

## FuSe 21      The Future of Foundations : The Issues

In this first cycle of seminars our focus has been on the general categories. But we have been realistic, and so special categories have been both operative and even discussed. Moreover, we have the advantage of the publication of **FuSe 31** in October of 2011, where my focus was on the beginning of the second cycle of seminars, dealing with Christian categories. In **FuSe 20** we have – are to have indeed, for this essay-effort follows the writing of **Fuse 31** - a communal airing of foundational stands, and my comments on the fifth seminar efforts will be included there. What I do note now and act on – others have hinted at this task – is the need both for broader comments on the way forward and for some help in using the McShane climb of the past fifty years in the movement forward.

I prefer to leave the question of help to the next seminar on metadoctrines and policies: that indeed is where it belongs. But broader comments on the way forward: that is a critical need of 2012. Let me see if I can do it some justice.

I take my lead, curiously, from what I wrote in **FuSe 31**, which focuses on the first of the seminars dealing with the special categories of Christian thinking. Today I have been thinking of the later essay, **FuSe 55**, with suggested title, “Contexts of Revelational Functional Research”. It is the first **FuSe** essay of the third cycle of seminars, seminars 17-24. It is too soon to tackle it but I would ask you to bear it in mind here. The roots of the view it is to offer lurk in the present essay. That leaves – as it were dangling - one other key seminar, number 25, of January 2017. I wrote of that last seminar previously as an open seminar: somehow a carrying forward of the project of integration: pilgrim and everlasting. It is to point ahead to more than treatise – rather a culture – lifting us globally to the psychic fullness of an eschatological perspective.

Now you – and I - might ask, “What is going on here, what is to go on in this essay, functionally?”

When Lonergan wrote his chapter on Foundations in *Method*, he was writing about the future of foundations. Sadly, he could not move forward as one writing in the realm of explanation. He could not venture forward like Wiles presenting

Fermat's Last Theorem.<sup>1</sup> Recall his optimistic sketching of the summer of 1953: "They are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint."<sup>2</sup> The way of pure formulations was closed to him. So he wrote in a way that might be called the style of *haute vulgarization*, or might be thought of in my terminology as C<sub>9</sub> : an output of the functional specialty Communications to a particular audience.<sup>3</sup>

"What is going on here, functionally?" Pretty much the same sort of thing, except more luminously for you and me than it was for Lonergan and his audience in the 1970s. Let me, however, skip on without comment on that, and do what I have to do. Like Lonergan's Damon Runyon character, I am doing what I can.<sup>4</sup>

Let me go back to his beginning of the book *Method*, and assume that you recall his problem and my view of his problem.<sup>5</sup> Focus on the statement, "a method is a normative pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results."<sup>6</sup> Our struggles in the previous seminars give us a faint impression of how far away we are from that in the zones in which Lonergan had

---

<sup>1</sup> As I worked on this essay I was also struggling with various groups regarding the economics of Lonergan, finding the usual difficulties of getting the folks to settle down to a first class in economics. The struggle helped me to grip with fresh luminousness the huge cultural problem of general bias and *haute vulgarization*. Might I add some pointers in this essay **to bring the issue into focus**? Well, we'll see: but you might keep cheerfully in mind the puzzle of why bold-face is used for those six words. Re Fermat and Lonergan: pages 12-16 of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas* (Axial Publishing, 2010) bring out the parallels and the problems. The biography is referred to below as **Bernard Lonergan**.

<sup>2</sup> *Insight*, 602.

<sup>3</sup> I am hovering in the problem mentioned in note one, indeed in the title which surely raises the issue of the meaning of issues? (The reader who paused over that issue in a first reading is crazily exceptional.) Lonergan is quite clear and blunt about *haute vulgarization*: sample his remarks in *CWL* 6, 121,155. The issue I would like you to attend to is the person who "is never bitten by theory, and has no apprehension, no understanding, for example, of the fact that Newton spent weeks in his room in which he barely bothered looking at his food, while he was working out the theory of universal gravitation" (*CWL* 6, 155). This failure is, with fresh brutal contemplative luminosity in this week of my struggle, to be considered a central characterization of the entire Lonergan movement.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 253.

<sup>5</sup> His problem was the subject of chatting with me in his lonely room on the sixth floor of the Bayview Regis College in 1966. How could he start *Method in Theology*? I had no suggestion about how to get *Insight* in there. My view? When I got to indexing *Method* in November 1971 I felt that he did a neat job with his notes on pages 286-7, and with his comment on page 260: "one has not only to read *Insight* but ...". In later years I have appreciated more and more his brutal and funny paragraph in the middle of page 287. It seems to me that the Lonergan school find these references and that paragraph .... Well, should I say that they have yet to find the issue in them?

<sup>6</sup> *Method*, 4; in italics on page 5.

labored. In particular I remind you of the tasks sketched brilliantly by him on *Method*, page 250. I recall, in one of the *Quodlibets*,<sup>7</sup> comparing this page to a medieval monk describing, in brilliant and obscure brevity, the scientific revolution of five centuries ahead.

It is evident to me now that the future of foundations is a much larger and subtler task than that sketched so ambivalently in *Method*. But that large task, like the scientific revolution, has to emerge as an achievement before it can be defined with serious luminosity.<sup>8</sup> So, again, we may muse, “What is going on here, functionally?”

We are stumbling around together in foundations, as shabby foundations, prior to any serious “cumulative and progressive results,”<sup>9</sup> and I am puttering along here descriptively, in fantasy land.

But note that I am fulfilling one of the two key functions of foundational thinking – they being [1] adding cycling momentum [2] fantasizing additions to that momentum.

The structure of the 25 seminars points to such a fantasy.<sup>10</sup> Here I allow myself to ramble round that fantasy, leading us to the suspicion, indeed to some conviction,<sup>11</sup> that that full fantasy is within the reach of general categories.

---

<sup>7</sup>I began my struggle with *Method* 250 by brooding over the page, and inviting a sharing of that brooding, in 8 SOFDAWARES [self-cultivating us as “Structure Of Dialectic” Awares]. The 21 *Quodlibets* followed, most of them dealing with facets of that same page. The issue you have is, not the finding of the reference but the fostering of a strange and strained straining fantasy of my strange fantasy.

<sup>8</sup>In the context of notes 1, 3, and 5, do you have a niggling suspicion that there is a shift to be made to a new culture of contemplative living that is deeply, molecularly, beyond present fantasy? Strange issues are to emerge in these coming millennia, and in the next million years. On the difficulties of conceiving heuristically even of the beginnings of this move, see my Website Book of 2007, *Method in Theology. Refinements and Implementations*, chapter 10, “Metaphysical Equivalence and Functional Specialization”.

<sup>9</sup>See note 6 above.

<sup>10</sup>There is a great deal of neurochemistry to be done on the invariants of creative fantasy. At present I can only alert readers to the massive challenge lurking in the first word of “**indicating** the view that would result from developing” (*Method in Theology*, 250, line 26). This is where the *per se* shift is demanded of the solitary dialectician, reaching forward to hand a front-running baton to the foundational person who is already at the pace of the cycle and picks up the baton without looking back. A loving belief is to be the air, the heir, of the present race. As the cycle of global omnidisciplinary collaboration grips our guts so the caring Tower will cyclically relish itself as a group that are “linked together in charity to the joyful, courageous, wholehearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by world order” (*Insight*, 745), and “possess a high reputation for

Why did Lonergan envisage two volumes in 1952: *Insight* and *Faith and Insight*?<sup>12</sup> Because theology, as he painfully knew it, had no up-to-date general categories, nor did it show any interest in them. Ho ho nor, I add with a sad non-laugh, does Lonerganism as yet show any serious interest. Think now: is the previous sentence foundational? The foundational meaning pivots on the words *as yet*. I am making a normative foundational statement about the future of Lonerganism [ho ho again, but more cheerily and cheekily: of its demise :> ) ].

But the general categories are to be a global business; one might think of them as a secular creation. In doing so one would be wrong: but that is another story! Aspects of that error are to be displayed, self-tasted, in what follows. What follows is a focus on the special categories. For Lonergan in 1952 there was the second volume, which would have handled foundational issues of theology swept up – by him, quite alone – into the context of the general categories. Would he have handled, or aimed to handle heuristically, all the issues of our seminars 9-25? I cannot say. I recall asking him about eschatology in 1961: his humorous reply was that he left the difficult problems to other people.

I remarked in the previous paragraph that his treatment of the issues<sup>13</sup> would have been foundational had he been allowed to venture into the second volume: functional specialization was still over a decade away, to emerge from his searchings for a solution to the problem of cosmopolis. But now we are standing on his shoulders, and we can handle the special categories differently within foundations, although here it is to be pop-foundations, minimally informed.

---

intellectual integrity" (*ibid.*, 734), and that possessive integrity is to blossom into a radiant common sense through a sublation of *haute vulgarization*. The reference to page 734 of *Insight* here brings us into the context of the dynamics of belief, a dynamics which is to change radically in the third stage of meaning with its new strange lift of adult growth and elderhood.

<sup>11</sup> There is too much to say about the undeveloped Position of *Insight* 413. The invitation there is slight, and elementary, and eventually it is to blossom into a rich axiomatics, an axiomatics which is to include axioms of intentionality, of infinity, of incompleteness. Some hints are given in this essay and elsewhere. Above I am making a single point: that the Position accepted is a choice of life-bent.

<sup>12</sup> I am recall a letter of Lonergan to Eric O'Connor in July 1952. The letter is reproduced on page 156 of **Bernard Lonergan**.

<sup>13</sup> You should, I hope, find a fresh and startling reading issue by grappling with the strange meaning of *issue* that is emerging. You might think of the word's roots in **ex-ire** expanded through twists of ingoings through and beyond common meanings to tones of the meanings of **exigence**.

First, then, recall that I regularly add, on *Method 287*, a (10) to the list of (9) zones. The addition includes the book, *Method in Theology*, method in Christian theology, and you can take as context of that addition and interest the later essay here, **Fuse 31**. But now we reach for a broader view of functional collaboration, such as I envisage in *Method in Theology : Revisions and Implementations*.<sup>14</sup> the collaboration is not restricted to Christian theology, or indeed to any particular discipline.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, in the first chapter of that book I talk optimistically of a minimalist view of collaboration that fits nicely within a decent statistics of scheme-emergence, exemplified by such efforts as the present reachings for a unified ecology.

But let us not get into that for the moment. Think, rather, of our seminar efforts. Then you can appreciate that our interests are (seminars 9-16) in special categories of Christian theology and (seminars 17-24) in special categories of global revelatory religiosity. Pause now over that question of interest, and I would also have you pause over the seminar and seminal fact that that interest is practical: we are shifting into the culture of **Praxis**. We are interested in special categories: and is that interest not foundational in the general categorical sense?

This may not seem to be a simple question. Yet when we consider that general categories relate to facts of the cosmos and human ventures, it seems quite evident that one cannot ignore the human ventures that are claims to grave meaning from beyond. Foundations in the sense that we are limiting the interest in these first eight seminars reach, then, necessarily and normatively, towards a heuristics of claims of meaning reaching to us from a beyond in a way that is beyond the divine reachings that we have grappled with in chapter 19 of *Insight*.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> I am thinking mainly here of the pointers of the first chapter there towards omnidisciplinary fermentations. See, for another twist, the next note.

<sup>15</sup> There is way of lifting what seem to be purely secular commitments to disciplinary authenticities that lifts the intussusception of such authenticities into the zone of critical method, "method with respect to the ultimate" (*Insight*, 708). Recall Paul Tillich, *Ultimate Concern* (London, SCM, 1968, 8) about asking people with no apparent ultimate concern, " 'is there really nothing at all that you take with unconditioned seriousness?' "

<sup>16</sup> Notice the odd challenge of the **we** here. In what sense might one claim that this chapter – so abused at the Florida Conference of 1970 – is the neglected amygdalic heart of human history, the core of sane poise?

So, (10) in my list includes the heuristics of such claims and reachings.<sup>17</sup> Note that this bears on the legitimacy of including chapter 20 of *Insight in Insight*.

But what, now, of **FuSe 31**? It points to a normative heuristics of Christian claims and practices. But, unlike chapter 20 of *Insight*, it is not a delicate heuristic dance. It is an *a posteriori* venture: drawing as best one can on the suggestiveness of the beyond-claims of the Christian tradition. And the same might be said of a **FuSe 55**, in so far as it emerges, not from me or from some other Christian, but from someone living within a particular tradition of beyond-claims.

Obviously, there is a genus of special categories, or more particularly a genus of special categorical methods. And these are to involve species and varieties. But how are these apparently different genera entwined? I might put this question in a more familiar context by recalling Robley Whitson's *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*.<sup>18</sup> Might there be such a phenomenon as the coming convergence of religious methodologies?

There are various ways of thinking of this problem or this convergence. In **FuSe 31** I focus on the metaword **W<sub>3</sub>**, which begins by identifying being as **3P + the sum of finite beings**, but in the reflections there I talk of the **3** shifting to **n** in a broader perspective, where **n** may be any number – might it not be fractional or even decimal? – between zero and an unclassified infinity.<sup>19</sup> The simplest context of those reflections would be that arrived at in section 9 of *Insight* 19: “in the twenty-sixth place God is personal”. The Christian tradition moves on to a 27<sup>th</sup> place, neatly corresponding to Thomas's 27<sup>th</sup> Question in the *Summa Theologica*, which leads to 3 Divine Persons.

And one can push further here. Indeed, it is as well to bring in immediately a positional axiom of incompleteness that should dominate our moleculed thinking, one that focuses on incompleteness, an incompleteness, so to speak, at the

---

<sup>17</sup> Note that this bears also on the legitimacy of including chapter 20 of *Insight in Insight*.

<sup>18</sup> New York: Newman, 1971.

<sup>19</sup> One might start here from *CWL* 18, the index on *Infinite and Infinity*. *Exigence* is already a topic there. You may correctly suspect that notes 19, 20 and 21 wind round the Cloud of Onknowing to which this essay drives, with which it ends. Is the suspicion not the issue, the odd infinity in you?

opposite end of being from that considered by Goedel.<sup>20</sup> It is an axiom of incompleteness that stands on the incomprehensibility of the Divine in relation to any finite mind.<sup>21</sup> There is a puzzle about this which should not delay us here, but it is as well to mention it: to what extent is this axiom one within the axiomatics of general categorical thinking? At all events, the axiom places the achievement of an answer to the question, What is God, beyond the range of chemical spirit.

How far beyond the range?

Here, alas, another foundational axiom enters the stage of our personal *acquis*. It is an axiom that regards the life-growth dynamics of chemical spirit. I have been thinking about it and writing about it in various ways since early efforts in *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*, a book written in rather crazy solitude in Oxford, 1988-89, but there I point back to the late 1950s when the problem bubbled up in my study of the meaning of the growth of meaning as Thomas puzzled over it.<sup>22</sup> What could I possibly write here and now of further effective significance? Should I appeal – as I have done on numerous occasions – to the growth dynamics, and the expression thereof, of people like Beethoven or George Eliot, Georg Sand or Merce Cunningham, to help my pointing along? Should I bring you back to Maslow’s pessimism about less than 1% of adults growing? Or perhaps further ramblings about my own last decades of climbing would help? But that last topic is the central topic of the next essay, **FuSe 22**, “Contexts of Functional Doctrines”.

A little autobiographical ramble, in that last paragraph and continued here, surely helps some, as I shift now, in and out of autobiography, to a blunt statement of the issue<sup>23</sup> that would weave into a later axiomatic pragmatics. The issue, then, is

---

<sup>20</sup> Goedel’s work is the central topic of chapter 1 of *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*.

<sup>21</sup>No need for details here on Thomas’s view of the incomprehensibility of the Divine Essence to any finite mind, even the human mind of Jesus. But there is need for a great deal of work in the future on the character of incompleteness, ourselves as issues of incompleteness, moving everlastingly in a contented surprising denial of Paul’s “knowing as we are known” ( **I Cor 13 : 12**).

<sup>22</sup>I write of this in section 2.0 of the website book (1990) *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*. The text in Thomas mentioned is *Quaestio Disputata, De Virtutibus in Communi*, a.11.

<sup>23</sup>All along here, in your reading, the issue has been the self-reading of the issue that is you. Note 23 here echos another note 23 of nearly twenty years ago, the central note of a strange cyclic set of 45 notes of “Turners. Strategist of Survival. The Legacy of Lonergan,” which is the middle chapter of *The Redress of Poise*.

the utter remoteness of the Idea of Being from any being except the being that is the Idea of Being. Perhaps it helps a little to say that the issue is at the heart of two seemingly different chapters of *Insight*: chapters 17 and chapters 19. Chapter 19 ends where chapter 17 begins: with the problem of mystery and nescience. It is over fifty years since I began my struggle with these chapters, and I struggled again these days in contemplative hope. But there lies a large foundational difficulty regarding the pilgrim genetics of chemical spirit. I could be brief with the results of my present struggle only if my audience was up to date and up to age.

“Up to date” should not be a troublesome notion. It may recall for some Lonergan and y Gaset talking of being up to the level of the times, but it means the usual demands in any topic.<sup>24</sup> You need to be up-to-date in any particular zone to follow seriously an advanced lecture. But what do I mean by “up to age”? This refers to an axiom of normative adult growth in heuristic searching. An early expression of it in this decade was the final few pages of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, where I try to image normative acceleration. One image there that might be helpful at present is that of the uniformly expanding balloon; the uniform expansion goes with a non-uniform increase in volume of air per unit expansion: got that? Or I suggest the image of the curve  $y = x^2$ , giving the same impression of increase: the curve climbs. Think of this personally: so advancing that you are leaving yourself **increasingly** behind week by week. It seems quite crazy: “I am a stranger to myself of last week, and increasingly stranger than for the previous week-gap.” Furthermore – is it not obvious? – I could not illuminate myself of last week about it in a quiet hour’s chat or performance. My claim is that this axiom and reality is to become increasingly normal and evident and normative as we move beyond the axial horror of “less than 1% of adults grow”. It is to have extraordinary significance in the entire dynamics of human communications.

---

<sup>24</sup>“Arriving in Cosmopolis” (2011: available in the Archives section of my website) returns to this topic, and to the problem of a maturing humanity. It has become shockingly clearer to me, since writing the essay six months ago, that up-to-dateness requires a deep luminous sense of history. Think of the problem of being up-to-date in economic science, when at present there is no such science? *Insight* notes that the simplest science, physics, gives us leads to our humanity. But we need communally to follow up on this luminosity so that legitimate refreshing chemical darkness is spread over all our talk, protecting us in our gropings towards the real issues.

The advantage of the rambling expression of the previous paragraph is that it helps, I do hope, to give acceptable commonsense pointers to a remote foundational fantasy-axiom. A later role of foundational reaching is to breath forth such axioms in full explanatory mode. This is an ontogenetic axiom and it has its phyletic mate, which I leave to you to muse over: Newton, for all his genius, would be quite lost at a serious contemporary lecture in astronomy, indeed at a serious lecture on advanced calculus.

Both these foggy axioms come to play – and will come to stay in a century – when we talk of Lonergan’s foundational reaching. Or when we hear *Insight* talk of that reaching. Or when I talk of the twining of the first part of *Insight* 17 with the last couple of pages of *Insight* 19. And best here to skip over the odd problem of Lonergan of 1966<sup>25</sup> talking to the Lonergan who wrote those two chapters in the summer of 1953! The Lonergan of 1953 is trouble enough, and that simple trouble nudges me to the foundational claim that Lonergan of 1953 lacked entirely an audience that was up to date and up to age.

So here we are reading that final page of *Insight* 19. “What, then, is critical method? It is method with respect to the ultimate.” Certainly you can hold to the words of the 1966 Lonergan, so that critical method now is to be strangely eightfold as it luminously controls and “contains in a general form the combinations of the empirical and the critical attitudes essential to human science.”<sup>26</sup> What, THEN,<sup>27</sup> is critical method after our “Arrival in Cosmopolis”?<sup>28</sup> It is a global radiance of perhaps 250 million Tower persons embracing 10 billion contemporary pilgrims. “We have described myth as an untutored effort of the

---

<sup>25</sup> In the previous note I talked of protection. The problem that haunted Lonergan’s puzzling with me in 1966 was fundamentally protecting his new reach from the sick side of *haute vulgarization*. He failed in that. He had been failing in that, indeed, indeed, from 1958 on. For me, the Halifax lectures are symbolical of a quiet yielding to what is despicable, his meaning shrunken by untutored academic minds. The tutoring to seriousness of climbing in science, and climbing towards adulthood: who might possibly do that? History and the Beyond are to do this: we are certainly here at “the problem of general history, which is the real catch” (*Topics in Education*, 236).

<sup>26</sup> The quotation concludes the third last paragraph of *Insight* chapter 7.

<sup>27</sup> The capitalization points back to **Cantower 5**, “Metaphysics THEN”, where there is a push for a longer-term view, resonating with moods of Ezra Pound and Samuel Beckett: the bottom of the first note there has what is probably the final short poem of Beckett, worth adding: ‘go end there / where never till then / till as much as to say / no matter where / no matter when

<sup>28</sup> I refer, of course, to the lecture of that title from 2011, available on the usual website, under **Archives**.

desire to know, to grasp and formulate the nature of things. In the measure that such an effort tries to free itself from its fetters, myth attains an allegorical significance.”<sup>29</sup> So Lonergan ends *Insight* 17, section 1.5 and moves to our topic here, “1.6 *The Notion of Mystery*”.

Is, was, this really our topic here, all along? What, after all and before all, are you and I on about here? What issue is the issue? I began my wind-up of my little book of 1974<sup>30</sup> with chapter 10’s title “The Notion of Survival”, you and I as such notions, oceans, and I climbed on through an odd Epilogue, titled “Being and Loneliness” to its concluding words “Infinite Surprise.” What was I on about then, and what now, in a re-read, a re-run, a re-crawl, call, caul? “Skin-within are molecules of cos me c all, cauled, calling.”<sup>31</sup>

So, I twist and turn my contexts, our contexts, thinking of, and asking you to think of, the 100 billion notions of mystery and survival of the past, and of the many billions of the future – might it not be endless?<sup>32</sup> - a genus that is indeed a genus of special categories, each quadrillion-molecular-tale, Q-M-T, caught in its little timespace yet cosmicapturing and being-hunting.<sup>33</sup>

Where is all this call leading us, Q-M-T, here now in our general categorial foundational ramble-scramble?

It could lead you to view with lonely delight a fantasy within of the beginning of the 25<sup>th</sup> seminar, indeed the beginning of The End that does not end.

---

<sup>29</sup> *Insight*, 569.

<sup>30</sup> *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations: Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*. Available now free-of-charge on my Website.

<sup>31</sup> *Lack in the Beingstalk*, 66.

<sup>32</sup> You may recall Thomas Aquinas’ reflections on the infinite in, so to speak, the other direction. See *Summa Theologica, Pars Prima*, q.46, a.7, ad 7m for his tricky thinking. The thinking forward is not so tricky, but it opens up to intriguing eschatological questions – or should I say **issues**?!

<sup>33</sup> Being-hunting should be twisted into two of Lonergan’s previous reachings: his searchings in *De Ente Supernaturali* (1946) and his struggle with the meaning of **exigence** (1957) in *Phenomenology and Logic*.

And it helps to go back and re-read, turn Q-M Tale on self to find, not yet read, previous pointers here, and pointers in *Method*.<sup>34</sup> Read, then, THEN, and someHOW always for the first time:

“Obviously, there is a genus of special categories, or more particularly a genus of special categorical methods. And these are to involve species and varieties. But how are these apparently different genera entwined? I might put this question in a more familiar context by recalling Robley Whitson’s *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*.<sup>35</sup> Might there be such a phenomenon as the coming convergence of religious methodologies?”

And might we, in the strangeness of the pilgrim cycling of a critical method, find an ever-coming convergence of each religious methodologist, each M-T-Q, each empty quest, weaving home<sup>36</sup> into a secretly claimed and named **u**, whether **u** be Hindu or Zulu, and the You of **W**<sub>3</sub> a wonderous cloud of onknowing ?

---

<sup>34</sup> The **issue**, to use that word again, is to re-issue the stumbling words of *Method in Theology*, so as to rewrite it ingestively, each of us, all of us, finding that we are the “cumulative and progressive results.” (*Method in Theology*, 4).

<sup>35</sup> New York: Newman, 1971.

<sup>36</sup> I am weaving, round, in my usual carefree scripting, **Revelations** 2 : 17, with an intimation of the secretly marked chemical aggregates, personalized stones. Thomas puzzled about the intelligibility of stones in his commentary on chapter one of **John** : you might well leap to note 45 of *Verbum* chapter 1, and sense a stranger explanatory route from there to the “Eo Magis Unum” of *Verbum*’s last chapter. **HOW**, indeed, we weave on in the **Home Of Wonder**, everlastingly, surprisingly contented in incompleteness : that is the question of **HOW** we fit into Double You Three; that is the issue’s issue.