

NUDGES TOWARDS THINKING OUT TOWER TOPOLOGY

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

What is necessary is a cosmopolis that is neither class nor state, that stands above all their claims, that cuts them down to size, that is founded on the native detachment and disinterestedness of every intelligence, that commands mans' first allegiance, that is too universal to be bribed, too impalpable to be forced, too effective to be ignored.²

It is as well to start my vague ramble about a positive poise on humanity's future—the concluding challenge of the previous Tincture—with this quite daft view of Lonergan. As I type, the June 2018 G7 meeting in Quebec is trickling to its miserable end—made all the more miserable and comic by Trump—with protestors held down, at vast expense, by masses of police. No sign there of cosmopolis.

But at least there are protests, tramping outside, tinkering inside. The problem of the long road to a global cosmopolis is to make effective the native attachment and interest—note the relevant reversal of Lonergan's view—of those protestors who have the tincture of a sense of the brutal sickness of present humanity.

The difficulty of making such protesting effective is discouragingly evident to me as I begin this sketching, this nudging. My full aim is for a sufficient group of protestors to join me in bringing forth a full symbol-rich heuristics of what I call now *theodynamics*, a word chosen, among other reasons, for its echo of *thermodynamics*. I think now of my

¹ Victor Hugo, *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, Buccaneer Books, New York, 11. This first note and the last, note, are the same notes bracketing my article in *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* (2019), “Method in Theology: From $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ to $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi^T}\}^4$ ”. The article gives a fuller context for the present enterprise.

² *Insight*, 263.

long-term optimism of seven years ago, when I wrote of that full heuristics being actually Bell-Curve operative by 9011 A.D. What of my optimism regarding producing the heuristics itself in a comprehensive-enough symbolic form?³ Depending on the meaning of *enough*, one could envisage it emerging in a broad implementable form by the end of this century. I shall get to sketching that project shortly. I am not alone, of course,⁴ but certainly we are not up to a sufficient “not numerous center”⁵ to move the sketching forward in effective detailings.

Nor indeed, do I see us “up to” breaking forward from the “discouragingly evident” core of present difficulties. On that I must focus now, before I do a little sketching.

The core of present difficulties is the settled narrowness of those working in Lonergan studies. This has a history, of course, going back to the narrowness of clerical education in Lonergan’s Catholic Church. The old style of doing philosophy and theology was a neuromolecular superego reality in Lonergan’s first couple of generations of disciples. Certainly bits and pieces were picked up from Lonergan, but the power of his *Praxisweltanschauung* was utterly foreign to almost the entire group. Especially evident is the dodging of the task of implementation: so, Lonergan’s work has had the feeblest of effects in contemporary culture.

Lonergan’s disciples of those first generations have set up narrow misleading patterns of classroom work, theses work, etc., so that the narrowness continues in what

³ Sharing this perspective in some positive *haute vulgarization form* is the panting hart (*Psalms* 42) of this final Tincture. My objective has been to arrive at an effective poise regarding the lean-to fact that “theology possesses a twofold relevance to empirical human science.” (*Insight*, 766). The five articles listed below in note #12 lifted me towards seizing that what is needed is a fully symbolized countervailing theodynamic heuristic isomorphic with any psychosocial theoretic and its referents in the next layered genera of situation rooms. My strategic referent here is the actual psychosocial dynamic of scripture studies in all religions with their false present empiricisms. The reach is for an effective relevance, a “cajoling or forcing attention” (*Insight*, 423) that visibly grounds an active sense of the convergence of world religions in and on a cosmic effective care.

⁴ There has emerged, in these past decades, a small eccentric community that share my horror at the dodging of (a) Lonergan’s 2nd canon of hermeneutics; (b) the differentiation of collaboration by function that cherishes its *raison d’être* of hitting humanity’s psyches and streets. I restrict myself to a single reference here: *Seeding Global Collaboration*, edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy, Axial Publishing, 2016.

⁵ *Collection*, “Dimensions of Meaning,” *CWL* 4, 245.

is primarily complex structurings of initial meanings weaving Lonergan's work into the channels of contemporary philosophy and theology. It all looks good and busy, but it is going nowhere towards "a resolute and effective intervention in this historical process."⁶ Nor is my own work going anywhere in that direction, though it has been appealing for such a shift from way back.⁷ Neither Lonergan's aspirations nor my own echoing of them have had any serious effect on what is now called Lonerganism, nor does Lonerganism in its "academic disciplines"⁸ channeled busyness show any welcome for the echo or the aspiration. No doubt, history may follow Lonergan's nudge: some other groups may find the way.⁹ But my present interest is in raising the question about his muddled religious group that Lonergan raised in 1935: "What on earth is to be done?"¹⁰

I am being briefly blunt about the past 60 years of Lonergan studies. I quote Fred Crowe regarding such bluntness: "is there not room for a measure of bluntness at this stage?"¹¹ But that was 1964, and less than decade later Lonergan made the measure of bluntness a *nomos* intrinsic to Method. My bluntness is simply a brief skimming over the three self-objectifications that he built into what I call *Lonergan's 1833 Overture*. My colleagues show no interest in adopting his blunt invitation to bluntness.

What on earth can I do? It seems wise to continue—or to conclude?!—my embarrassing echoing and my enlargement of the challenge, supported by those few who have found their way forward to Lonergan's position on genetic interpretation, on

⁶ *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 306.

⁷ As in note 4 above, something symbolic suffices here. I think of my naïve optimism in presenting two papers at the Florida Conference of Easter 1970, one on Botany, one on functional collaboration in musicology. I recall Lonergan's remark to me about the botany paper: "It opens up area after area!" Well, it didn't. And functional collaboration in anything? Dream on Bernard Lonergan. (Part Two of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, [Axial Publishing, 2010] ends with my diagram page (163) titled "The Tower of Able: Lonergan's Dream."

⁸ The reference is to the last two words on the first page of *Method in Theology*, a poise of the humanities condemned by Lonergan, the dwelling place of his followers.

⁹ See the concluding paragraph of Lonergan's essay, "Healing and Creating in History."

¹⁰ Quoting the end of a long relevant letter of Lonergan to a religious superior. The letter is reproduced fully in Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, (Axial Publishing, 2010), 144–54.

¹¹ Frederick Crowe, "The Exigent Mind: Bernard Lonergan's Intellectualism," *Spirit as Inquiry. Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan S.J.*, edited by Crowe, Herder and Herder, 1964, 27.

collaboration, on implementation. They also continue the outreach in various ways, but I leave the detailing to their work of these decades. In this essay I cut my effort back to generating a mood of sketching elements in the second objectification required by Lonergan: where do I think my position leads? The moody sketching here echoes detailed pointers emerging elsewhere,¹² but the summary here helps beginners to sniff the escape from the rot, and hopefully embarrasses my senior colleagues, if they rise to bother with reading my tiresomely repetitious continued impolitenesses. “Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company.”¹³

The antecedent willingness of hope has to advance from a generic reinforcement of the pure desire to know to an adapted and specialized auxiliary ever ready to offset every interference with intellect’s unrestricted finality.¹⁴

Sketchings? “Accordingly it is necessary to proceed from the heuristic structure of the solution to its identification in the facts of human living and human history.”¹⁵ There is a sense in which my second objectification leaves dialectic and reaches boldly way beyond the “bolder spirits”¹⁶ who rotted compact intellect’s unrestricted finality by sliding away from the compact bent to offset every interference. We need a new group and global nine-cycling foundations to effectively offset the interference that results from compact consciousness split into a pseudo-practicality that grounds the sweet brutality of present town and gown. Compact consciousness grasped, and was grasped by, mystery, however shabbily and disgracefully, but axial consciousness has settled into

¹² There are five relevant articles to appear during the next few years in *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education*. “Minding Reality;” “The Coming Convergence of World Responsiveness;” “Steps towards Effectively Converging Religions;” “Converging Religions to Effective Historical Intervention;” “Converging Religions into being INTO Love with Jesus EtC.”

¹³ *Method in Theology*, 299.

¹⁴ *Insight*, 747, end.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 745, end.

¹⁶ *Method in Theology*, 3. I have aired, in many places in my recent writings, the axial flaws that area skimmed past in this second paragraph of the book.

trading shabbiness and ungraciousness. There is now little sign of that ancient past or that distant glorious future, “sign of what is grasped and psychic force that sweeps living human bodies, linked together in charity,”¹⁷ in the odor of sanctity and sexuality. There are, alas, no longer “two spheres”¹⁸ as “separate as Sundays and weekdays.”¹⁹ Sunday and religious gatherings are just crinkles, cringles holding frail rope but not fresh hope in a see-sailing lacking life before death, “each indeed autonomous within his narrow orbit, for each is free, yet together swept in a swirling mass down the cataract of life to the serene pool of a green churchyard.”²⁰

I reach here, indeed, bluntly and boldly, into a compact scream of the third objectification, pleading with you to fill in, as the experts refuse to do, some serious musings on the “swirling mass” of Lonergan studies, musings that would bring forth directive diagramming. And it also must move on in a compact expression of second-objectification hope, that objectification that constitutes the heart, the panting hart,²¹ of the lean lean-to of foundations.²² “In the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it.”²³ The busy hills of Lonerganism have to be replaced by the Mountain of blunt *Nomos*. “When you have a mountain to move, and only a spade and wheelbarrow to work with, you can either sit on your hands or you can put spade to earth and move the first sod.”²⁴ But now I must talk to you as I talked to the nun in my

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, top.

¹⁸ *Insight*, 556.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Shorter Papers*, “The Mystical Body and the Sacraments,” *CWL* 20, 78.

²¹ I am recalling *Psalms* 42, “As the hart pants for running streams, so longs my soul for you.” See [Vignette 19](#), “The Cargo Pants,” where I am lifting a pun into a memory of Lonergan’s semi-humorous comment to me in 1961 about the church being the bark of Peter: the Pope the captain, the clergy the crew, and the laity the cargo.

²² The lean-to notion is a reference to “Burckhardt rather than Ranke” (*Method in Theology*, 250) lifted to a communal luminous pragmatism in *The Leaning Tower of Able* of functional collaboration. The foundational community are few in number and thin in thinking. The present effort points towards a lift in that thinking thinness through a reach for fulsome symbolizations.

²³ *Isaiah* 2:2, quoted at the end of Lonergan’s *Essay in Fundamental Sociology*.

²⁴ Frederick Crowe, *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study of History*, (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), 149.

physics class, a lady willing to move those first-year sods, but lifted to the task by a vision of what is to come.

What is to come is the positive Anthropocene, where the masses²⁵ begin to luminously object to the companioned swirling masses of “politics, economics, education,”²⁶ that “have been trying to remake man, and have done not a little to make human life unlivable.”²⁷

See, See-saw, seize however slightly and slightly, the problem of my talk. This is not the nun’s story but the none’s story. If I talk to the nun about thermodynamics, she knows what I’m at, she smells the climb, she cherishes the opaque equations. I have to hand, as it happens, Max Planck’s wonderful little *Treatise on Thermodynamics* of 120 years ago, and scan it to see how packed it is with such opaque equations. My nun expects nothing less. If I talk here about a little *Treatise on Theodynamics*, with its fermenting of equations, do you not squirm a little? Do you not have the inclination to echo Einstein’s listener in Lonergan’s story: “I was never good at math: just tell me in my own simple words.”²⁸

²⁵ I quote note 7 of my article “[Arriving in Cosmopolis](http://www.philipmcsane.org/website-articles)” (This article is available online at: <http://www.philipmcsane.org/website-articles>). “There is an obvious reference here to Ortega’s *The Revolt of the Masses*. But I would note that Ortega’s notion of the masses was quite complex. Chapters 6 and 8 of the book are directly on the topic, but also chapter 12 on “The Barbarism of Specialization.” Saul Bellow, in his Foreword to the translation, neatly sums up Ortega and the problem of the changes in the meaning of mass man since Ortega’s time. “Ortega when he speaks of the mass man does not refer to the proletariat: he does not mean us to think of any social class whatever. To him the mass man is an altogether new human type. Lawyers in the courtroom, judges on the bench, surgeons bending over anaesthetized patients, international bankers, men of science, millionaires ... differ in no important respect from TV repair men, clerks in Army-Navy stores, municipal fire-inspectors, or bartenders. It is Ortega’s view that we in the West live under a dictatorship of the common place.” (*The Revolt of the Masses*, translated by Anthony Kerrigan, edited by Kenneth Moore, with a Foreword by Saul Bellow, University of Notre Dame Press, 1985, p. ix). Much of Lonergan scholarship is done by mass men inviting Lonergan into such a commonplace, not at all the talk envisaged in note 5 above. The problem of that talk is raised in profound doctrinal fashion in the first section of *Insight* chapter 17.”

²⁶ *Topics in Education*, CWL 10, 232.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ I quote from the first of six lectures given by Lonergan on Easter 1961. This first lecture was not recorded. The other five are available in the Lonergan Archives.

So: here we are in my scripture meaning that is being quite lost to most of you, granted that, thank you, you got this far in reading. I have climbed for decades towards seeing, seizing, the way, the theodynamics of effective intervention. I sum it up, an order of and from nature and grace, with a leap of hope, “with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.” But I doubt very much that we are on the same page, indeed, that page 722, which begins its turning magnificently with four final words of page 721, “It follows that love.” **Its** turning? **It** follows? What love are you following, what turn are you paging over a new leaf?

I twist and turn to freshen you pause.

What do you want? “What do you want?”²⁹: I quote John’s account of Jesus walking on stage in the drama of John. Check, if you like, his meeting of different individuals through the Gospel, until eventually Jesus comes to say what **HE** wants. “. . . may they all be one . . . ? (John 17, 21).” Here the extra quotation marks indicate that I am quoting Lonergan’s last quotation from scripture in *Method in Theology*.³⁰ Let me twist and turn further.

How do you interpret the interpretations that occur in those different meetings in John? How do scripture scholars interpret them? How do scripture scholars in any religious tradition interpret the meetings in their scriptures? Jack meets Jill. Jesus meets Jill. Guru Nanak meets God. So, pausing over Guru Nanak’s meeting one might ask, of Guru Nanak or his readers, in the reading of Guru Nanak’s scripting: “Do you know the true court of Waheguru?”³¹ “Do you know His Kingdom?”³² Do you, who follow Guru Nanak, know His True Court?³³ Does Jill know Jack’s Kingdom? What is it to be at

²⁹ *The Gospel of John* 1:38.

³⁰ *Method in Theology*, 367.

³¹ *Waheguru* (Punjabi: *vāhigurū*) is a name given to God in Sikhism. “Wah” as gratitude, “He” as that, “Gu” as darkness, “Ru” as light. Hence, gratitude to the ONE who takes you from darkness to light.

³² Lonergan, “An Essay on Fundamental Sociology,” concluding paragraphs.

³³ *You*, here, asks you to ask, at some tincture level (about)³ the central point of this essay: the conceiving of the you of the following, mainly the Sikhs, of Guru Nanak in an adequate and effective heuristic manner that is weaved into the geohistorical control of meaning symbolized by $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}$ ⁴. On that symbolization see my article “Method in Theology: From $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$ to $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}$ ^{4b}” in *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* (2019). It is discussed less elaborately in

home in home, in Om? One weds: home is not just an object but also an objective. Only a fool would think it to be a known objective. N. T. Wright is no fool: and yet I now ask him, or rather someone among you ask him and his ilk, experts on the New Testament Kingdom, “Do you know His Kingdom?” How hopeless is the asking?³⁴

So we arrive at a relevant and, perhaps, an effective beginning of my sketching of a task for you and me, meeting here in my scripture. “Where does the Beginning Begin? As I am putting down these words on an empty page I have begun to write sentence that, when it is finished, will be the beginning of a chapter on certain problems of Beginning.”³⁵

I have arrived, gloriously, at a beginning that is the title of my entire *Cantower* series of the decade 2002–2012! “Roun’ Doll, Home James”! I am sneaking a Trojan Ass inside the walls of the shrines of the world’s religions.³⁶ Are you prepared to kiss my Ass?

To assume is to make an ass out of u and me: but should I not say, an *ask* out of you and me?³⁷ We both are presented here and now with an ask regarding and re guarding a mystery: the mystery that is assumed in all scriptures. Neither Guru Nanak nor Paul

[Vignette 10](#), “A Place in the Son: Rise With Me.” On the full challenge of the poise, “do you know,” see the following note.

³⁴ We are back at the identification of the task of a positive convergence of world religions associated with the five articles listed in note 12 above. There I moved to the challenge of all religious groups rising to a leadership luminosity, and, indeed, a *haute vulgarization* communality, regarding the religion’s general categories. “To say it all with the greatest brevity, one has not only to read *Insight*, but also to discover oneself in oneself.” (*Method in Theology*, 260). There is a centuries-long road ahead. Heavens, think of the long road to a competent honest following among Lonergan’s disciples from the top down!

³⁵ Eric Voegelin, *In Search of Order*, vol. 5, *Order and History* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 13.

³⁶ “I am sneaking” here means my taking a foundational cyclic stand. There was a time some years ago, when I had the ambition to get into conversational touch with members of the great Sikh community of Vancouver. At 87, focused on such foundational efforts as this, that personal outreach is quite unrealistic. But I am asking you, whatever your expertise, to pause over the task of moving to an effective conversational touching. See notes 33 and 34.

³⁷ I am recalling here a picturing of Joyce on page 196 of *Process* (see note 47 below) with a subtext, “I am getting along nicely in the dark. My ask sword hangs by my side Am I walking into eternity along Sandymount Strand?” I modified the original text of Joyce, replacing *ash* by *ask*. And yes, the answer to the walking into eternity is a fuller Yes, a discovery of a walking in eternity, of the fuller answer to the question “where is finitude?” which poises one where “God is not an object.” *Method in Theology*, 342.

nor Tom Wright nor you nor me know The Kingdom, and we speak in and of that Unknown.³⁸ My Cantower title says, “Roun’ Doll, Home James,” but we who are musing now on its origin as it leaped to me are better at making and taking the point, the appointment.

“Deshil Holles Eamus. Deshil Holles Eamus. Deshil Holles Eamus” begins a key section of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*.³⁹ It is not a great problem to arrive at its lighter meaning. *Deshil* is Gaelic for “turn right.” *Holles* is the name of a street in Dublin that gives its name to the Maternity Hospital there. But it also echoes a German *All*. *Eamus* is Latin for “let us go.” The three words have, then, an obvious meaning, “Let us twirl right round all.” But there is a catch, or something to catch. In my own case, the catching took decades.⁴⁰ Steal the “s” from *Holles* and stick it on *Eamus*: you get *Seamus*, the Gaelic for Joyce’s first

³⁸ “We speak”? Here we are at the heart of the crisis of religious contemplation. It is helpful to draw your attention here to the top of the paragraph of *Method in Theology*, p. 261, the end of which I quoted in note 34 above. “Such speech, however, is found clear and accurate and explanatory only be those who have done their apprenticeship.” The apprenticeship is a personal daily apokataphatic struggle into and up through the mansions of *The Interior Lighthouse*. This has been a recurrent topic in these past years of writing. I introduced that name in my essay [HOW 13](#), “The Interior Lighthouse,” but the question was raised much earlier. For a fuller view of the question see the 5 website essays [Prebymous 4–8](#), “Foundational Prayer”.

³⁹ The section, Episode 14 of the book, runs from 380 to 425 in my Penguin edition of *Ulysses*. It is popularly titled “Oxen of the Sun” and deals—the dialogue is in a maternity hospital—with the birth and growth of language. You note that we are dealing here with the birth and growth of theological language. It is helpful to pause over a suggestion of Lonergan applying to the present essay: “an invitation to mathematicians [and us] to explore the possibility of setting up the series of deductive expansions that would do as much for other empirical sciences as has been done for physics” (*Insight*, 339). Our focus here is on aspects of the language of the empirical science of theology. There is the central problem of lifting theological God-talk into its proper and personal domain, dominion. “To speak of the dynamics state of being in love with God pertains to the stage of meaning when the world of interiority has been made the explicit ground of the world of theory and of common sense” (*Method in Theology*, 107). Think, now, of the shift even of that statement of Lonergan when the context becomes luminously that of the lift mentioned in note 37 above. Is “being in love with God” not then “Being in the Love of God,” and in the Christian case the “in” shifts—through the agonbite of inwit of the Interior Lighthouse—to “InWithTo,” and the real God is the Dark Joy of Gⁱ_{jk}.

⁴⁰ My slow pace here is odd, but advertent to my general slowness and yours is relevant, even as you pause over this note. Being shot or shocked forward is the core of accelerating adult growth, or it might better be identified as the expectation of it, a neuromolecular weaving round wonder. See further notes 48 and 53. Indeed, there is a mood of disturbance in the flow of these final notes.

name, James.⁴¹ No need here to go rambling towards the roundabout of *Finnegans Wake*, a tale with its tail in the mouth of the river with which the book begins.⁴² Simply see this as a nudge to you and me to surround ourselves, our scripted selves indeed, with our own asking. Complexly see it as cauling our bluff, our “alles in scripture” bluff. So, for example, I have used the imperative, “Turn Wright” to that magnificent scripture scholar.⁴³ Does he hear me? He has never heard of me. So I repeat my plea: Might you have a friend of a friend of his that could be nudged to tell him? Effectively?!

And this brings me to my sketching of a beginning of the “a resolute and effective intervention in this historical process”⁴⁴ that Lonergan longed for all his adult life. Perhaps my readers include only the few that agree with me. But please please, surely you could now join me in pushing for this right turn guarding and regarding scripture? Is there not a neighbor or a priest caught in the present walled-off hot tell of scripture studies? Should I not delay you here with the next bit from that chapter of Joyce, before landing you with “the coughmixture with a punch in it for you, my friend”?⁴⁵ Here you are—skip, or skip and lip and leap in later, his ramble of hoopsa prayer for “quickenning and wombfruit.” Does he not point, the same way as I do, to your “sapience endowed to be studied” within the scripted “sign of omnipollent nature’s incorrupted

⁴¹ The first of the five papers mentioned in note 12 above, titled “Minding Reality,” gives a neat and comic exercise of self-identification through a proposed alphabet soup of meanings. A Joycean nudge that might shoot or shock in the mode mentioned in the previous note. The identification either clashes or clicks: in both cases a stirring of neuromolecules.

⁴² “The keys to. Given. A way a lone a last a loved a long the” and then on you go, fresh starting: “riverrun, past Eve and Adam’s, from swerve of shore to bend of bay, brings us by a commodious vicus of recirculation back.”

⁴³ I have great respect for N.T. Wright in the various phases of his career. His podcasts are a delight. But but: there is that great gap. Pointers re our basic difference are given in [Disputing Quests 4, 5, and 8](#): “Scripture Studies: Turning Wright I, II, III”. For a broader perspective, see [Disputing Quests 10](#), “Paul’s Epistles and Functional Systematics.”

⁴⁴ I hardly need to reference this: *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 306. But is the meaning not beginning to rise up in your molecules. Might it rise up to make you sister to the pacific salmon, weaving and leaping home? But the weave must grow and grow, a heavy light house of our subjectivity that reaches for all your brothers and sisters. And now, might you not read the final chapters of *Phenomenology and Logic* and listen to the Lone Ranger sing his Highwayman song?

⁴⁵ *Ulysses*, 425.

benefaction”? Aren’t you glad, though, that I make it far more obvious than Joyce, who once wrote to a friend, “If I can throw any further obscurity on the matter let me know”?

Universally that person’s acumen is esteemed very little perceptive concerning whatsoever matters are being held as most profitable by mortals with sapience endowed to be studied who is ignorant of that which the most in doctrine erudite and certainly by reason of that in them high mind’s ornament deserving of veneration constantly maintain when by general consent they affirm that other circumstances being equal by no exterior splendor is the prosperity of a nation more efficaciously asserted than by the measure of how far forward may have progressed the tribute of its solicitude for that proliferant continuance which of evils the original if it be absent when fortunately present constitutes the certain sign of omnipollent nature’s benefaction.

The point is that the precondition to understanding the scripture properly is “understanding the object,”⁴⁶ an evident impossibility when the object is the alle-meaning of The Kingdom. The very best you can do is to line up genetically the bestest of previous readings with an additional shot at anticipating on-going readings. Isn’t that the limit?!⁴⁷ No need to push on through Joyce’s metaccounting of the birth of signs and words, but yes, savour his ending to that section:

The Deity ain’t no nickel dime bumshow. I put it to you that he’s on the square and a corking fine business proposition. He’s the grandest thing yet and don’t you forget it. Shout salvation in king Jesus. You’ll need to

⁴⁶ The title of section 2 on page 156 of *Method in Theology* dealing with Interpretation.

⁴⁷ On my mind as I typed this was the same question put by Joyce on line 13, page 198, of *Finnegans Wake*: “Yssel that the limmat?” The question occurs on the third page of the great “river section” of the book, a section that begins, “O / tell me all about / Anna Livia! / I want to hear all about Anna Livia” (196). It is the want of the “ask” (see note 36 above) that needs to be educated in and into darkness. The Joyce question occurred previously in my writings, in note 86 of chapter 6, “Total Process” of my 1989 book *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minds*. In that note I recall John Bishop, *Joyce’s Book of the Dark: Finnegans Wake*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1986. It adds a context to this limit reaching, as of course does that previous book of mine, which is available at: <http://www.philipmcs Shane.org/website-books>. The existential question raised by the river section is put to you in *Quodlibet 8*, “The Dialectic of My Town, *Ma Vlast*,” an essay written while doing walkabout on the edge of Dublin’s river Liffey, which slides past the church called *Adam and Eve’s* on its way to the sea. The walkabout reflection was in the wake of that terrible gathering in Toronto for the centennial of Lonergan’s birth.

rise precious early, you sinner there, if you want to diddle the Almighty God. Pflaaaap! Not Half. He's got a coughmixture with a punch in it for you, my friend, in his backpocket. Just you try it on.

Please, please, think, and think effectively, about trying it on. There is a triple try-on here. You have to think right round yourself. You have to think right round genetically.⁴⁸ You have to think right round the leaning Tower of Able.

Not just **you**, of course: but the **you** of a later mature Anthropocene Age. And yes, you could make a start. Personal, perhaps local and immediate: but that relevant move is a seeding of sending it viral round the globe, one neighbour at a time, one Guru at a time.

We have paused in the previous two Tinctures, 2 and 3, over the core of the genetic self-surrounding. Here I wish [1] to nudge you to muse, pen-sketchily, over the Tower Leaning Forward in your own quite elementary introductory way; and [2] to get you to actually make a move on one or two others regarding the needed venture.

The elementary introductory way, assembled and spread, is to be a psychic possession of the global community, perhaps even in a century or ten. Of course, it will slowly have a massive internetting structure. I leave that alone for now, but do bear it in mind recalling Lonergan's comment: "Some day, perhaps, it will give us a complete information-retrieval system."⁴⁹ Here, let each of us reach, exercise-fashion, towards a quite nominal sketching of a planar topology.⁵⁰ And I would suggest, in this effort, holding our interest to the linkages starting from foundations and reaching through the specialty workers of doctrines, systematics and communications all the way through, so

⁴⁸ Here we are faced with the central crisis of the following of Lonergan, a point made terminally in note 53 below. The crisis is not in dodging functional collaboration: it is in dodging the manner in which "interpretation is to be scientific" (*Insight*, 587), so that our lonesome ask (see note 36) becomes a communal global joyous task poising us asymptotically "to respond to an impalpable presence, to grow inwardly to the stature of eternity." *Insight*, 749.

⁴⁹ *Method in Theology*, 127.

⁵⁰ I have found that getting beyond this, into perspectival efforts, is quite difficult for those without experience in space-arts or in mathematics and its scientific applications. Computer developments, of course, give all this a great lift.

to speak, to the people of the plains.⁵¹ I am being brief, leaving detailed diagrammatic or programming ramblings to your experiencing of a peculiar exercise, reminding you that part of that exercise is finding a working—not just a workable—way to outreach to your neighbourhood.

Indeed, place that start in the fullest context you can manage. Assume that one of my readers arrives at an effective breakthrough on the foundational pointing I am making, a pointing made by me in the context of that “famous” paragraph of *Insight*, 60910, swept up into my crazy heuristic $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{0\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$; a point made cunningly by Lonergan in the pointer towards the need to “understand the object.” The effective breakthrough, finding its way into the third objectification of Dialectic, is a stand of an implemented new poise in scripture studies, be that study in a church, mosque, graduate school, wherever. We skip how the success story is sifted and shifted up into *Assembly*. We skip also the process by which it is contextualized by the other five operations of Dialectic. What is to be tossed about creatively, in the shift from *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture* to foundational reachings, is a heuristics of its success, and that heuristics finds its airing and heirs in a particular subgroup of the foundational community. Here I would draw your exercising attention to the two main functions of foundational people: to boost the cycling process, and to add into that boosting creative fantasy, a very strenuous neuromolecular task. Might you move this week to a diagramming of the village success as it diverges in strange non-linear topologies to reach villages the world over?

My problem now, as I write, is the abundance of my fantasy regarding our topic. It seems best, indeed to halt abruptly here to let your creativity and fantasy simmer.⁵² I begin to envisage freshly the topology of the ascent and assent through massively

⁵¹ In [Cantower 8](#), “Slopes: An Encounter,” I give some simple pointers regarding the topology of the first four specialties (see page 13 there). That area, too, obviously requires development, and such developments are to emerge under the pressures of recyclings.

⁵² I think now of Lonergan’s story about the gathering of nobles talking of Columbus’s discovery of America as a simple business. Columbus put an egg on the table as asked for attempts to stand it on its end.

transformed forward specialties.⁵³ I think of the mediation of a flow of heuristic symbolizations that would be the effective countervailing cymbals to the tinkling brassy idiocy both of pious contentedness and of committed greed-warped humanism. I am into the world of Herman Hesse, the world of the “great pilgrimage . . . the eternal strivings of the human spirit towards the East, towards Home,”⁵⁴ and yes, there comes the “Arrival in Cosmopolis”⁵⁵ of 9011 A.D., and “then the vision which Herman Hesse puts in Goldmund’s mouth and mind becomes, not poet’s fancy, but a pilgrim’s fact.”⁵⁶ Symbols are to emerge, flocks of internetting bird-streams interfering gloriously with this historical process.⁵⁷ “Each letter becomes a bird, grows a tail, ruffles out his feathers and flies off. Well, Narziss, I suppose you think nothing of such letters. But I tell you this: God writes this world with them.”⁵⁸ Imagine, then, THEN, the scriptures of the world taking theodynamic flight from the strange nest $\{M(W_3)^{\Theta\Phi T}\}^4$.

⁵³ Might not this “T” but you gradually, speeding forward in adult growth, ontic within phyletic? My best dense expression so far of the full challenge has been the Epilogue (92–125) to *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human* (Axial Publishing, 2013), “Starting into Functional Collaboration,” although refining leaps are pointed to in *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* two years later and on up through the *Divyadaan* articles of 2017–2020. But the full transposition of theological talk and living is a wildly different matter hinted at here, a dream of Lonergan in the first section of *Insight* chapter 17, with its engineering strategy sketched in the third section, so brutally dodged by his disciples. Surely we shall come to suspect, in this millennium, the humble processes of self-love by which “the earth and every common sight take on the glory and the freshness of a dream”? *Insight*, 556.

⁵⁴ I quote here from the beginning of the Epilogue “Being and Loneliness” of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations. Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*, 1974, at page 101 (This book is available online at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/published-books>.) The quotation is from Herman Hesse, *The Journey to the East*, London, 1970, 12.

⁵⁵ This is a lecture given at the first Latin American Lonergan workshop in Puebla in 2011. It is available in English and Spanish at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/website-articles>.

⁵⁶ I quote here from the Epilogue referred to in note 54, at page 105.

⁵⁷ So I come to a compendious aesthetic poise regarding the panting hart of finitude that we hovered over and in in in in note 3. The aesthetic points to a massive task of contemplation and computing.

⁵⁸ See note 54. I am quoting now, from page 105 of the Epilogue, from Herman Hesse, *Narcissus and Goldmund*, Penguin, 61. My later quotation on page 110 from *Steppenwolf*, (Penguin, 178–9) is also relevant to our task, the task pointed to in note 33 above. I talk to you as Hermine talks to Harry Haller: “Ah, Harry, we have to stumble through so much dirt and humbug before we reach home. And we have no one to guide us. Our only guide is our homesickness.”

But first imagine how you can reach out this month, with a just steward's cunning, to change effectively, in some neighborhood, the minds of students of scripture, professors or gurus, teenagers or totterers. A report on successful cunning would of course be gratefully received, making its humble village way, now randomly, much later cyclically, into a recycling through 10,000 villages.

Having thus ended abruptly my present nudgings and sketchings, I cannot resist returning to my “tiresomely repetitious continued impolitenesses” with a breeze of optimistic humour. I snatch the three center paragraphs from the “Afterwords” of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.⁵⁹

The present Afterwords, of course, began to grow as a tale as I mused further about the origin and future of this last book-effort of mine. Sadly, I do not expect it to be a success: it is too far out. How it got that far out has been on my mind, and I think of the luck that seeded the climb. There was the luck of teen years immersed in Chopin, the luck of working with Lochlainn O’Raifeartaigh in graduate studies of mathematical physics in the mid-fifties, the luck of finding in 1956 Fr. John Hyde who led me towards reading Aquinas and Lonergan properly, etc., etc. But I must leap over the decades and think now of the luck that this book seeks to weave into.

So I think of Lonergan’s long-term optimism—“what will count is a perhaps not numerous center”⁶⁰—and about his question, “is my proposal utopian?”⁶¹ Luck will have it happen as non-utopian, including the luck of the increasing global economic and military messes, so that the proposal will find takers living beyond the little world of Lonerganism. But I am now back in the problem of the dog’s tail, and should desist. Perhaps a touch of humour at the end would do some good.

My elder colleagues will no doubt gather, as usual, at the end of the Boston workshop the year I die. I do hope—and is this not a neat blocking strategy?—that they will not get into laudatory nonsense at my passing.

⁵⁹ *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, Axial Publishing, 2015, 253.

⁶⁰ The conclusion to “Dimensions of Meaning,” *Collection, CWL 4*, 245.

⁶¹ Lonergan, “Healing and Creating in History,” *A Third Collection*, 108.

That, I think, would be somewhat dishonest. Better by far that they consider mentioning to their classes in the following autumn that they suspect they have not only missed the point of Lonergan but have also missed that strange post-Aristotelian pointing towards a science of global redemption given by the compelling genius of history.

At that moment Quasimodo was really beautiful. He was handsome—this orphan, this foundling, this outcast. He felt himself august and strong. He looked directly into the face of the society from which he had been banished and over which he now exercised so much power—that human justice from which he had snatched its prey—all those tigers, now forced to gnash their empty jaws, those judges, those executioners—all that royal strength, which he, the most lowly, had broken with God's strength.⁶²

⁶² Victor Hugo, *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, Buccaneer Books, New York, 349.