

Field Nocturne 12

Self-Appropriating the Inner Parts¹

“One of the temptations of having a mind is to try using it alone to solve the mystery of its own nature. Philosophers have attempted this since time immemorial At the ‘brain of the matter’ is the most complicated arrangement in the known universe. To understand it will take us from philosophy to embryology, in a curious but necessary leap.”²

Introduction

To some readers a definite question may already be raised by that quotation: in what way is a venture into neuro-anatomy etc part of self-appropriation? It certainly is a long way from, say, the elementary pointers of chapter 9 of *Insight*. Yes, it seems a legitimate project when put in the conclusion of chapter 15: it gives a lift to the heuristics of botany, zoology, psychology. But it does not seem to be an essential of self-appropriation, nor of the standard type of self-appropriation that we have become accustomed to in the tradition associated with Lonergan. This, I suspect, is a view that in fact would be shared by the almost all of my readers. I think myself that it is a limited

¹I note that the title is abbreviated from that of its projected location in an emergent work, a series of 41 essays, *Field Nocturnes*, that are to be a 300-page commentary on the single paragraph of *Insight* 464[489] which starts “Study of the organism begins....”. The work will be available on the usual website: www.philipmcshane.ca. This little essay stands on its own as making some elementary points regarding the future reading of *Insight*. The essay’s title in the series is “Field Nocturnes 12: Self-Appropriating the Inner Parts”, recalling the second sentence of the paragraph to which I referred, “a first step is a descriptive differentiation of different parts and, since, most of the parts are inside....” [The essay was sent to the **Method** Journal, and I leave it as it was sent, thus causing less confusion for referencing. I even leave the address: it allows people to send me comments ... or money ho ho].

²Gerald M. Edelman, *Air, Brilliant Fire. On the Matter of the Mind*, Basic Books, Harper and Row, 1992, 31. See, however, the comment below, at note 18.

and limiting view. Let me see if I can turn your thinking towards a larger view.

Now I cannot help adding a second, primary turn, to your thinking about this matter. But I shall not do so immediately, apart from mentioning it. It is the larger turn that is the collaborative functional recycling process. Then the “let me see if I can” would be shifted uncomfortably but efficiently into the operations of the second half of page 250 of *Method in Theology*. Let us leave it at that until section 2: let us at most think of ourselves as doing an impoverished version of the exercise of dialectic that aims at helping us along in a relatively commonsense fashion. We have a shot at that in the following first section. In section 2, as I say, we come back to the larger turn. In section 3 we venture further in fantasy. The Epilogue locates the compact presentation in the fuller project.

1. Self-appropriating my brain

Perhaps we might start by going back to that first page of chapter 1 of *Insight*, to Archimedes in the bath. We are being introduced in an elementary fashion to the mind-leap of Archimedes, but notice now that we are also introduced to his leap of enthusiasm and to his leap out of the bath. Furthermore, we are being introduced thus to ourselves: is not that the whole point, pointing, of the book? But that whole pointing is not obvious, and is not immediate. Lonergan is caught in a problem that was to repeat itself in his old age, when he began working towards a primer in economics.³ So, the larger invitation is present right from that first page, but a first reading is possible where, at best, the self is read only in the context of a culture of self-description. One adds to that descriptive perspective something like an initial meaning for a scientific pursuit.⁴ I do not wish to enlarge here on the danger of that initial meaning. For people

³I consider this problem in the second chapter of the third part of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, a work that is to appear in English and French in 2009.

⁴See *Insight*, 544[567] at note 5.

unfamiliar with scientific thinking, the initial meaning can too easily be locked into a *haute vulgarization*, even into patterns of “pseudo-metaphysics myth-making.”⁵ The larger enterprise lurking in the book has, in that shrunken context, to be somehow tamed, so that, for instance, the bridge⁶ of chapter 5, and the build up to it, is replaced by a by-pass such that one manages not be discomforted by the final sentence of chapter 7: “May we note, before concluding that, while common sense relates things to us, our account of common sense relates it to its neural basis and relates aggregates and successions of instances of common sense to one another”. But the larger challenge bubbles out explicitly, perhaps a surprise to many readers, at the beginning of the section on genetic method in chapter 15 of the book, and it becomes brutally explicit in the section of chapter 16 entitled “The Unity of a Concrete Being”. It is worth quoting here Lonergan’s two explicit pointings:

[1] “To reveal the heuristic significance of the notion of development, and to prepare our statement of the integral heuristic structure that we have named metaphysics, attention must now be directed to genetic method.”⁷

[2] “So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extensions and experiencing duration gives place to the subject oriented to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate

⁵*Insight*, 505[528]. On *Haute Vulgarization* see Lonergan, *Complete Works*, vol. 2, 121, 155.

⁶The notions of space and time “form a natural bridge over which we may advance from our examination of science to an examination of common sense” (first paragraph of *Insight*, chapter 5). Without that sophistication, backed by the aggregiformic infolding that is the main topic of the previous chapters, one is liable to be the victim of “the viewpoint of sensitive extroversion” (*Insight* 513[537]) the operative “terms of space and time are mere intrusions of the imagination” (*Insight* 379[404]). See further, note 17 below.

⁷*Insight*, 458[484].

potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies.”⁸

The fifty odd pages between these two explicit pointers sketch a climb foreign both to present science and to present philosophy. What might I say here, briefly, of their significance, that might be of effective use to readers? The key is in the word *effective* and in helping towards grasping, in popular doctrinal terms, its long-term methodological meaning. The difficulty, obviously, is that the serious doctrinal grip comes only through the mediation of such enterprises as I mention in note 1, a note indeed that must, then, be supplemented by the tasks lurking in notes 31, 32, and 34 below.

The problem and the long climb are expressed compactly in a meaning for *Standard Model* that is part of the title *Loneragan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*.⁹ What do I mean by *Standard Model*? It is a common name for the present orthodox perspective in physics.¹⁰ The standard model is operative as a powerful explanatory perspective throughout present physics, and here it is useful to attend to

⁸*Insight 517*[534]. I regularly speak of the movement here, the complex existential explanatory conversion, as the “*come-about*”.

⁹The book (2007) is available on the usual website. I would note here that, while the Standard Model of the next century is identified there with a sublation of the foundational perspective expressed in *Method in Theology*, and mention is made of its eschatological component, I am only slowly coming to grips with the centrality to the operative model of an eschatological heuristic such as is intimated in notes 31 and 32 below. A fuller view of the cycling standard model’s content of UV + GS (a universal viewpoint and a genetic systematics) is available on the website in *Prehumous 11* “Fostering Functional Specialization”.

¹⁰There are other reachings at present that are not within the genetic heuristic of that model. My opinion of them coincides with that given in the following quotation: “The next step in creating a more unified theory of the basic interactions will probably be much more difficult. All the major theoretical developments of the last twenty years, such as grand unification, supergravity, and supersymmetry string theory, are almost completely separate from experience. There is great danger that theoreticians may get lost in pure speculations.”(L.O’Reafeartaigh and N.Straumann, “Group Theory: Origins and Modern Development”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 72(2000), 15.

that zone of physics that is to be analogous to functional research: normal research as it is carried out in those cyclotronic centres of massive experimental competence. The processes of that research make clear that the experimental competence is controlled both in its techniques and in its findings by theoretic competence in the standard model. Otherwise a researcher is not in the ball-park of detecting anomalies, signs of future shifts of theory or of neglected possibilities in present theory.¹¹

So, the present essay might be considered as compact descriptive research pointing to anomalous neglect of elements in the standard-model component of *Insight*.¹² It points to functionally distinct tasks for many selves during the next millennia, but it also points to each present self meeting the issue discerningly, in the context of talent, time, strategic job-holding. An increasing number of selves need to face the effort “to prepare our statement of the integral heuristic structure that we have named metaphysics.”¹³ For some, that statement may be simply the expression of a

¹¹An illustration from theology would be more in tune with the present audience than one from physics. So, for example, a competence in Lonergan’s life-long searchings regarding the exigence that is the natural desire for God is key to noticing his identification, in thesis 12 of 1964 version of *The Incarnate Word*, of the “ineffable” nature of the natural desire. The noticing is a function of functional research. How is the anomalous shift to be lifted towards street-value? The noticing leads to efforts of interpreters, and so on round the cycle of global collaboration.

The illustration is apt in the present essay, in that what is noticed here is an inner part of the brain dynamic that needs to be considered aggregatively in the full perspective of finitude’s “dynamic joy and zeal” (*Insight* 700[722]).

¹²I would note that my pointing here meshes with the work on neuroscience of two other searchers, William Mathews and David Oyler. Neither have as yet published on the matter - they are pushing towards books -, but both envisage the zone as requiring long-term commitments of interpreters, historians, etc. They have delivered papers on the topic at the 2008 Lonergan Conferences in Los Angeles and Boston. Both would carry forward their concern to the need of a sublimating implementation of the powerful but neglected hermeneutics expressed by Lonergan in chapter 17 of *Insight*, but that is a topic for another day. I think of the interest in what I might call chemodynamics expressed by people with apparently diverse interests: Patrick Byrne’s focus on the chemical dynamics of ethics; Paul St.Amour’s cosmological investigations. No doubt there are others, from whom I would like to hear.

¹³*Insight*, 458[484].

hope, a change of ethos, a shadow of later standard-model communications. The ethos, a pick-up of the mood of the searching Lonergan of 1953, is very important. It is a matter of an aesthetic apprehension of missed opportunities. "Man is nature's priest, and nature is God's silent communing with man,"¹⁴ and talk of brains and techniques such as MRI and PET open doors to a fresh empiricism of our inner cosmic loneliness. "The aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin and story become operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides or acts - and especially in a crisis."¹⁵ And we have here a crisis.¹⁶ Any self can begin to be a point of discontinuity with present philosophic culture. An accumulation of such points can ground the shift from a Poisson distribution of rare occurrences to the emergence of Bell-curve success.

We turn to that issue of statistics in the next section, but perhaps I should conclude here on a practical note. The new "turn to the subject" is by no means an easy matter. It gradually brings forth, with new refinements, the problems of objectivity associated with "out-there" and "in-here", with imaging and "bodies."¹⁷ In first efforts, those problems will not be evident: it will be a matter of facing the challenge of the

¹⁴Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, University of Toronto Press, 1993, 225.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 230.

¹⁶I enlarge on the crisis, especially regarding aggreformism and objectivity in psychology, in the series *Field Nocturnes*. But two questions of immediate interest to Lonergan students would be: where does the drive towards self's-brain-appropriation described here leave [1] phenomenology [2] the debates about feelings within Lonergan studies?

¹⁷To the obvious contexts of *Insight* I would add the context of Thomas' peculiar start to his considerations God in the First Part of *Summa Theologica* (Q.3, a.1): "Is God a Body?". Add the Trinitarian context of processional unity from *Contra Gentiles* 4: 11 . Both these contexts are central to the pointers of section 3 below, especially notes 31 and 32. There is not only the very human problem of the illusion of size as of consequence, but also the disorientation of a positive view of energy as against Lonergan's view of energy - micro and galactic - as dispersiveness needing sequences of formal infoldings. But one must hold also to the cosmic dynamic zeal at the heart of energy: see the concluding line of *Insight* 700[722].

invitation “Study of the organism begins” by using standard texts on neuroanatomy. Such texts are generally not helpful in their entrapment in reductionist tendencies, information theory jargon, anti-genetic stances. The text I use in the series of essays mentioned is among such flawed texts: there does not exist the equivalent of Lonergan’s recommended Lindsay and Margenau.¹⁸ It is the task of a later culture to bring forth such texts in botany and psychology, spanning later school grades and post-graduate directives.

2. Selves Appropriating a Standard Model

The challenge expressed compactly in this section can be located neatly by recalling paragraph of *Insight* that speaks of a particular probability-discontinuity. “Now a sum of a set of proper fractions, $p, q, r, . . .$ is always greater than the product of the same fractions. But probability is a proper fraction. It follows that, when the prior conditions for the functioning of a scheme of recurrence are satisfied, then the probability of the combination of events, constitutive of the scheme, leaps from a

¹⁸*Foundations of Physics*, with many paperback editions, still stands as a remarkable work, not easily replaced. I usually recommend supplementing it with the more recent Ian D. Lawrie, *A Grand Tour of Theoretical Physics*, Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol and Philadelphia, paperback, 1998. Neither of these are light or popular reading, of which there is a present surge in the area. The same surge, with a lag, is occurring in the neurosciences. The works of Gerald Edelman, such as the one cited at note 2, fall into that category. The task here requires that one venture into the serious scientific effort, however bad its heuristic and its expression is. The beginners’ book I use - *Neuroscience. Exploring the Brain*, M.F.Bear, B.W.Connors, M.A.Paradiso (Lipincott, Williams and Wilkins, 2001) - is by no means a Lindsay and Margenau, but it is a convenient start. The reach must be to be luminously at home in one’s own amygdala and mid-brain, one’s ATP and cytogates. Part of that at-homeness is to be luminous about one’s limited explanation at lower levels of science: how competent is one on the dynamics of protein-folding involved in the cilia-movements of one’s hearing? There is a profound problem here of aggreformism and a mythic thinking that would allow description at a higher level - especially if it is aesthetically enriched - to bluff forward as explanatory. So, there can be something like enthusiastic talk of sonata form but no serious grip on the concrete dynamics of any sonata.

product of fractions to a sum of fractions.”¹⁹

I do not wish here to get into explanatory details about this. Rather, I wish for a little imaginative leaping. There is, in *Insight*, the problem of implementation and of cosmopolis: a solitary builds his foundational ark: sharing the ark as the waters of decline continue to rise, that is a matter of multiplying very tiny fractions. “The concrete intelligibility of Space and Time grounds the possibility of those simultaneous multiplicities named situations.”²⁰ So, the solitary Lonergan gets to display models of his ark in a continuum of Roman situations and a scattering of other space-time venues. He was not happy at that period about either the reach or the effectiveness of his model, and the ferment of his discontent towards a sublating model is a well-known story. The sublating model was eventually conceived as a recurrence-scheme yielding cumulative and progressive results.²¹

But what of the satisfying conditions? The sublating model, in its global operation, seems a utopia.. “Is my proposal utopian? It asks merely for creativity, for an interdisciplinary theory that at first will be denounced as absurd, then will be admitted to be true but obvious and insignificant, and perhaps finally be regarded as so important that its adversaries will claim that they themselves discovered it.”²² Such a sequence of receptions will, I surmise, be an actuality of this century. The model is fosterfather Lonergan’s self-appropriated brain’s child, but the reality is to be mothered

¹⁹*Insight*, 121[144].

²⁰*Insight*, 172[195].

²¹*Method in Theology*, 4.

²²B.Lonergan, “Healing and Creating in History,” *A Third Collection*, edited by F.E.Crowe, Paulist Press, New York, 1985, 108. The article is also in Lonergan, *Macroeconomic Dynamcis: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, edited by F.G.Lawrence, P.H.Byrne and C.C. Hefling, Jr., by University of Toronto Press, 1999, 106.

by history.²³ The satisfying conditions are emergent in the present muddles and confusions of every contemporary zone of global investigation and care. But they look to a complex multi-faceted paradigm shift, especially as they bubble in the volcanic mess of present political economics. It would seem that the fractional probabilities are larger in such harmless zones as musicology and literary studies, or in a popular zone like green-party or feminist-ecological movements.²⁴

Still, the followers of Lonergan have an edge in the aggregate of unconnected fractional probabilities: an initial meaning of the eventual global achievement sits there, awaiting the effective attention of his disciples. "It asks merely for creativity", but that creativity is a massive struggle of fantasy. What if *Method in Theology* was and is a poor shot at an initial meaning of something that is to blossom, in a hundred years or so, into a global omnidisciplinary collaboration whose elders' talk would break into the polite cover-ups and spins of world-bodies like the UN, the World Bank? "Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company," but a foundational global elderhood of transdisciplinary women and men would lift green and Gaia movements into a Bell-curve statistics of pressure on world business, world hunger, world inequalities. There is a beckoning here that is 13.7 billion years old, a call of will that is 7 million years old, lifted recently²⁵ to an incarnational pre-cosmopolis that shifts

²³I have treated this topic in chapter one of *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*, 2006, available on the usual website.

²⁴ Arne Noess, Founder of a fundamental ecological movement and of the journal *The Ecologist*, makes the point in "Deep Ecology and Ultimate Premises", *The Ecologist*, 18, 1988, 131. On musicology, see chapter 2 of my *The Shaping of the Foundations*, University of America Press, 1974. On literary studies see chapter 5 of *Lonergan's Challenge to the University and the Economy*, University Press of America, 1979. Both these books are available on the usual website. On functional specialization in law, see chapter 8 of Bruce Anderson, *.Discovery in Legal Decision-Making*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1996. On feminist movements see Alessandra Gillis Drage, *Thinking Woman*, Axial Publishing, 2006, chapters 11 and 12.

²⁵A full heuristic perspective helps. The past stretches back 13.7 billion years. Estimates of the sun's story allow for at least another 2 or 3 billion years of present human conditions, not

massively the statistics of willing so that “good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that orders dynamic joy and zeal.”²⁶

3. Reaching for the Seeds of the Eschaton

“In that beckoning we discern not only the ground of our hope but also the cosmic dimension in the new creation of all things in Christ Jesus our Lord.”²⁷ But before going on to muse over discerning the ground of our hope in the self-appropriation of brain, let me pull in a milder reaching from another context. So I quote from a reaching presented at an Australian Lonergan Conference in 2007:

“By a new global culture I mean a culture that is established in the scientific mode invented by Lonergan in his creative leap of February 1965, when he conceived of a functional collaboration in the global search for progress. In Christian terms one might see him as bracketing Paul’s hymn to charity of *First Corinthians*, chapter 13, with a sublation of the two bracketing chapters, 12 and 14, with a refinement of interpretation, a maturing of thinking: “All do not interpret, do they?” (12: 30); “in your thinking be mature” (14: 20). But to that light-weight reading of a parallel in scripture there is to be added the deeper perspective of the effective unity of the mission of Jesus

taking into account travels beyond the solar system with concomitant adaptations. The emergence of the human predates the Incarnation merely by a few million years.

²⁶*Insight*, 700[720].

²⁷B.Lonergan, “Christology Today: Methodological Reflections”, *A Third Collection*, 94. I am reaching in this short section for compact suggestiveness. Eschatology has been a focus of my attention for at least twenty years. I resonate with Rahner’s last public address - I think in February 1984 - when he lamented the absence of a serious contemporary eschatology. But there is too much to suggest here. Think, for instance, of a brain-including reading of *mind* in those two key invitations to cherish and make our own the mind of Jesus (*I Cor* 2: 16; *Phil* 1 : 5). Think of the inclusion of brain in the eschatological reach for a Big concentrated Clasp (see notes 31 and 32): “the universe can bring forth its own unity in the concentrated form of a single intelligent view”(*Insight*, 520[544]), an eternally brain-viewing Community, Mysteriously incomplete and genetic.

as it seeds the efficient unity of a human science. "It is quite legitimate to seek in the efficient cause of the science, that is, in the scientist, the reason why a science forms a unified whole."²⁸ And that efficiency places the global solution to Plato's ancient problem of the control of urban meaning in Lonergan's final identification of the human component of Cosmopolis.²⁹ Functional collaboration is to replace eventually the long muddled haphazard effort of thinking effectively forward in history."³⁰

That reaching for a strange recontextualization of Paul's hymn to charity, is a contextualization in a new global culture that would gladden Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's heart: "Lord Jesus Christ, you truly contain within your gentleness, within your humanity, all the unyielding immensity and grandeur of the world. And it is because of this, it is because there exists in you this ineffable synthesis of what our human thought and experience would never have dared to join together in order to adore them - element and totality, the one and the many, mind and matter, the infinite and the person; it is because of the indefinable contours which this complexity gives to your appearance and to your activity, that my heart, enarmoured of cosmic reality, gives itself passionately to you."³¹

²⁸B.Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, University of Toronto Press, 1993, 160.

²⁹In the second half of *Joistings 22* I discuss the manner in which the characteristics of Cosmopolis are realized in the strategy of functional specialization.

³⁰The conference was organized by Professor Neil Ormerod and he is in process of publishing the papers. For the present, the paper quoted, "*Insight Within a New Global Culture*", is available on the usual website, www.philipmcshane.ca, under *Archives*.

³¹Quoted in *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Writings Selected with an Introduction*, Ursula King, Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York, 1999, 53. The quotation is from *Writings in Time of War* (Harper and Row, New York, 1968, 69). The mood and struggle of Chardin provides an existential and prayerfilled context for the challenge left abruptly here in my final paragraph of this section. How are we to replace the muddled struggles of, say, Thomas and Chardin? There is the Big Bang. How are we to slowly come to envisage, not a Big Crunch, but a Big Clasp, in which "element and totality, the one and the many, mind and matter" neurolink with the Big Brain of the Incarnate Word in a brain-shared mesh of billions of humans, trees in an eternal nerve-forest, individually circumincessionally (see Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systemics*,

But the reach I speak of is the slow luminous climb through the third stage of meaning, mediated by functional cyclings of global collaboration, that would mustard-seed the distant utopia of finitude's eschatological meshing into *Theoria* in a long series of leaps from initial meanings of Old or New Testaments. That series would slowly lift the self-meaning of Chardin's enarmoured heart or the heart of *Roman's* 5: 5 into the world invisible of the "come-about." The "come-about" is to an ever-incomplete aspirating of the foundational elders reaching in prayer for an imaging of "their destiny."³²

The reach I speak of is for a new eschatology so desperately needed in these coming millennia. But it must begin with the foundational self-appropriation of our brains. And, providentially, the pressures towards such a foundational effort, the conditions for the recurrence-schemes it involves, are present in crises of neurodynamics, genetics, psychology, linguistics, that are erupting in the simmering volcano of contemporary technologies.

4. Epilogue

It seems to me important to make, at this stage, the compact statement of the

University of Toronto Press, 2007, 509-513) named and cherished? "I will give him a white stone, and a new name written on the stone which no one knows but he who receives it" (*Revelations*, 2:17). We can only begin, in our time, by cherishing the genetic neurodynamics of the naming of water that Annie Sullivan made possible for Helen Keller.

³²*Method in Theology*, 292. As the previous note indicates, the imaging is to be a slow climb through the analogies of nature. We are here up against issues of fantasy and of the humble struggle for explanatory invisibility. It brings to mind Lonergan efforts at these in another context, reaching for the "difference between high civilization and primitive gardening. But we are not there yet. And for society to progress towards that or any other goal, it must fulfil one condition. It cannot be a titanothore, a beast with a three-ton body and a ten-ounce brain" (*For A New Political Economy*, 20). So, for example, we have left the voicings of the primitive garden to mesh brains cellophonically in a global village: might this give pointers towards a Big Clasp?

article.³³ *Insight* emerged in a solitude reaching way beyond the 20th century, and its success depended, paradoxically, on recurrence-schemes of which its author had no notion at the time. As we flounder into a new millennium of terror and hunger, the conditions are being grimly fulfilled for a fresh global effort at implementing his later fantasy of differentiated collaboration. “The most difficult of enterprises will have to be undertaken under the most adverse circumstances.”³⁴ The adverse circumstances include, within Lonergan studies, developed habits of contented old-style descriptive and comparative searchings of the surface self. Within the global struggle they include the evident yet sadly dodged fact of a global village that includes the needs of the brains and bellies of Arabs, Orientals, and Africans, as well as the appetites of Americans and Europeans.

³³A simple analogy helps here in sensing the need for a fuller standard model. It is of enormous help to have a heuristic grip on the nature of the adult animal when studying the processes towards that adulthood. So, some heuristic grip on the brain-seeded Eschaton gives a key lift to what I call the Standard Model. An initial context for the reaching is Charles Hefling Jr.’s essay on chapter 20 of *Insight in Lonergan’s Hermeneutics. Its Development and Application*, edited by Sean E. McEvenue and Ben F. Meyer, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C., 1989.

³⁴*Insight*, 233[258]. A final footnote seems an inappropriate place to open up massively the topic of our present interest. Still, it is appropriate to note that the topic of the spiritual, in its mesh with energy, is a topic of *Insight* 16.4.3, on “The Unity of Man”, outside the 50 pages that I mentioned at the beginning. It is a topic needing all the clarity attainable by a community regionalized in history by the “**come-about**” of the previous section. (The problem of this functional regionalization emerges, but implicitly, in the final chapter of *Topics in Education*). It is to give a fresh and subtle other sense to the claim that “in another sense it is quite difficult to be at home in transcendental method” (*Method in Theology*, 14). And what is it for the human group to reach home in the ultimate Ascension? We have to lift Thomas cramped and non-genetic puzzling (see his searchings about the separated soul and the Ascension of Jesus), within the layered and time-tight cosmology of his time, into a dynamic view of the separated soul and the energy-redemptive lift-off we are to share with Jesus, onwards everlastingly into the Big HUG: Home Unrepeatedly in God.