarities of the place of that phrase in the diagram of *Method in Theology*, p.48: I have already commented on that. There is the context of the global nudging towards kataphatic concern that, in these **Cantowers**, can be identified with the **Tomega Principle** as it becomes a cultural reality and percolates into contracted common sense. Within these two contexts, this **Cantower** and the next focus on two components.

There is the nudge towards refinements of cultural intersubjectivity; there is the

⁶⁰The four graces are treated in *De Deo Trino, Pars Systematica*, q. xxvi. The quotation is from the chapter mentioned, a few pages from the end of *The Redress of Poise*.

⁶¹Lonergan, “Mission and Spirit”, *A Third Collection*, 26.

⁶²*Ibid.*. The same sentence.

nudge towards integral thinking about the space and time of our empirical residence.⁶³ But all these nudgings, warped by present culture, need the accelerated cycling of the hodic enterprise if the nudging is to become efficient budging.

There is enormous difficulty in budging my own Christian tradition towards understanding: the reluctance is all the more strange in that the divinity of Hebrew-Christian revelation is a divinity variously identified with merciful understanding. But I have aired my view already, and more than once⁶⁴, on the need for the slow climb of understanding, of reaching for the hearty mind of Christ. So let us move on to a brief word about the cosmic call that embraces you in the room in which you read.

21.4 Epilodging: A Room with a View

“It is our noticing them that puts things in a room, our growing used to them that takes them away again and clears a space for us. Space there was none for me in my bedroom (mine in name only) at Balbec; it was full of things which did not know me, which flung back at me the distrustful glance I cast at them, and, without taking any heed of my existence, showed that I was interrupting the humdrum course of theirs. The clock - whereas at home I heard mine tick only a few seconds in a week, when I was coming out of some profound meditation - continued without a moment’s interruption to utter, in an unknown tongue, a series of observations which must have been most uncomplimentary to myself, for the violet curtains listened to them without replaying, but in a attitude such as people adopt who shrug their shoulders to indicate

⁶³The nudge manifests itself in various ways. *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway*, chapter 3 deals with some of these: the appetite for popular cosmology and physics; on a higher level, the debates about the Anthropic Principle; etc. But we will be dealing with this nudge right through the center *Cantowers*, preparing for the Everest of a quest for an ultimate everlasting meaning of the empirical residence in the final *Cantowers*.

⁶⁴You might find useful an early invitation to thinking in a religious context, now republished: *Music That Is Soundless*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2003.

that the sight of a third person irritates them. They gave to this room with its lofty ceiling a quasi-historical character which might have made it a suitable place for the assassination of the Duc de Guise, and afterwards for parties of tourists personally conducted by one of Thomas Cook's guides, but for me to sleep in - no."⁶⁵

What an odd beginning, you ferment, to this final section which purports to be on contemplation, a summation of exigent attitude, a fantasy of future prayer. And indeed, so it is. I recall - and most what I what I write here is about calling and cauling and recauling - my Hebrew professor's 'principle of minimal coverage': what can one intimate, in a brief course, of the wonderland of the Hebrew language? Take a little phrase, dip a little madelene. I recall, too, persuading a French professor to add Proust to her course-topics. "But what can I do?" she said. "You can bring them to read a few sentences". Well, at least here I have pointed you towards reading four sentences of Proust. And there is a minimum benefit that, when asked in academic converse, "have you read Proust?" You can reply, "Oh yes, indeed his sentences!"

What is it to read these four sentences of Proust? What is it to read anything? But take the little phrase: "it was full of things which did not know me?" Is there not some strange truth lurking here, quite beyond Proust - for interpretation is not our goal, but intimation. In its fullness, is there not the "room filled with music", "God's silent communing with man"? Is there not "his blood upon the rose", part of His reach to know me, but not knowing me in that I do not attend, thus grounding an incompleteness of mutual mediation? "Life is saying 'Hello'" (Lonergan's remark), but how wide the reach of that hello, and how minding, mindful? Is the room, the Raum, a friend "in a friendly universe"⁶⁶?

You might note here that I am back, or quite forward, at the end of chapter 9 of *Insight*, in the centre of **Cantower IX**: "Position, Poosition, Protopossession". There is

⁶⁵Proust, II, 333.

⁶⁶*Method in Theology*, 117.

the facticity of dust motes in the sun, the Son, Grace notes of “The Song of the Adorable”⁶⁷, “thus taking pleasure in considering my friend as a work of art, that is to say in regarding the play of all the parts of his being as harmoniously ordered by a general idea”.⁶⁸ But the Idea is not general but detailed in its creative delight, a present cawling of the annotaste of throat.

It should be evident that I am writing here of a long haul, a cawled call, a microcosmic exigence in a groaning universe luck-lifted in sustained “striving and groaning as would announce a new and higher birth”⁶⁹ in “a transformation that one did not bring about but rather underwent”.⁷⁰

And there is the apparent ill-luck that is axial, whether in the exercises of Ignatius or in the exercises of Proust. I am continuing here my apology for minding and you need not be reminded that I am not writing of minding for all. There are many ways up Mount Fuji. I might push my plea and say that the way I write of is the core of all genuine ways, but that push I leave as a question lurking in you. It may well be lurking in you as it was in me when I faced my first disorientation in Jesuit life. I entered the Jesuit novitiate on September 7th, 1950. In the evening we were given points for morning meditation: the topic was the rich young man; the objective was resolve to not turn away. But it was a turn away from thinking, a turn away that left me discomforted then and through the two years: I ended the two-year period a mental wreck. Are you perhaps, even a little, with me?

Only slowly in the decades to follow did I manage to shift the Exercises of Ignatius - let us think of the first and the last - into a harmonious context. “Principle

⁶⁷See note 58 above.

⁶⁸Proust, II, 433.

⁶⁹B. Lonergan, “Mission and Spirit”, *A Third Collection*, 1984,26.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, 33.

and Foundation.... praise, reverence, serve”: was this a boot-camp slogan, or a nudge to find the principal longing and a minding praise, reverence, service? “Contemplation for Obtaining Love”... what might be the reach of the considering of of divine work and presence and invitation? Infinite Understanding is saying ‘Hello’, “full of things which did not know me”, in a room, a Raum, filled with radiant music.

So there is the cawl “of the wonderful world and the physicist’s way of looking at it which, I believe, is a major part of the true culture of modern times”. Are you open to the wonderland of the room in which you read, now, of room and Raum? “In this room... first of all, there is a steady magnetic field - it comes from the currents in the interior of the earth that is the earth’s steady magnetic field... then there are some irregular fields... as people move about in their chairs and rub their coat sleeves ... fields produced by currents in the electric wiring in synchronism with the generator at ... light, little wiggles of 186,000 miles per second.... infrared rays traveling from warm forehead. Flying across the room are waves which carry jazz music... pictures of other parts of the world... oscillations with crests separated by a foot, from Venus... waves that originated billions of light years away”.⁷¹

Such is the friendship presence that calls out to be understood in these shadows of Understanding. I think now of my first meeting, in 1956, with the principle “Ens et verum convertuntur”.⁷² The professor was a Marechalian Thomist, and one could move to the view of a finality of things, cattle and corn, fated, longing, for the being of being known. Is this not a friendly tense call to contemplation? No - as I repeat - not everyone’s, but surely the call of foundations persons, of the sufficiently cultured consciousnesses that are to be the *limens*, “preliminaries to conceiving the

⁷¹*The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, II, 20-8.

⁷²The convertibility of truth and being is an old Scholastic topic, which can however ground rich reflection on human being in process, finality, the groaning of non-human being.

transcendental idea” ?⁷³ “The secondary component in the idea of being”, the friendship minding of the One, is to have a complementing component in minding Sargawits, embraced in its non-systematic radiations in loving contemporary adequacy. Or are we all to settle for a prayer that “by-passes the scientific theory of color or sound” and leaps - stumbles - blindly towards a descriptive underpinning that preys on God’s patience? “Such blind leaping is inimical not only to science but to philosophy”, not only to philosophy but to prayer and to the things in the room, the Raum.

Certainly, there is anaphatic prayer, and there is an anaphatic component in all prayer and in all life: that is a key point insisted upon in *Insight* 17.1 and in **Cantower XVII**, section 1. But there is the call to kataphatic reaching that is at the heart of the move into the third stage of meaning, in the hearts of the vortex movers of “the turn to the Idea.”⁷⁴ The call is, within our axial times, in the slope, slip, sliding, cycling of vortex embarrassment, “the flowering of our catharsis”,⁷⁵ poised and pirouetting against the sanguine conclusion that “it is difficult not to import his compelling genius to the problems of this later day”.⁷⁶ How else are we to find and “be at home in transcendental method”⁷⁷, “embraced in a single coherent view.... effecting a transfiguration of human living”?⁷⁸

⁷³The title of section 4 of Chapter 19 of *Insight*.

⁷⁴Georg Simmel’s “*Die Wendung zur Idee*”, variously sublated.

⁷⁵I am bringing to minding the poem of Kavanagh, “The One” quoted in full at the conclusion of **Cantower IX**. “God is down in the swamps and marshes / Sensational as April and almost incredible / The flowering of our catharsis”.

⁷⁶The final statement of the Epilogue of *Insight*.

⁷⁷*Method in Theology*, 14.

⁷⁸*Insight*, 742[763-4].

Here, certainly, the “development of empirical human sciences has created a fundamentally new problem”⁷⁹ in our empirical residence. “Against the bias of the human subject there can be set the expansive dynamism of the object”,⁸⁰ a background radiation of the beginning fermenting forward in the physicists’ minding of every room. So we arrive at “the terminal viewpoint of the theologian”,⁸¹ “the theologian as a moment in history”,⁸² “an important moment, as the Muse at her toilet / prepared to inform the local farmers / That beautiful, beautiful, beautiful God / Was breathing His love by a cut-away bog”.⁸³

⁷⁹*Insight*, 743[765].

⁸⁰*Insight*, 744[766].

⁸¹*Insight*, 745[766].

⁸²See note 33 above.

⁸³The conclusion of the Kavanagh poem, “The One”.