

A PLACE IN THE SON: RISE WITH ME

I had thought of beginning this transitional essay by recalling my conclusion to Appendix B of *Vignette 7*. Then a memory bubbled up of advice Lonergan gave me as we lunched together in the late 1970s. I had just mentioned to him that Matt Lamb had asked me to write something for *Creativity and Method* on Mathematics.¹ But, I said, “I already did that in the early sixties.”² Well, Lonergan said, “give it to them again.” So, instead of quoting the end of that previous *Vignette 7*, about my promise regarding the content of this one, I give you again the full Appendix B. I do so all the more deliberately because it went unheard then, as did my outreach expressed there in Appendix A. It is quite clear to me that the opposition to my suggestions among all levels of Lonergan studies is solid. That clarity does not come from an articulated opposition, which I would have welcomed, but from a Gross Silence. Am I surprised? Not at all. But absence of surprise does not reduce my disgust. You, my colleagues of the next few generations after me, have settled for a cosy and busy aggregate of patterns of betrayal of Lonergan’s hope,³ and the settling misleads even the brightest of students, victims of their busy wastelanding of history.

¹ The volume referred to is *Creativity and Method*, edited by Matthew Lamb, Marquette University Press, 1981. Eventually I submitted the essay, “Features of Generalized Empirical Method and the Actual Context of Economics,” 543–71.

² “The Foundations of Mathematics,” *Modern Schoolman* 40 (1963), 373–87. Reprinted as chapter 2 of *Lonergan’s Challenge to the University and the Economy*, a book of the mid-1970s. A photocopy of Lonergan’s copy, with his asides, is available at: <http://www.philipmcschane.org/published-books>.

³ Lonergan’s hope may be considered to have been for “a resolute and effective intervention in this historical process” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 306) such that it would ground the blossoming of Isaiah’s Dream (2:2–4) of “the last days.” He concludes the extant part of his “Essay on Fundamental Sociology” with a comment on that dream. “Is this to be taken literally or is it figure? It would be fair and fine, indeed, to think it no figure.” (Michael Shute, *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research*, University of Toronto Press, 2010, 44). My drive in this essay is to intimate the new strange distant home, OM, a Towering mediation above nations and tongues, “that commands man’s first allegiance, that is too universal to be bribed, too impalpable to be forced, too effective to be ignored.” *Insight*, 263.

So, on I go, first with the repetition, shortly, of that Appendix B, then on to the task noted at its end: pitching my full heuristic stand.

You may find odd, yet also be amused at, my remembering now a passage of Shakespeare that made a solid impression on my sixteen-year-old self. Seventy years later I delight in quoting the end of the speech. “I’ll so offend to make offense a skill / Redeeming time when men think least I will.”⁴

Indeed: and why not entertain you, and eventually inspire you, with the beginning of that speech?

I know you all, and will awhile uphold
The unyok’d humour of your idleness;
Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That, when he please again to be himself,
Being wanted he may be more wondered at
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.⁵

Yet now you must pause and brood, for a day but yes a decade or three,⁶ over my reading there of the first “I”, for it is not I, but first the “I” of Jesus in a strange fantasy of mine⁷ about “distinguishing the successive stages of this, the greatest of works.”⁸ There is the allure of the compelling Genius of history: millennia to come will see the beauty of Jesus, smothered by these past two thousand years, breaking through religious walls in a strange coming convergence of world religions.⁹

⁴ *Henry IV, Part 1*: Act 1, Scene 2, lines 209–10.

⁵ *Ibid.*, lines 188–96.

⁶ You problem here, and there, is facing the challenge of The Interior Lighthouse: a challenge I have written about extensively (see note 31 below), and to which I return in later Vignettes.

⁷ Might I not put it, imaged, in this footnote? *Ecce, Bonmo*: $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}$ ⁴

⁸ *The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 491.

⁹ There is to appear a series of five essays in *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education* 2018–2020, that lifts Whitson’s *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*, into a suspicion of the fuller context pointed to in this more recent effort of mine. The essays there are “Minding Reality”; “The Coming Convergence of World Responsiveness”; “Steps towards Effectively Converging Religions”; “Converging Religions to Effective Historical Intervention”; “Converging Religions Into being in Love with Jesus EtC”.

But there is also the “I” of Lonergan, breaking through the foul and ugly mists belched forth by little frogs. “They will bring rulers and compasses to measure the words, and those forms which are used to measure bricks.”¹⁰

Time now for that Appendix B, freshened in this sad yet hopeful context.

APPENDIX B

Let us, you and I now, as slow as you like, think ‘things’ out, not unlike a primitive group stumbling into weir-fishing.¹¹ Lift the stumbling a bit and yet a strange great lot.¹² We are not, then, stumbling but seeking a weird view that will help us grow up out of the shambles of the our story, us individually and us as a human group—you may think of the compacting words *ontic* and *phyletic*.¹³ The stumbling has, say, to be done with primitive mastery. We are in the first paragraph of *Method*. And we are not looking for a view: we are stumbling with modest success from facts to acts, not knowing what facts and acts are. We are stumbling, two-packed, round a six-packed pattern, pack-muling.

I won’t go on with this pedagogy here: we shall get back to it after *Vignette* 10. We have to slowly uncover in ourselves and our story “all that is lacking,”¹⁴ including all that has been

¹⁰ Aristophanes, *The Frogs*. I first quoted this piece in Postlude: Prelude to *Process: a Paideiad*, the final page of my 1975 book, [Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations: Self-Axis of the Great Ascent](http://www.philipmchane.org/published-books). The book is available at: <http://www.philipmchane.org/published-books>.

¹¹ See Michael Shute, “Real Economic Variables,” in a volume devoted to beginning a science of economics: *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education* 21(2), 2010. Right through this short Appendix our interest—including yours now, if you have been stirred to the task of finding some personal zone of implementation—is to get things going in me and my group. You could even start by annoying your present department, but tread softly if you are in thesis or tenure mode!

¹² “One can go on to a developed account” (*Method*, 287: that troublesome paragraph!) of primitive compact consciousnesses, only slowly and with enormous difficulty. As we putter in these simple shots at beginnings there is obviously nothing to prevent you venturing into much heavier musings and searchings.

¹³ And you may well think of the works of Voegelin, Sorokin, and such, delving into early and recent sensate cultures. From Lonergan I would recommend the personal nudgings of the last two chapters of *Phenomenology and Logic*.

¹⁴ *Insight* 558, line 24. I intimate that, yes, we can reach in these years 2018–2020 for a vision of the “all” but my focus is not on all, but on finding little zones of shifting. There is the obvious central zone of *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*, and yes, making it a topic and an annoyance to Lonerganism. But we need to find little zones of personal interference in history, and thus find that implementation and change are massively difficult.

lacking in the entire negative Anthropocene Age,¹⁵ in order to be open to the shifting from the six-pack to an eight-pack in the global growth problem. We still have a long-group group-way to go “to prepare our statement”¹⁶ about growth.

So let’s begin—you may think oddly—with a two-pack: sniffing out flawed and successful flows in going from past to future.¹⁷ Our world leaders, our educators, our economists, our religious leaders are at present well-endowed with flaws. Recall page 2 of *Vignette 6*, “brood on the horrid characters of present statecraft: Putin and Trump, Xi Jinping and Kim Jong-Un,” and add in Pope Francis and other religious leaders.

I am asking you to hover weakly and weekly over *Loneragan’s 1833 Overture*: brood simply on the flaws and on the flawed brooding. Each of us can thus begin to see and seize what we might do about those flaws, and especially important is to face up to the flawed brooding and flawed street-action of the disciples of Loneragan. Let me illustrate a flaw by talking about that honest hunter Fred Crowe: his culture led him to simply miss that “implementation”—“fruit to be borne” (*Method*, 355) was the center-piece of Loneragan’s life-work. It did not find its way into his first index of *Insight*.¹⁸ Such is our intellectual culture, caught in a axial superego¹⁹: the culture of *Method*, paragraph 2.

¹⁵ You would find useful Ian Angus, *Facing the Anthropocene. Fossil Capitalism and the Crisis of the Earth System*, Monthly Review Press, 2016.

¹⁶ *Insight*, 484. Here we have the key: hear Loneragan freshly: “to prepare our statement of the integral heuristic structure that we have named metaphysics, attention must now be directed to genetic method.” We shall begin to see this better slowly, sniffing our way to finding the center of the “third way, difficult and laborious.” *Method*, 3rd paragraph.

¹⁷ This seems to me at present to be the key to starting up some functional collaboration. It cut down the immediate practicality the full cycle that starts with a first functional specialty poises, “this is worth recycling” (where *worth* is either because something working well has been found in some village or the opposite) and swings through the 8-pack. In this effort you, now, need to have an effective shot at envisaging the effective interference of some immediately available remedy, even a thumb in dyke business. Of course, you are also invited to envisage the full effort of the poise, “this is worth recycling” as I present it in the ten website essays [FuSe 0–9](#) on the first functional specialty.

¹⁸ Fred and I joked occasionally about our flawed indexings. His indexing effort in *Insight* was in fact an extraordinary achievement. But the point I am making is that the best of us can be culturally trapped in old ways.

¹⁹ See the two website *Humus* essays: [Humus 2](#), “Vis Cogitativa and Defective Patterns of Anticipation”; [Humus 6](#), “Repatterning the SuperEgos’ Molecular Religiosity.”

This entire series of 217 essays is directed to detecting flawed brooding and flawed acting and seeding remedies. A beginning can be made as I suggest here. Pause over “my” and “my (various) groups” flawed broodings and actings. Are there little ways forward?²⁰

But I ask for patience with these first ten essays. On May 20th, *Vignette 10*, “A Place in the Son: Rise With Me,” I will put in the *Assembly*²¹ line *my* view of growing, which is what the first two objectifications of the *Loneragan 1833 Overture* are all about. By then will others have had a parallel shot at horizon-expression? Will we be able to move into the third objectification? We must wait and see. But what I wish for now is a simple, almost primitive poise of active concern, about and round about modern misery, greed, mindlessness, industry, us all “together swept in a swirling mass down the cataract of life to the serene pool of a green churchyard.”²²

Well, we waited and I saw that I have been left quite alone by the usual suspects,²³ in the project proposed so clearly by Loneragan in his short section 5, “Dialectic: The Structure” of his chapter in *Method* on “Dialectic.”

As I move on here I have to modify my first hovering intention of presenting, in dense brevity, my stand on Metaphysics, the *bon mot* re Futurology mentioned in note 5 above. Here, at any rate, I end the hovering by repeating that compact expression of it, in large bold face, and going on to curtail the presentation.

²⁰ You would find it useful to venture into the beginning of my *Futurology Express* (Axial Publications, 2013, 7–10) and find the Toronto family in trouble regarding their annual holiday’s deterioration. But what we are reaching for here, in our two-pack approach, is a simpler intimation of remedies.

²¹ See note 5 of *Vignette 7*. In the notes to this little Appendix I have push different aspects of the task of *Assembly*. In the later mature dynamic of the 8-pack this task will be one of adding successful refinements to a successful global cycling and recycling. In our present state of betrayal of Loneragan, even small assemblies—tasks or groups—are a relevant seeding. Try thinking in terms of the array at the top of *Method* 48: mustard-seeding little “institutions, roles, tasks.”

²² *Shorter Papers*, CWL 20, “The Mystical Body and the Sacraments,” 78.

²³ The usual suspects who leave me alone are the senior Loneragan scholars of the generations after me. I am, however, not alone. There is a small group of oddities who consider my view of Loneragan’s *Praxisweltanschauung* to be on target. One might think of those who contributed to *Seeding Global Collaboration*, edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy, Axial Publishing, 2016. Some of those contributors have heavy books already available but neglected, waiting in the wings for the turn to the positive Anthropocene Age.

$$\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\mathbf{T}}\}^4$$

You will recall a simple version of this given in *Vignette 9*,²⁴ but now it has been bracketed and placed to the power of four. What, you must surely be asking IF you are tuned into our task, is this all about? Obviously, it is about the total future, the “field”²⁵ in Lonergan’s terms, eventually a neuromolecular field-mesh of infinite delight in Tripersonal Mysteriousness.²⁶ But here and now it is about seeding the core of the mediation of a genetic field heuristics, and the core is what I call *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*. We must pause over that seeding before I venture into comments about my strange summary symbol of my own self-identification.

My entire Vignette enterprise is the seeding of a collaboration in meeting the demands of *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*. What of the demands of the upper half of that page 250 of *Method*? Certainly they are involved, and will be attended to in the next 207 essays. But it will be a massive achievement if I get people who aspire to be dialecticians to have a shot at participating in the climb up through the three objectifications that Lonergan deems to be normative in the cyclic dynamics of omnidisciplinary global collaboration. And having written that far in this paragraph, it seems best to halt. I thus place us back in my last paragraph of Appendix B.

Yet now, what might I do about my identification of my self-identification? We can be amused at my first foolishness, expressed in the title of this Vignette, conjured up weeks ago. It merges the title of [Cantower 10](#) with the title of [Vignette 7](#), thus nudging towards a paralleling of my younger searching for foundations with the accelerating present effort.²⁷ It brings to

²⁴ See [Vignette 9](#), “The Conception of Metaphysics,” p. 4. On pages 5–6 there is a clarification of the three superscripts: θ , Φ , and \mathbf{T} .

²⁵ “As defined, the horizon is a relative term: what is meaningless-to-me may or may not be meaningless absolutely. By way of contrast, we shall also speak of the *field*: what is beyond the field is meaningless absolutely, insignificant absolutely, insoluble absolutely. The field is *the* universe, but my horizon defines *my* universe.” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 199). The italics are Lonergan’s, since I was quoting there his lecture notes.

²⁶ The heuristics of this requires a lift of the suggestiveness of “The Divine Missions” (*The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 437–521) into a self-luminous explanatory horizon weaved into the fulsome eschatology suggested by section 20 of the article referred to in note 38.

²⁷ The full Cantower series is described in [Field Nocturnes CanTower 43](#). That climb was a project of the decade 2002–12. Some such monthly and daily effort is required in those who seek the world of *The Interior Lighthouse*. See note 31 below.

mind chatting with Lonergan in 1966 about his aspiration to contextualize *Method* with the achievement of *Insight*. But I would note that the problem becomes quite different in a mature Futurology. Then the first and second objectifications—and indeed the third, but differently—presume the context of a standard model that is open to refinements. Might I play that card here? Then I would note, in a practice to become standard, the *Assembly* additional to the model that is involved. Let me illustrate that by assuming that my addition is a shift from in $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}$ to $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$ in my definition of metaphysics and I assume that I am talking about my shift to colleagues competent in dialectic.

And now I find that a fortunate accident of a week or so ago places me in such a happy position: a recent correspondence with my competent colleague Mike Shute fits the bill sufficiently to get me off the hook of inventing the required *Assembly*. Yes, it is a loose presentation, exchanging nudges between friends. But does not that loose nudging also illustrate a distant future of core *ad core loquens*, open to discomforts, demands, criticisms? Might it encourage other colleagues to at least express their cor and core to me, so that we can get the show and tell on the road?

Here you are then, with permission from Mike Shute: my unedited ramble to him in two recent e-mails. The e-mails are left as they were sent, but I add a few footnotes.

Hi Mike,

You have a really right-on project. Here I go with some back-up rambling.

I just checked back to my essay in the Doran-Dadosky volume: “The Fourth Stage of Meaning: Essay 44 of the Series Field Nocturnes Cantower.”²⁸ Worth venturing into. The fourth stage is what is meant by the “4” in *Vignette* 10’s introductory symbol

$$\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{\theta\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$$

which gives my new definition of metaphysics. [see comment at end] The “4” goes back to my invention of ()³, e.g., (discernment)³, for (discernment of discernments of discernments)

²⁸ In *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology. Essay in Honor of Robert M. Doran*, edited by John D. Dadosky, Marquette University Press, 2009, 331–43. The Dadosky work referred to above, “Midwiving the Fourth Stage of Meaning: Lonergan and Doran” is there too, pp. 71–92.

at the end of the first chapter of *Redress of Poise*, “The Value of Lonergan’s Economics for Lonergan Students.”²⁹

The fourth stage of meaning, briefly, lifts GEM 3 [3rd Coll, 141, top] to being focused on the subject, not a ‘tandem’ business. Neither Dadosky nor Catherine of Siena is in this world. Nor are the so-called mystics of any tradition. The shift to four relates to the two zones [1] “God is not an object” (*Method*, 342) and [2] and existential solution to page 537 of *Insight* that is weaved into *Insight* chapter 19, section 9, in the fourteenth place (683): the question ‘where is finitude?’ [1] and [2] come together in my poise of *Allure* 233–235.³⁰ But it is in the ‘trail’ set by the appendices of the book and the 5 articles of *Humus* (4–8) on “Foundational Prayer”. This meaning, this shift from apophatic to apokataphatic thinking, needs to blossom in all religions. There is to emerge a global tradition of “The Interior Lighthouse”³¹ that lifts the “In” of *Insight*, and of its first word “In”, into a meaningful word, “Innn”, finding room in the Inn for the Nomen, the Om, the omen, the Amen. Blossom actively: giving “convergence” its full meaning of a global leaning Tower of Able.³²

²⁹ The book is available at: <http://www.philipmcschane.org/website-books>.

³⁰ I refer thus throughout to the book *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History. Teaching Young Humans Humanity and Hope*, Axial Publishing, 2017. My perspective on the entire set of topics is shockingly different now, weaved round a new meaning of hope and the richer meaning lurking (but where is it lurking?) in my bon mot of metaphysics.

³¹ I quote here note 42 of “The Coming Convergence of World Responsiveness” (see above, note 9). “On my website, [HOW 13](#), “The Interior Lighthouse” introduced the topic, *Interior Lighthouse*, under that title. [Disputing Quests 12](#), “The Interior Lighthouse II” continued the reflection, as did [Disputing Quests 13](#), “The Interior Lighthouse Zero.” Those essays were followed by [Interpretation 4](#), “The Interior Lighthouse III,” [Interpretation 16](#), “The Interior Lighthouse IV: Twenty Seventh Lea,” and [Interpretation 17](#), “The Interior Lighthouse V: Interpreting God.” The topic, however, goes back to *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minds* (1989, available at: <http://www.philipmcschane.org/website-books>) and the broad challenge is made explicit in the five essays, [Prebumous 4–8](#), on “Foundational Prayer.” It is the heart of the matter in my recent book, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* (Axial Publishing, 2015). The drive of that series was towards an appreciation of the need for a contemplative ingestion of *Insight* if we are to arrive at a sub-population competent “Tower-wise” “to be a resolute and effective intervention in the historical process” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 306). What of rest of the contemplative population? This short essay is a nudge towards your answer: but the full answer, sniffed at the end of this essay, is a complex heuristic requiring “distinguishing the successive stages of this, the greatest of all works” (*The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 491). Finally, in this first footnote, I would wish you to consider the notes as to be returned to later: they are meant to cut out of the text complexities that are indeed of interest to all of us dummies.”

³² See the references at note 9, and with their slow ingestion let your molecules reach on and on in a manner touched on below in note 34.

The Tower work in that later stage—perhaps ho ho beyond the date I gave³³ for a decent emergence of Cosmopolis, 9011 A.D., where one-fortieth of 10 billion humans are Tower-workers, and there is a rising ethos of self-attention and leisure (in the presence of robotics, vertical chemical fishing and farming etc: but perhaps my old view of a billion farm-holdings could still be valid. Also include sexual leisure, the allure of the Nomen) is the mediation of fourth-level contemplatives of a genetic global focus, a positive hope-filled answer to my question (*Profit*, 85) about “humanity going forward” through their role of accelerated cycling and fantasy.³⁴ Will some of that group have walled zones, like our local magnificent “Westminster Abbey Mission, British Columbia”? (You can Google that.). I found myself uncomfortable walking in that zone, under that dome, a couple of weeks ago, but I can’t say. The idiocies criticize by the 29-yr-old Lonergan³⁵ will, of course, be identified as such by an ethos “too effective to be ignored” (*Insight* 263).

best halt there!

Phil

P. S. an afternote. Front-line shifts in the full Markov sphere-skin of Metaphysical meaning shift the entire sphere-meaning: think either of the Sunflower or of the economy of ancient Rome [or Peking, or Bagdad ...]. There is a new capacity for reading ‘what went on’. The actual operative idea or the missed good idea have both a new heuristic. One sees and seizes the trampled little sunflower stem differently. But one also sees and seizes $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$ differently!!

³³ The lecture, “Arriving in Cosmopolis” was given in Puebla, Mexico, in 2011. It is available in Spanish and English at: <http://www.philipmcschane.org/website-articles>.

³⁴ We reach here the highpoint of my suggestive—if it grows on you and in you—bon mot, M.O., OM, $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$ the toe-filling fantasy that lifts us beyond present town and gown into a globe in which “the ready-made world heads on to God. Man is nature’s priest, and nature is God’s silent communing with man.” (*Topics in Education*, CWL 10, 224–25)

³⁵ I refer here to his *Essay on Fundamental Sociology*. I had, in particular, in mind when I typed, “the stupid appeal to a common language and a unified geographic position as something of real significance,” page 30 in Shute’s *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research*.

{Second E-mail}:

Further on those pointers, FLM, 47 of *CWL* 4: the paragraph end starting from “Theologians, let alone parents...”³⁶ Add the pointer of the note (74) and also the pointer “moral education is impossible without the constant vision of greatness.” (*CWL* 10, *Topics*, p.102). It is a matter of reaching for the fourth stage gripping and gripped meaning of “Where is finitude?” and “distinguishing the successive stages of this, the greatest of all works” (*CWL* 12, 491). This needs the seeding of a tradition of kataphatic reading of *Insight*. That climb needs the back-up of InWithTo meshed slowly with a full psychic presence the six genera of causalities of the Incarnate Word. There is need, as previously mentioned, of a lifting into this context of Christ-life of a full treasury of sexuality, “the universe being in love with God” expressed at the high evolutionary achievement of craving expressed e.g. in leaping salmon and rutting elephants. Increasingly, it seems to me, there emerges the need [see the sadness of Rahner’s last address]³⁷ to have an eschatological vision that sublates Thomas’ gallant effort (see the final note 86 of *The Everlasting Joy of being Human*, page 125 but also the filling out of the sketch of the full modern reach in section 20 of my Div (2017.1) article “The Trivialization of History.”³⁸ An eschatonic tonic savoring of finitude’s lonely molecules salmon-leaping from e.g. entrapment in present automobiles, planes, missiles, needles and threads to weaving into the neurodynamics of Jesus’ disembodied Head, all our (100 + billion) heads’ Head. Fourth stage contemplatives need to HEAD that Way, that truth, that life, for others, those others sniffing the X-factor in their “*Vinceròs*.”³⁹

³⁶ Collection, “Finality, Love, Marriage,” *CWL* 4, 47. The paragraph began on page 45. Note 74 is a reference to Aristotle: weave it round the pointers of note 43 below.

³⁷ Karl Rahner’s final lecture “Experiences of a Catholic Theologian” was published in *Theological Studies* 61/1 (2000), 3–15.

³⁸ The reference is to my article, “*Insight* and the Trivialization of History,” *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education* 28(1), 2017.

³⁹ See *Allure*, the final lines of page 225. The reference is to the television show, the X-Factor, and similar talent shows. *Vinceròs* refers to a popular choice of singing challenge, the conclusion of the aria “Nessun dorma” from Puccini’s *Turandot*. The psychic lift of the audience is manifest. There is a chambering in grouped “immortal diamonds” of “Dilegua, o notte! Tramontate, stelle! Tramontate, stelle! All’alba vincerò!” (“Vanish, o night! Fade, you stars! Fade, you stars! At dawn, I will win!”)

Re the Vision of Greatness: the end of *Essay in Fundamental Sociology* built forward into my “Amendment A,”⁴⁰ a positive “heart going like mad and yes I said yes I will yes” (Molly Bloom, blooming finitude, at the end of Joyce’s *Ulysses*, “I was a flower of the mountain” [8 lines earlier]).

Re “Where is finitude?”: the answering is a long climb into the Interior Lighthouse that sublates the Upanishadic search for Om. It dances into the 14th place, palace, on *Insight* 683, to find there the oddity of the lift of divine creativity’s poise of the secondary intelligibles that we are, “there and no where else”.

Phil

Does not this ramble give some impression of a grounded hope that we can rise, heliotropically, in the feebly emerging positive Anthropocene Age? Might you now read, freshly, the Prince of Peace borrowing from the Prince’s speech in *Henry IV Part 1*?

Prince. Herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That, when he please again to be himself,
Being wanted he may be more wondered at
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.⁴¹

And might you too not rise, Hello-tropically⁴² and Helio-tropically over decades, to steal from another hero of Shakespeare, Pericles, so as to be Toweringly Able to express a

⁴⁰ Best repeat it here, in its question form: “Do you view humanity as possibly maturing—in some serious way—or just messing along between good and evil, whatever you think they are?”

⁴¹ *King Henry IV, Part I*, Act 1, scene 2, lines 190-96. Does this nudge you to a fresh hope, an Isaiah dream, Jeremiah’s heartlaw (31:31–34) flaming forth to heat the Earth? And perhaps a little poem I wrote some weeks ago might help in a fantasy of a newly mantled (my dismantling of the word *dismantling*) Christianity? “The Wholly Frail / Was brought to / Roam in / Walled guard dens / Clouding the / Home in / His Lone Lens / Of a story / So slowly / Mantling humanity.”

⁴² I am recalling here a conversation with Lonergan in the late 1970s. We were talking about Dante and Beatrice and greetings, and he remarked, raising his right arm and his end-word, “that’s what life’s about: saying hello!”

fuller *cor* and core of foundational meaning? To speak, a character of incarnate meaning,⁴³ to all the Heli and Helae Can us tropes of loneliness?

Pericles: I embrace you.
Give me my robes. I am wild with beholding.
But hark, what music?
Helicanus: My lord, I hear none.
Pericles: None?
The music of the spheres!⁴⁴

⁴³ You need to weave together—an existential neurodynamic challenge—section 6, “Incarnate Meaning” of chapter 3 of *Method*, and section 1, “Meaning and Ontology” of the 14th chapter (where the word ‘character’ occurs) with the first paragraph of the Aristotelean *Magna Moralia*, on **character**’s global reach.

⁴⁴ *Pericles*, Act 5, scene 1. For Patrick Kavanagh’s magnificent reflections on the climb to enlightenment of Shakespeare’s *Pericles*, see my *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway*, Axial Publishing, 2006, 56–65.