

THE SCRIPTURES' STORY

Our *Assembly* now reaches **into** all scriptures of all religious traditions. *Into* here is a massively loaded word. It has its fullest suggestive Christian meaning with its 'interruption' by a *with* that points to the sharing of humanity **with** the incarnate second person of a Triune God. The resulting compound, *InWithTo*, has occurred frequently in my recent writings, and it—and its standard-model-for-me meaning—is part of my present *Assembly*.

But the plural in my title is expressive of an outreach that was the dynamics lurking in my venture into the problem, and slim heuristic solution, of the active convergence of world religions. The active convergence, in my present *Assembly* perspective, leans on the massive shift of cultural assumptions comi-tragically pointed to in the phrase *the cargo pants*.

Let me first deal compendiously with the Christian cargo, a compendiousness that is facilitated by directing you to the [Disputing Quests](#) 4, 5, and 8, titled "Turn Wright." There is the 'turn right' that is emphasized by Wright: the need to read Christian Scriptures as not just about me and my salvation but about the Kingdom. It is a need that has its complex of problems of effective resolution, problems that, here, are not ours. Our problem, and its *Assembly* solution, is the needed shift to a genetic perspective regarding the story being told by any tradition's scriptures. That need I have been spelling out for some time, for example in the series [Interpretation](#), is Lonergan's dense treatment of the issue in his second canon of heremneutics. In the Christian case that concerns us in this paragraph, the need is summarily indicated by the question, "What is the story of the Kingdom?" A Testament book, yes, can occupy a subgroup seeking to determine its writer(s)' content and perspective. But that seeking had best be determined by an understanding of the object, which here is profoundly heuristic, especially when it reaches, as it must, for an eschatology. The seeking—and note here that I am continuing my *Assembly*—is to be within the caring cycling of the standard model. It is refined in each cycle, thus detecting, for example, the early seeds of relevant psycho-social structures that may emerge in decent explanatory form only in the third millennium. I am thinking here, as helpfully illustrative, of the psycho-social structures that would rescue the "cargo's" panting. What are they? I have done my dialectic bit: I hand

on the question strategically to the strenuous effective fantasies of foundations persons. They may well find clues in the other dialectic operations that reach beyond *Assembly*.

What of the Scriptures of other religions? Here I think illustratively of my musings regarding Guru Nanak and the Sikh Scriptures, since that tradition is clearly what we may call “this worldly.” That tradition needs to be persuaded—again, I point forward to the fantasy and fantastic situation-rooms’ tasks of “cajoling or forcing attention,”¹ the task of “resolute and effective intervention in the historical process.”² I would note the presently obvious: the attention and its effectiveness has to mewl and crawl before it can walk.

There are Traditions and Scriptures that purport to be “otherworldly” or “non-worldly.” What of their needs? I end abruptly here with humor. There is the story of the Jesuit student in Ireland who, sitting in the dentist’s chair, looked up at the Threatening One and remarked, “please go easy: since I left the world³ I feel pain terribly.” The dentist paused for a worldly heartbeat and replied, “And where the hell do you think you are now?”

POSTSCRIPT: PRESCRIPT

This postscript on prescript loads both those words with a fullness of meaning that comes from my present poise of finishing the Vignette Project. The finishing, “so far,” occurred in my reflections at the end of [Vignette 18](#) on the sketching of a final McShane Last Theorem on the final finitude that I presented in [Vignette 17](#). The presentation of the sketch thus as paralleling Fermat’s Last Theorem obviously has its comic aspect. But there is a deeply serious appeal there for you to strain and stretch your fantasy towards a startlingly different future for humanity, a living in our heads that eventually is to Sonflower blossom in living in Our Head.

Such stretching was originally to be a task for you to weave out of 21 footnotes that were built into this Vignette, but now are cut back to the above 3 by this new “final” twist. The final footnote, now note 3, in that preliminary version of this *Vignette*, was to the quaint phrase, “since I left the world” in the, yes, true story of the dentist’s response to the Jesuit

¹ *Insight*, 423, lines 4.

² *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 306.

³ “leaving the world” is a phrase that occurs in some languages in the circumstance of “having a vocation.”

patient. The note was to sketch out varieties of otherworldliness that weave in and out of the world's religious orientations. Instead of that sketch—which after all, would have been a sketch of a massive future dialectic task—I stick here with compact foundational talk, thus apparently stepping beyond the entire series. It is only an appearance: I am still in the middle one of the three objectifications specified by Lonergan in his 1833 Overture. But now, in this final intimation of perspective, I manage to give a fresh meaning to the *None* of the previous Vignette, and to the aspirations of my symbolic nun introduced in [Vignette 5](#)—who was indeed a real student of mathematical physics. Of footnotes there are none, and the nun becomes symbolic of a new religiosity that would take contemplatively serious the canons of complete explanation in our search for *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*. She would know of, is in the culture of, developed modern physics. Present theologians and philosophers are not in such a culture in their own zones. Lonergan sketched A Complete Guide; I claim to have filled it out. I claim indeed to have filled it out with an adequacy that, e.g., meets the challenge of the end of *Insight*: how are we to lift the human sciences into adequate collaboration with human progress. There is no point now in me trying for a summary. The high point of the filling out is the identification of the communal global task of the common global religiosity—captain, crew and cargo of each bark—is a shocking recognition of the need to rise to a globally adequate analysis such that it branches out into an ongoing plethora of geo-historical analyses that is isomorphic with all psychosocial analyses and their referents.

A mouthful and a mindful there. I got to that high point comprehendingly and comprehensively only in my recent struggle with the possibility of an active democratic converging of world religiosity. The active converging can only be seeded slowly. I could illustrate it by getting into my favorite illustration of the challenge: Guru Nanak's founding of the Sikhs and the challenge of moving into a fresh poise regarding and guarding their scriptures. What madness is it, to suggest to them that, e.g., *Insight* is to become their book of common prayer in centuries to come? What madness is it to suggest the same to N.T. Wright? Heavens, what madness is it to suggest the same to Lonergan's disciples? One finds in that group a solidly established major and minor resistance. The group has indecently dodged the challenge of 60910.

The minimum I ask in this series of essays is that some few of the group join me in *Lonergan's 1833 Overture* either to agree or disagree, but with reason, with that “further objectification of horizon” (*Method in Theology*, 250, line 24) that would be a laying of their cards “on the table” (*ibid.*, 193).

Obviously I could write more, going back over my invention of W_3 or of the hierarchy of situation rooms that is so so slowly to make the indicated powerful isomorphism a working reality of the positive Anthropocene in 10,000 villages and campuses, in 10 billion hearts and eyes. But my objective is to get some response from the Lonergan scholars of all generations. If I do not, then, the rejection of the Lonerganian tradition will be delayed for a decade or a millennium. Students will follow, writing their theses, getting their jobs, with their mix and varieties of authenticities and inauthenticities, among which there is invincible ignorance.

There is the minor authenticity or unauthenticity of the subject with respect to the tradition. There is the major authenticity that justifies or condemns the tradition itself. In the first case there is passed a human judgment on subjects. In the second case history and, ultimately, divine providence pass judgment on traditions. (*Method in Theology*, 80)

Notice my minimalist plea. Forget about functional collaboration as a suggestion. Think of the claim that, whether you are dealing with the scriptures of Luke or Luther or Lonergan, the writings of Hegel or Husserl or Heidegger, the live-styles of hens or hawks or hydrangeas, the oddities of Jeremiah or Jesus or Janáček, you need a genetic perspective.