

N.T. Wright on Resurrection: the Problem of Initial Meanings¹

The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History raised a range of questions for readers but key early ones turned on my view of initial meanings² and related remarks about N. T. Wright's work.³ Because of this it occurred to me that I might well get seriously into the letters and the career of Paul the Apostle and move forward slowly through 2016 towards a solid indication of the place of Paul's meaning in a genetic systematics of Christian meaning. Eventually, however, I cut back to a short pointing to a general way into this central piece of the new culture through focusing on one work of N. T. Wright.⁴ But it would be more helpful, in our present context, to do some further suggesting about "a third way, difficult and laborious"⁵ that haunts that pointing. So, I finally

¹ A first version of this single essay moved into being a series of essays. Not only is the zone of scripture study worthy of such lengthy treatment, but also such a longer treatment would open the door to seeing how the slim heuristics of the Standard Model (see section 3 of [FuSe 4](#), "Contexts of Functional Interpretation" on the standard model as FS + UV +GS) would enter into any initial effort at functional collaboration. However, such an expansion would lead us away from the objective of this series of March 2016 essays – 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 – to get people – especially those at the Boston Workshop meeting of Saturday June 25, 2016 – to attend to the last 16 lines of *Method* 250, with a focus on the question, "What is my effective stand of functional collaboration?" The missing treatment, I hope, will become the nudge towards the collaborative efforts suggested in [LonerGAN Gatherings 1](#).

² See *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, note 24 on page 51, note 23 on page 145 and note 4 on page 223 (note 61 there refers to the aforementioned note 24: it is the 61st note of chapter 4). This book is referred to later as *Allure*. One may ask about the relation of between initial meanings and commonsense meaning. The answer is quite beyond common sense. Common sense can read seriously the two chapters on common sense in *Insight*, and end up with a solemn organized set of initial meanings.

³ See *Allure*, 122-3, 129, 217.

⁴ N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 2003. This is the third of three volumes on *Christian Origins and The Question of God*. Volume one was *The New Testament and the People of God*; volume 2: *Jesus and the Victory of God*.

⁵ *Method in Theology*, 4.

settled for two parts in this single essay: one suitably called *Context*, the other simply titled *Resurrection*. There is no problem in you going directly to that second part. But, please, bear in mind as much as possible our present context, by which I mean the context of the six essays posted here on March 1st 2016, essays 6–11. That context is quite simply my challenge to the Lonergan leadership that is to gather after the Boston Workshop on Saturday morning, June 25th, 2016. Both parts will, I hope, lead to the exchanges intended by this series, and I would note that the second part here, while seemingly focused on scripture studies, is so focused as to leave behind any of the spectrum of meanings associated with the phrase *sola scriptura*. Indeed, my attempt there can help us all towards a decent initial shot at functional work, thus generating an initial meaning of it, a swing into the cycles of effective global care.

1. Context

Am I being tiresome in mentioning once again page 4 of *Method in Theology*? Yet, it is clear to me that it is a difficult and laborious task to read that page. It is a massive task of our culture to recycle those first four paragraphs. Part of that task is reading seriously the first page of *Insight*, or something equivalent: join either Archimedes or someone else who faced a serious scientific challenge. At the other extreme from Archimedes I could put someone like Fermat: Why is $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$ so extraordinarily different from $x^3 + y^3 = z^3$? Or I might invite you to try for a glimpse of the shift of a tradition, like that of the shift from Faraday's gallant puttering to the emergence of Maxwell's equations. Or I might, in homely and discomfoting fashion, nudge you back to the apparently simple problem of chapter one of *The Allure of the Compelling*

Genius of History that asks about how many ways one can seat n couples round a table.⁶

How many wonderful ways can hundreds of billions of couples be seated round the table of the eternal banquet of resurrection? And is not the answer something that dances delightfully round the molecular minding of the Risen Jesus? And does not the worth of the answer to that issue of secondary determinations not pivot on the grip on the part of the field⁷ that is the what of **Risen**, of *resurrection*? Am I not here, like Faraday, introducing a field problem when Maxwell is a distant hope?

So, back I bring you to muse over N. T. Wright's book, or if you prefer only to those letters of Paul significant for pushing forward a what-question about the Risen Jesus and our resurrection destiny.

But here we face the crisis highlighted in the previous essay. Let me snatch a paragraph from that essay to get us poised, to get you to begin to see what is meant by *pushing forward a what-question about the Risen Jesus and our resurrection destiny*.

So perhaps I can come back to that statement of Pierre Trudeau, "Just watch me." I reduce the watching of me to a plea to listen to me during a single meeting, the Boston Saturday Gathering on June 25, 2016, which ends the 43rd Annual Lonergan Workshop. I appeal to the group to watch those

⁶ *Allure*, 12–13.

⁷ My regular reference here is to *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 199: "The field is *the* universe, but my horizon defines *my* universe." I note, however, a deep problem in this present context by referring to the challenge of *Method in Theology*, chapter 7, "Interpretation," section 2, "Understanding the Object." One needs a decent grip on the standard model (see note 1 above), especially in its W_3 symbolization, to home in on the referents of Christian scripture. On referents and their meaning see below, at note 30.

sixteen lines of *Method in Theology* that I have called his *1833 Overture*.⁸

And I had best follow that quotation by quoting the sixteen lines, breaking them into what I would like you to think of, to pause and think of, as four movements in a symphony.

Horizons.

The results, accordingly, will not be uniform. But the source of this lack of uniformity will be brought into the open when each investigator proceeds to distinguish between positions, which are compatible with intellectual, moral and religious conversion and, on the other hand, counter-positions, which are incompatible either with intellectual, or with moral, or with religious conversion.

A further objectification of horizons is obtained when each observer operates on the materials by indicating the view that would result from developing what he regards as positions and by reversing what he has regarded as counterpositions.

There is a final objectification of horizon when the results of the foregoing process are themselves regarded as material, when they are assembled, completed, compared, reduced, classified, selected, when positions and counter-positions are distinguished, when positions and developed and counter-positions reversed.⁹

The first movement is the single word which begins the sixteen line overture: "Horizon." It is a massively symphonic chord, a cord to *cor* word, reaching to your heart: how does your heart string and sing?

"Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company."¹⁰ I am really not being impolite when the word *polite* is taken in the deeper

⁸ Generating a community that begins to read these lines, and that within a fantasy of interpersonal operations, is the goal of these March 2016 essays.

⁹ *Method in Theology*, 250: the last 16 lines, broken into four paragraphs.

¹⁰ *Method in Theology*, 299.

authentic sense of the first paragraph of the Aristotelian *Magna Moralia*, but yes, the doctrine of reading in the previous paragraph is embarrassing. Indeed, the doctrine of those 16 lines of Lonergan are a deep source of embarrassment. Is that, one may ask, why the entire page 250 of *Method in Theology* has been consistently avoided or misread?¹¹

But let me be less stressful about the three paragraphs that follow. We can be happy enough about the present reading if you notice them thus: [1] state your position—perhaps to yourself only at this stage—your view about the range and reach of minding the New Testament; [2] state where you expect that position, adopted by us, would lead us in the future; [3] finally, run your statements, and mine, and, say, those of Wright—or attributable to him if he does not join in the chat—about these four paragraphs through the process of the four paragraphs.

[3] is a marvelous piece of Lonergan’s genius. Earlier in the book he writes that “the more the historian has been at pains not to conceal his tracks,”¹² but here he pitches in a precise methodology of disclosing tracks, with perhaps embarrassment and indeed nerve-racking discomfort. It is not a little disturbing to be informed methodologically that you are very much on a wrong or an outdated track: as we shall find here that N. T. Wright is. Find? The finding is a long climb, beyond our present intent.¹³ We only putter with initial meanings when I claim that, e.g., Wright does not have the horizon of section 2, “understanding the object,” of the seventh chapter of *Method in Theology*, most

¹¹ *Lonergan Gatherings* 10, “Some Notes on the Development of Method, Page 250,” by Pat Brown, deals with that topic.

¹² *Method in Theology*, 193.

¹³ The issue of course, is your long-term intent regarding this page, these paragraphs. It is not that you need to push into their project, but might you make this “conversion a topic and so promote it”? *Method in Theology*, 253. Say – recalling the drive of the previous essay – at the 43rd Annual Lonergan Workshop meeting at Boston College on June 25, 2016?

especially when it is placed in the challenge of a scientific interpretation that is locked in that brilliant paragraph of Lonergan that I name 60910.¹⁴

But I wish to postpone further detailed musing on Wright's magnificent work: such shared musings will benefit from the context of *Lonergan Gatherings* 14: "Refining Our Quest for the Historical Jesus." This, of course, does not prevent you, if you have his book or some equivalent work, from moving through his 800 pages to search out what his meaning of *resurrection* is.

My challenge in these essays of March 2016 is, however, to raise the question of facing the task of the 1833 Overture effectively in the Lonergan community.

It should be a help, in doing this, to see how the Overture lifts the strategy of *Insight*. Certainly it gives a new focus to the strategy of "cajoling or forcing attention."¹⁵ The cajoling and forcing is a public communal one, precisely structured. You may want to think out that new precision in terms of the "basic novelty"¹⁶ of *Insight's* weavings that "rest on a strategy of breakthrough, encirclement, confinement."¹⁷

Here the strategy is lifted into a magnificent methodology of refining and advancing foundations persons. The community of dialecticians face each other, "at pains not to conceal but to lay all ...",¹⁸ all their stumbling foundational hopes, out in a ferment that is to lead to a further blossoming of a communal horizon. One could pause contemplatively over the final word of the page, as we have paused over the final word of the previous page—*Assembly*—and will pause more adequately in Lonergan Gatherings 16, "(Reviewing)³

¹⁴ It is the paragraph that brings us from *Insight* 609 to the next page.

¹⁵ *Insight*, 423.

¹⁶ *Insight*, 545, line 16.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, line 20. The strategy was introduced on *Insight* 508–9 and further commented on at the conclusion of *Insight* 593.

¹⁸ *Method in Theology*, 193.

'living human bodies linked in charity,'¹⁹ in the Context of the 2015 Lonergan Philosophical Society Gathering [October 8–11, ACPA, in Boston]." Here the word of interest is *reversed*. Reversed, not just haphazardly, but in global ways that is to model-shift the focused fantasies of foundational persons, fantasies about the detailed reorientation of education and world banking, the rescue of Palestine²⁰ and Tibet,²¹ the follow-up to Putin's kleptocracy, the metafracking of fracking on steroids, etc. etc.²²

And a further help is to see the strategy in action. It is as well to contextualize this added help by noting that page 250 describes a strategy of refined recycling. What is assembled is, in later stages, to be possible and probable refinements of progress in caring for meaning, for the symphonic meaning of Jesus. The assembled's author may not be present, indeed may be long dead:

¹⁹ *Insight*, 745.

²⁰ For a broad balanced perspective see Ari Shavit, *My Promised Land: The Triumph and Tragedy of Israel* (New York, Spiegel and Grau, 2013). An enlightened effort at patterning "the conflict and the wars and the stress and all the shit of this country" *Op. cit.*, 300.

²¹ See Michael Buckley, *Meltdown in Tibet: China's Reckless Destruction of Ecosystems from the Highlands of Tibet to the Deltas of Asia* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

²² My listing may be a surprise. Its reaching calls for a stressful communal molecular effort of fantasy in regard to "the genetic cycle." *Early Works on Theological Method 1*, CWL 22, 140. "That genetic process does not occur once. It occurs over and over again." *Ibid.* The power of the new structured collaboration, a global cosmopolis "cajoling and forcing" (*Insight*, 423) governments and educators and bankers out of sedate evil, will be slow to emerge. Our problem is the courage of beginning, taking the road to Lonergan's dream as he quoted *Isaiah 2: 2-4*, about spears replacing sickles. "Is this to be taken literally or is it figure? It would be fair and fine, indeed, to think it no figure." These words conclude his very relevant "Essay in Fundamental Sociology" of 1934. (see note 22). I appeal to serious Lonergan people to reach for its meaning. Think of him then—30 years before his leap to the effective project of replacing liberalism and nationalism ("a tribal god": *op. cit.*, 32) and armaments empires (*ibid.*, 27ff) by a functional Cosmopolis of global care)—brooding over a "turn to the philosophic estimate of the future." *Ibid.*, 30. What would he have thought then of "[Arriving in Cosmopolis](#)" in 9011 A.D.? What do you think of it now, as it was sketched by my younger self a decade ago in the essay of that name?

think of the sublation of the refinements suggested by Schiller.²³ But if the author is alive then the strategy emerges as a comforting or discomfoting invitation to participate, to whirl into the 1833 Overture. Here I think, sadly, of a large community of Lonergan authors to whom I could extend the discomfoting invitation, and a smaller community who would be comforted by my stand, twirled out of the last lines of *Method in Theology* page 250.

Here, then, I dare take a stand on a leading Lonergan scholar's work. Bob Doran is one of the very few who pays any attention to the problem of functional specialization. In a previous essay I took a non-structured critical stand on his recent work, *The Trinity on History: A Theology of the Divine Missions*.²⁴ Here I assemble his implicit take on what I call Lonergan's 1833 Overture.

I am not going to tackle his lengthy discussion or the manner in which he splits Foundations and slides over the 1833 Overture. I simply invite you for the moment to pause over two of his statements.

A. "It is my position that all theological operations are embraced in this list of the set of tasks."²⁵

²³ See his *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, translated by Reginald Snell, Frederick Unger Publishing Company, New York, 1965: see e.g. page 137, quoted in [Cantower 9](#), "Position, Poosition, Protopossession," page 19. Recall also the powerful context of Lonergan's early writing, "Essay in Fundamental Sociology," *Lonergan's Early Economic Research*, edited by Michael Shute, University of Toronto Press, 2010, 15-44. "The function of progress is to increase leisure, that men may have more time to learn ... and finally, I am not certain 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." *Op. cit.*, 42-43.

²⁴ University of Toronto Press, 2012. This is the first volume, "Volume 1: Missions and Processions." Cited below as *Trinity I*.

²⁵ *Trinity I*, 111.

B. “Fifth, there is an entirely different set of operations involved when the theologian turns from stating what others said and done to providing the grounds for their own positions. I call this operational specialty Horizons.”²⁶

Might you take my invitation seriously, and thus, enter, in a loose sense,²⁷ the 1833 Overture?

Doran has taken a position: so we can assume that he is in there. Are you in there? If you are, then as you work through the “further objectification” and the “final objectification” you could find that “the entirely different set of operations” from—according to Doran—those of dialectic, are in fact in there too. So, Doran misses the point of those concluding lines of dialectic work, and goes on to invent an extra specialty. His list of specialties includes “Horizons” floating uneasily over the other eight of Lonergan.

Oddly, though, this specialty is not arrived at by Doran as a split in Dialectic work but in foundational operations. He goes on to his positional statement of **“Thesis 14: *The functional specialty that Lonergan calls Foundations should thus be divided into two functional specialties. The specialty called “Horizons” stands outside the other eight.*”**²⁸

My position, as I wind down through the 1833 Overture, is that all this bundles together a variety of oversights that need to be thematically sorted out in the further and final objectifications. But no more hinting is relevant here. Despite our difference, Bob and I push forward towards some move into a new

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 110.

²⁷ My *Futurology Express* (Axial Publishers, 2013), chapter 8, “Critical Paws,” helps towards beginning moves.

²⁸ Trinity I, 112. The bold-face and the italics are his. I end the thesis abruptly so as to avoid further confusing pointers regarding the concrete universal. Those pointers would seem to point to Doran missing the point of the meaning of *Comparison*, a meaning which solves Lonergan’s search (*Insight*, 763-4) for the place in theology of the treatise on the mystical body.

theology. He has the courage to face the problem of the meaning of functional specialization. The rest of the Lonergan leadership are content to putter along eruditely in old channels. Their disciples seem settled in continuing the dodgy allegiance to old ineffective ways.

What is relevant is that you begin to suspect that the positioning of Lonergan on page 250 of *Method in Theology* is way beyond you and could well escape you as it did Doran. The fullness of that positioning, of course, pushes for a refined differentiated genetic structuring of systematics that is sadly absent in Doran's effort. It is also absent, of course, in the massive effort of Wright, whose work weaves forward in secondary determinations that give an apparent enriched meaning to the communal initial meaning of the fact of resurrection. So we arrive at our key elementary venture into Wright's volume on the Resurrection.

2. Resurrection

My emphasis is on an elementary effort. So, I invite you to attend here only to Wright's final chapter, "The Risen Jesus as the Son of God."²⁹ And I find it helpful to hold to his three sections in my own musings: [1] Worldview, Meaning and Theology; [2] The Meanings of 'Son of God'; [3] Shooting at the Sun? Let us first glimpse aspects on Wright's venture here. It is obviously only a glimpse of his twenty pages at the end of his great effort. But, to be reasonably faithful to him I stay as best I can in the zone of direct quotation.

[1] Worldview, Meaning and Theology.

"I pointed out in *The New Testament and the People of God* the ways in which words, sentences and stories 'mean' what they mean because of the place they

²⁹ *Resurrection*, 719–38.

occupy in a larger whole.”³⁰ “I shall avoid meaning as referent The sense I shall intend when I say ‘meaning’ is ‘implication in a wider world within which this notion makes the sense it makes,’ as in the phrase ‘democracy means happiness’.”³¹ “The question we are now to explore, then, is not the referent of ‘Jesus was raised from the dead’”³²: “the question before us is the meaning of this sentence.”³³

[2] The Meanings of ‘Son of God’

“We take as our starting point the early Christian belief that the resurrection had demonstrated Jesus to be ‘son of god’, and enquire what this meant for them as a way of sketching the groundwork for possible meanings today.”³⁴ “It would be possible at this point to begin a whole other book, and we must be content with a brief summary statement of what the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth meant to the early Christians: what they meant when they said, as Paul does in the opening to Romans, that he was and is ‘son of god’, and indeed Son of God.”³⁵ “How does calling Jesus ‘son of god’, in this sense, help us to understand not only who Jesus was and is but who the one true god was and is?”³⁶ “Paul means that Jesus is the one sent by God, from God, not only as a messenger but as the embodiment of his love.”³⁷ “This is what made them [the early Christians] not only speak of the one true God, but invoke him, pray to

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 719, the 2nd paragraph of section 1.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 3rd paragraph.

³² *Ibid.*, end of page.

³³ *Ibid.*, 720, line 10.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 723, end of page.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, end of 725.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 731, middle.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 732, middle.

him, love him and serve him in terms of the Father and the lord, of the God who sent the Son and now sends the Spirit of the Son.”³⁸

[3] Shooting at the Sun?

“Have we been shooting arrows at the sun? Have we been trying to prove the unprovable, to reach the unreachable, to unscrew the inscrutable?

No. Of course, our arrows of historical enquiry are all earthbound, subject to the epistemological equivalent of the law of gravity. The historian qua historian cannot mount an argument from first principles and end up proving God. Christian faith, however, has always declared that earth—gravity and all!—is where the Son of God made his home, pitched his tent, as John puts it, in our midst. And that declaration was the consequence, not the cause, of the belief that on the third day God raised Jesus from the dead.”³⁹

The more leisured or serious minded among you may venture further than this summary glimpse. Indeed, no doubt some of you have relished Wright’s three volumes or even, as I have done, followed his trail into his later popular works. But here we have sufficient, in these few quotations, to make a beginning of our communal jolt out of comfortable initial meanings.

The quotations make comfortable reading, do they not? It is even quite acceptable stuff for a Christian, even though some may sense too much of a bent towards proof, knowing that *fides quaerens intellectum* does not mean faith seeking certainty.⁴⁰ So what is the snag, what is the jolt I have in mind for your molecules and mind?

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 736, end of section 2.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 736, the beginning of section 3.

⁴⁰ The point is abundantly made by Lonergan. Recall *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, CWL 2, 219: “St. Augustine’s *Crede ut intelligas* no more means ‘Believe to be certain’ than it means ‘Believe to have an intellection’; it means ‘Believe that you may understand.’”

The jolt, one that has been felt in some of the readers of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, is the shock of finding that it is so easy to not notice that we have been quite trapped in initial meanings in these first two millennia of Christianity. We are comfortable with a standard view of “Jesus Christ, yesterday, today, and the same forever.”⁴¹ His resurrection, our resurrection? Well, yes: part of the tradition.

What do you mean by *resurrection*? What did and does N. T. Wright mean by *resurrection*? Write a paragraph on it to yourself: hopefully, be embarrassed by that exercise.⁴²

Go back, now, to *The 1833 Overture* quoted fully above on page 3. The second paragraph makes the same point of writing to yourself—“each investigator proceeds”⁴³—but there one has the nudge to make it available as N. T. Wright has done in a light fashion.

Indeed, are you not a little startled to find that N. T. Wright’s three sections are a light journey through the first three of my four paragraphs on page 3? Wright’s [1] could indeed be named *Horizons*. Then [2] is simply a positioning regarding conversions, and [3] is his shot, “shooting for the sun,” at where the effort goes.

The shadow of such thinking haunts our lives as well as our scholarship: how do you react to a lover who says, “I am beginning to question our relationship”?

⁴¹ *Hebrews*, 13:8.

⁴² My little book on seeding Eschatology, *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human*, (Axial Publishing, 2013) is surely embarrassing: a venture into a zone neglected for 750 years. There are seeds in it of the answer to the question, “What is humanity’s resurrection in Jesus?” But it is a tough long climb into Lonergan’s surrealism (*ibid.*, 20-27) so as to rise to being able to answer in genetic soundness, e.g., the questions raised in chapter 8 of Wright’s book, “When Paul Saw Jesus,” questions, e.g., about the neuromolecular dynamics of the encounter. And there is, of course, the fuller quest at the heart of human loneliness for a heuristics of humanity’s everlasting home in the absolutely super neurodynamics of the Risen Jesus.

⁴³ *Method in Theology*, 250, line 20.

And so we arrive at his missing [4], our fourth paragraph, our focus in this and the other essays that I associate with what I would like to be the June Crisis. The focus is on weaving all attempts at The 1833 Overture into the discomforting operations of its final lines.

You and I are here now together, not to simply agree or disagree, but to prepare for a communal dialogue over our cards painfully laid on the table. But you can keep your cards, for the moment, close to your chest and thus feel more comfortable contrasting, say, Wright's positioning with mine, or Doran's positioning with mine.

Here I have offered you a simple problem for positioning, your stand in initial meanings. Perhaps I might handily pose the question by quoting from above Wright's pointing: "Of course, our arrows of historical enquiry are all earthbound, subject to the epistemological equivalent of the law of gravity." Gravity and resurrection are both there, to be inquired about: but do they both not deserve the respect of a humble genetic drive? And here I am into the full, yet incomplete, craziness of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*: the craziness of the book, and the craziness of its topic, The Sower of Seeds. What is this genetic drive? Four Appendices there point to the journey to The Dark Tower, the Interior Castle, and beyond that there is the deeper challenge of "[Being at OM in transcendental Method](#)." Future Scripture scholars must face that climb if we are to reach the "fair and fine" of cosmic care.⁴⁴ And the challenge obviously belongs to all who would seriously venture forward in theology.

⁴⁴ The challenge goes beyond the studies of sacred books to all zones of science and arts. But our challenge is to raise questions of starting in anywhere. Might we do that this year, even make feeble starts? Might we be helped to do so by some resoluteness of leadership springing from the meeting of June 25, 2016? See note 47 below.

Yes, sadly, theology is bogged down in an initial meaning. It does not even have the doubtful splendor of Thomas' importation of Aristotle's narrow axiomatic bent. Nor does it have the benefit of the younger Lonergan's push for the cherishing of quest and questions. Those interested in Lonergan too easily settle for a new set of initial muddled meanings that dishonor his dynamics of human loneliness. So, the desire of the eternal hills is bottled by them in old academic distilleries.⁴⁵

But it is best for me to halt here. The limiting meaning of the confinement by initial meanings only emerges through a contemplative effort already mentioned. That contemplative effort obviously goes galactically beyond the small climb to which *Insight* invites: mathematics and physics are lightweight entry points. One must ask now, as they advance a little from Feynman and Fermat and Gödel, whether "one can go on to a developed account"⁴⁶ of quarks and man and God without the communal whirl foster-fathered by Lonergan and being mothered by history.

One must ask? Certainly, if one has in mind effective global care. Certainly if one is serious in taking Lonergan seriously. And if one is thus serious about taking Lonergan seriously, then one cannot continue to dodge his brilliant challenge of cycling and recycling through page 250 of *Method in Theology*. The next essay, by Pat Brown, reveals the shame of past inattention to that page. Then, in my final essay of this appeal I bring forward a previous appeal.⁴⁷ Will

⁴⁵ "As Mme. Kollontai put it: 'Immorality is progressing favorably in the schools.'" I quote Lonergan, from page 28 of the work cited in note 22 above.

⁴⁶ *Method in Theology*, 287, where Lonergan suggests the explanatory rewriting of the first part of *Method in Theology*.

⁴⁷ [Question 36](#) of the Website Q/A series is "An Appeal to Fred Lawrence and Other Elders." It is a long road from my first naïve appeal of 1970, in one of my Florida Conference papers, on the functional collaboration needed in Musicology. See [The Shaping of the Foundations](#), chapter 2, "Metamusic and Self-Meaning." Finally, I would note that the previous appeal of *Lonergan Gatherings* 11 (originally Questions 36) was

the June 25, 2016 meeting at the 43rd Annual Lonergan Workshop in Boston remain silent in the matter? Is the shame to continue brutally and destructively in a busy silent support of the monster⁴⁸ until, perhaps, some quiet North Korean lady of the next millennium finds an old copy of the Korean *Method in Theology* and persuades her comrades that “this is worth recycling”?

As I conclude it dawns on me that, yes, we could be lifted into another history if we recycled the 1833 Overture here. But now I enlarge the exercise. It is not Wright’s final chapter or Doran’s shot at foundations but my nudge in the four Appendices that are to be weaved into your reading, surely giving a new lift to your searching.

“[1]Horizons.⁴⁹

[2] The results, accordingly, will not be uniform. But the source of this lack of uniformity will be brought into the open when each investigator proceeds to distinguish between positions, which are compatible with intellectual, moral and religious conversion and, on the other hand, counter-positions, which are

written by a younger man: he still had to plumb further, with shocks of fantasy, the profound nudges about the future that Lonergan was contemplating at the age of 30. See note 21 above.

⁴⁸ “The monster that has stood forth in our day.” *Method in Theology*, 40. A context here is the chapter 14, “Horizon, History, Philosophy,” of *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, and my appeal of these essays is “a summons to decisiveness at a rather critical moment in history.” *Ibid.*, 300. There is a massive existential gap in present philosophy and theology, and there is the offer of the pragmatic cosmopolis of functional collaboration that would give a normal law coverage for its closure. “In so far as there is to be an effective intervention in the historical process, one has to postulate that the existential gap must be closed.” *Ibid.*, 306. We have to move from “an ivory tower that exerts no influence upon society at large” (*ibid.*, 307) to a communal stand of taking the “difficult and laborious” (*Method in Theology*, 4) hill-climb to the Tower of Able.

⁴⁹ The single word paragraph now becomes a precise question of finding, in discomfiting reading, your to-do question’s present remoteness, tittering and tottering along in a ferment of initial meanings: “Appendix: Judgment of Value,” *Allure*, 24.

incompatible either with intellectual, or with moral, or with religious conversion.⁵⁰

[3] A further objectification of horizons is obtained⁵¹ when each observer operates on the materials by indicating the view that would result from developing what he regards as positions and by reversing what he has regarded as counterpositions.

[4] There is a final objectification of horizon⁵² when the results of the foregoing process are themselves regarded as material, when they are assembled, completed, compared, reduced, classified, selected, when positions and counter-positions are distinguished, when positions and developed and counter-positions reversed.”⁵³

The counter-positional reversal is not something of a desk-jockeying, but of perhaps a prayerful walkabout during the two months of a sunflower going from small seed to tall smile. I am reminded now, and so remind you, of the

⁵⁰ There is the integral conversion that is the topic of the second Appendix “Reaching for a World View,” *Allure*, 47.

⁵¹ And now, by meshing into your reading the third Appendix “Reaching for an Image of Global Valuing,” (*Allure*, 125), might you not rise to a sense of the challenge in each of us to resonate with the Word in finding, over coming decades, that “good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that dynamic order’s joy and zeal.” *Insight*, 722, concluding words. Schemes of recurrence, an evolutionary joy, call us out of our solitary searching.

⁵² But it is a discontinuously creative objectification, allured to be at pains not to conceal, but to lay all hearts on the table so as to arrive at “joyful, courageous, whole-hearted yet intelligently controlled performance of the task’s set by world order.” *Insight*, 745. The fourth appendix twines in here a sliver of *Loneragan Gatherings* 11, which ends the series of six March essays. But we can sense an openness in acknowledging a [5] here, which is the 5 there at the beginning last December, now freshly caulding: [Loneragan Gathering 5](#): “Being at OM in transcendental method.”

⁵³ *Method in Theology*, 250: the last 16 lines, broken into four paragraphs, but in the suggested new context.

prayer with which the *Cantower* series began, when I was a young man of seventy in 2002:

*Sun, flowers, 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.*⁵⁴

⁵⁴ The beginning of [Cantower 2](#), "Sunflowers Speak to Us of Growing".