

## Bridgepoise 9

### The Hypothesis of a Non-accidental Human Participation in the Divine Active Spiration

[ See the appendix at the end for the place of this essay in the series ]

The hypothesis, as considered here, may be likened to the early hypothesis of the existence of the neutrino in physics: it is the undeveloped hypothesis of a reality required to meet empirical needs.<sup>1</sup> The hypothesis may be nicely located in the context of Aquinas systematics, as sublated by Lonergan, by considering it as a hypothesis within the developing sequence that would begin “In the 27<sup>th</sup> place” in Lonergan’s consideration of God.<sup>2</sup> The locating is nice numerically, in that one can then envisage another continuation<sup>3</sup> of *Insight* after chapter 19 which would correspond to Aquinas 27<sup>th</sup> Question in the first part of the *Summa Theologica*. But it is nice in a much larger sense which can only be hinted at here. It is God as re-conceived of by the theological community living in the general categories of Lonergan that we are - normatively -

---

<sup>1</sup>A context here, as we shall see, is Chapter 19 of *Insight* which deals with God in a scientific manner. *Cantower* 19 brings this out by a parallel with the science of the neutrino. Roughly, one can consider section 8 of the *Insight* chapter to be the initial cloudy hypothesis and verification of God [or the neutrino] and section 9 the genesis of a decent hypothesis with verification following in section 10. Here we are concerned about a hypothesis regarding **sanctifying grace**, mentioned once, neutrino-trace-like, in “Finality, Love, Marriage”, *Collection*, University of Toronto Press, 21, lines 2-3. [The essay is referred to below as **FLM**.] I end the essay with a feeble and relatively nominal hypothesis: the sequence of fuller hypotheses, components of a future genetic systematics, is a matter for later generations of theologians.

<sup>2</sup>“In the twenty sixth place, God is personal” (*Insight*, 691) ends the pseudo-deduction of chapter 19.

<sup>3</sup>One could consider this as a possible take-off point for the missing second volume, *Insight and Faith*, mentioned below in note 55.

dealing with and in.<sup>4</sup> It is the God that is conceived of by Lonergan and print-pointed to in chapter 19 of *Insight* and in his two volumes on the Trinity, up to that point in Volume 12, where Lonergan introduces the minimal hypothesis.<sup>5</sup>

Further, the consideration here is focused on the participation as non-accidental as opposed to accidental in the usual metaphysical sense that is sublated by Lonergan's meaning of *conjugate*, and indeed by the particular meaning of conjugate that he gives that participation when it is placed in a clear-headed<sup>6</sup> effective thinking of "the ecstasy

---

<sup>4</sup>"Dealing with": getting a precise heuristic meaning for this is the underlying challenge of this essay, for we are dealing with the messy beginning of the future of a functional theology, to be dominated by a genetic systematics of the geo-historical efforts of humanity to get its minding in order. More on this as we move along: see, e.g. notes 11 and 27.

<sup>5</sup>Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 470-73. It is as well to bear in mind, have as mind-set, the analogy with science. The neutrino hypothesis emerged in a context, and this context is a tricky reality to specify. It is helpful here to brood over Lonergan's comment on conceptualization: "the conceptualization of understanding is, when fully developed, a system, and one must advert to the implications of systematic knowledge .... if one is to grasp the precise nature of the concept: the concept emerges from understanding, not an isolated atom detached from all context, but precisely as part of a context, loaded with the relations that belong to it in virtue of a source which is equally the source of other concepts" (*Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, 238). The context of any concept of sanctifying grace is, in a mature functional theology, to be dominated openly by the genetic systematics mentioned in note 4.

<sup>6</sup>There is a massively important point to be noted here regarding **focus**. Thesis 5 of Lonergan's *The Triune God: Doctrines* shows how mystery can and should be focused so that natural analogues be clearheadedly developed. The attitude he draws attention to dominates the present effort, whether I am reflecting about functional collaboration or about prayer. The hymn question, "What a Friend we have in Jesus?" benefits from the distinction, but also the more subtle issues of the practicality of functional collaboration. So, e.g, Karl Rahner, responding to the version of chapter 5 of *Method* published in the *Gregorianum* in 1969, is right on: "Die theologische Methodologie Lonergan's scheint mir so generisch zu sein, dass sie eigentlich auf jede Wissenschaft passt" [ "Lonergan's theological methodology seems to me to be so generic that it actually suits every science." ], Karl Rahner, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu B.J.F.Lonergan's Aufsatz: 'Functional Specialties in Theology'", *Gregorianum* 51(1971), 537. Global culture is at present a ferment of the need for the omnidisciplinary collaboration that was Lonergan's great final achievement. There is no mystery about its need in theology. Karl Rahner objects to the lack of theological focus in Lonergan's functional methodology; but he does so in a non-focused way that is undermined by Lonergan's Thesis 5.

and the intimacy that results from the communication of the absolute and unbounded love that is God himself”<sup>7</sup> that is to be attained in the adventure of intussuscepting section 5 of chapter 20 of *Insight*. I am considering, then, the clear-headed context, suggested by Lonergan, of the absolutely supernatural solution to the problem of history.<sup>8</sup> Finally that consideration fits in with my holding to the minimal character of the assumption in that, if one considers the question “What is that participation?” with the usual back-up of analogies of nature, then one grasps that the question is one regarding conjugates. Conjugates, as conceived, are what are given unity, identity, wholeness, by central form. A central form’s meaning is given simply by that necessary and sufficient unity, identity, wholeness.<sup>9</sup> The further What? Pushes the thinking to an investigation of conjugates. The key issue here, then, is the tentatively<sup>10</sup> verified unity and identity in the human subject of the absolute supernatural.

But are we dealing<sup>11</sup> here with a someday-added central form to the human

---

<sup>7</sup>*Insight*, 741.

<sup>8</sup>“The problem of general history, which is the real catch” (*Lonergan, Topics in Education*, 236) The solution to the problem, posed by Lonergan in that work, was published a decade after those lectures were given (see note 6 above) with little fanfare or follow-up.

<sup>9</sup>See *Insight*, 270-75, 362, 461. I would invited you to add to that the consideration of beauty, and - in relation to sanctifying grace - the beauty of holiness. It is useful to think of Lonergan’s threesome, unity-identity-whole as contained in the first two of Aquinas’ wholeness-harmony-radiance.

<sup>10</sup>Think of the initial efforts to conceive of the neutrino with the help of the relevant suggestive data of the time. The ramble here is towards an existential pause over the complex of data that is the **I** who loves Jesus, whatever your present age, and the single writing of the **I** of Lonergan as he produced “Finality, Love, Marriage” at the age of 38. The fuller control of the ramble, shifting the ramble into the beginnings of the mesh of genetic systematics with the universal viewpoint (see the next note), would be the developed second canon of hermeneutics (*Insight*, 609-10).

<sup>11</sup>Recall notes 4 and 5. The crisis in Lonergan studies is the absence of a Standard Model such as is assumed in the more elementary science of physics (indeed, the name, *Standard Model*

subject? I would note that, in envisaging an absolute supernatural and its embedding in this aggreformic finitude we are in the thinnest air of *Gauging What's Real*.<sup>12</sup> A serious grip on the “detailed metaphysics of proportionate being”<sup>13</sup> “reveals that the theologian is under no necessity of reducing to the metaphysical elements, which suffice for an account of this world, such supernatural realities as the incarnation, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and the beatific vision.”<sup>14</sup>

What then of the absolutely supernatural realities? They must be conceived in a multiplicity of obscuring tensions. These realities are suited to any other type of finitude, not only the types that Thomas envisages at the beginning of the Third Part<sup>15</sup>:

---

comes from physics). See note 27 below.

<sup>12</sup>By this reference, I am bringing into the present context the work of Richard Healey, *Gauging What's Real. The Conceptual Foundations of Contemporary Gauge Theories*, Oxford University Press, 2007. I would note that physics is the most elementary of sciences, so, more advanced than higher sciences, yet still struggling and muddled. Lonergan appeals briefly to it for clues on method at the beginning of *Method in Theology* but he does not develop the appeal as it needs to be developed in the search of this millennium for integral omnidisciplinary functional collaboration. This becomes very evident when it comes to seeking for a coherent contemporary eschatology, which requires a fulsome grip on “The Concrete Intelligibility of Space and Time” (*Insight*, 194-95). On a parallel need regarding incompleteness theorems, see note 25 below. Return to the first topic, of gauging the real with the help of physics, it is important to intussuscept that Lonergan embraced this help from physics in his life: it was a core piece of his *Weltanschauung*. To that topic chapter 10 of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010, I devoted. The biography will be referred to below as **Lonergan**.

<sup>13</sup>*Insight*, 756.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid*.

<sup>15</sup>I am thinking here of the flights of Thomas' *Questio 3*, and indeed particularly of Article 6 regarding two divine persons in one human nature. We are here “dealing with” (that phrase again!) flights of minding that would have the first and second persons of the trinity gracing each of us pilgrimwise and in a genetic *eschaton*. I make mention of the latter on and off here and elsewhere, though nothing serious has been done about that zone of being in recent centuries. I give a brief indication of the need and problem in *Field Nocturnes CanTower 116*.

not, then, tuned tightly into the aggreformic reality of the layered aggreformic being that grounds a three-layered developmental potential in humans.<sup>16</sup> The fourth “added”<sup>17</sup> level of being is added within an open “obediential”<sup>18</sup> potential of being and of consciousness that, in an intimate mystery-meshed manner<sup>19</sup>, escapes all definitions of consciousness that emerge from empirical investigations: more about that below.<sup>20</sup> So, its study involves a clear recognition of discontinuity in the study of finite spirit.<sup>21</sup> That clear recognition requires, for one, an acknowledgment of the immaturity of our present scientific grip on the immaturity of Thomas’ grip on “natural resultance”<sup>22</sup> in

---

<sup>16</sup>See *Insight*, 762-3, 541-3.

<sup>17</sup>“Adds to man’s biological, psychic, and intellectual levels” (*Insight*, 762, bottom of page). *Adds* is a very tricky word, intimately related to the problem mentioned in the next note.

<sup>18</sup>“Obediential potency is mentioned in **FLM** twice ( 20,36)as well as in the editor’s note **g** (261). I pass over the topic, but recall the comment on *Verbum* 149: “one may ask if this neglect of natural potency has not some bearing on unsatisfactory conceptions of obediential potency”. *This* in the quotation refers to debates around natural potency as receptive, but there is also the context of the previous few pages on Thomas’ incomplete development of “natural resultance” (see note 22 below).

<sup>19</sup>Recall the comment on mystery-focus above, note 6. Existentially, this focus can be carried over into action, even the action of prayer. Think of the Ignatian adage: “do everything as if it depended entirely on you, knowing that all depends on God”. The address of prayer, to which we turn later in the essay, can be redeemed from psychic fuzziness by such an operative balance.

<sup>20</sup>The **below** refers especially to some footnotes below. It is useful to give two short lists, one with focus on the ontic and the other with focus on the phyletic. One might consider note 87 as the linking note, as well as note 9, on the beautiful. So, ontically focused are notes 10, 18, 32, 35 and 36; the phyletic focus is found in notes 1, 5, 6, 43, 48, 73. But of course *below* has also a curious self-referential meaning that relates to the note 87 on **incorporation**: the *below* of one’s neuromolecular dynamics. That below is a zone of cosmic dynamics that, especially in darker personal and historical times, needs the focus mentioned in note 6 above.

<sup>21</sup>This is a very complex area of aggreformic reality in its own right. See *Insight* 541-543. See also my *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, Axial Publishing, 2010, chapter 8, on the long climb ahead of us in following the question, “What is spirit?”

<sup>22</sup>On this important gap, see *Verbum*, 144-8.

the dynamics of finitude. Further, that clear recognition must reach to a full recognition, within eschatological science, of the permanent immaturity of our grip on the “natural resultant” of the invitation that is the absolutely supernatural invitation internal<sup>23</sup> to the molecules of the present “order’s dynamic joy and zeal.”<sup>24</sup> Finally, however, I would note the core of the perspective on incompleteness - and on theorems of incompleteness<sup>25</sup> - is nevertheless given in the incomplete science of Aquinas, who had no doubt, from his limited science, that the comprehension of the divine reality is permanently beyond the finite mind of the Incarnate Word.<sup>26</sup>

Coming to grips with the science of the previous paragraph would poise us to envisage the modest grip on “our neutrino” of which we are at present capable. The development of our grip, as Robert Doran regularly suggests, is a massive enterprise that I would associate with a quite new second part of the *Secunda Pars* of the *Summa Theologica*, and so a new sublation of the genetic systematics that is to emerge as part of

---

<sup>23</sup>A provocative use of the word *internal*. There are deep issues here related both to the meaning of obediential (see note 18 above note 89 below) and to the reality of secondary determinations of quantified realities (see *Insight* chapter 16). But an interesting start is to muse over such questions as “What is a molecule of oxygen? Might it fly? Might it flow in the blood of Jesus? Might it thus flow now?” On the finality of oxygen, see **FLM**, 23.

<sup>24</sup>*Insight*, 722: final words of page.

<sup>25</sup>There are theorems of incompleteness within contemporary logic of course, but here the issue is the set of such theorems as they apply to eschatological reality. Might there be, for instance - I recall Thomas’ magnificent suggestion that you cannot exclude an infinite number of ancestors (*Summa Ia Pars*, q. 46, a.2, ad 7m) - an incompleteness in an endlessness of humanity’s emergence and invitation to eschatological circumincession? I would note that all such theorems of incompleteness would constitute a fuller position that is given in the brief pedagogy of *Insight*’s “positioning”(413), which is lacking in more evident theorems, such as theorems of intentionality and of infinity.

<sup>26</sup>*Summa Theologica*, III, q.10, “De Scientia Beata Animae Christi”.

the Standard Model of a new theology.<sup>27</sup>

I wish only to make two further points here about the long-term enterprise. There is, related to both, the issue of the sublation of Thomas notion of **convenience** into the fullest meaning of contextualized hypothesis. That full meaning carries us into the full science of the Theory of God that is the Second Person in that Person's wholesome reality of an integral grasp, embrace,<sup>28</sup> of the present finitude. The larger point regards the coherent convenience that is to be the new terminal systematics-slice of the genetic systematics required for functional collaboration. The lesser, first, point has to do with the question of the non-accidental nature of the reality Faithfully known to Thomas as *sanctifying grace*.

The convenience of that grace being something non-accidental is the issue, but the concrete context of coming scientifically to grips with that issue is the central focus of my pointing here. We cannot afford to skip the climb of *Insight* with its various bridges<sup>29</sup> into and forward in metaphysics. The effort to do elementary metaphysics

---

<sup>27</sup>A compendious comment on the genetic systematics may help. First, think of the slice of the organism that is the topic of the *Insight* 489 (see below, note 42). One is invited at the end of that page to move to the dynamics of the organism. This gives a first glimpse of the theological systematics. But the genetic dynamics is of local theologies, and of overlapping, merging, etc contexts. So one needs to image it as tunneling forward from the globe geohistorically - imagine flies eyes! Finally, the GS is heavily dependent on reversing counterpositions thematized in the component of the Standard Model identified as operating towards "cumulative results" (*Method*, 4) of the universal viewpoint. Regularly I symbolize the integral perspective of the Standard Model of any age by UV + GS + FS. It is, normatively, the mindset of all functional collaborators.

<sup>28</sup>I would draw attention to the massively discomfoting norm presented by Lonergan: "Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view." (*Insight*, 442).

<sup>29</sup>The key bridge of *Insight* is the one identified by Lonergan at the beginning of chapter 5. See, on the Website, Bridgepoise 5, "2010 Moves towards 2020 Collaboration of Lonergan Students". A relevant context is my "Features of Generalized Empirical Method: A Bridge too Far?", *Creativity and Method*, edited by M.Lamb, Marquette University Press, 1984.

only enters the stage at the beginning of the final section, section 7, of chapter fifteen of the book *Insight*.<sup>30</sup> That effort needs the context added in chapter 16, on distinctions and relations, with its discomfiting demand of an existential shift rare in our times: the comeabout<sup>31</sup> to a Poosition<sup>32</sup> in being. It further needs the sublation of the poositioned persons into the remote world of the fusion “into a single explanation”<sup>33</sup> - an echo of the Theory of God that is the central Person of finitude - of the full story of stumbling perspectives.<sup>34</sup>

Within that large climb of the future there are to be many personal and communal climbs, quite beyond present fantasy. But here I must restrict my hints, my fantasy, regarding these climbs to a single illustration of the challenge to climb towards a sublation of Lonergan’s effort of the early 1940s expressed densely, tentatively and modestly, in his essay, “Finality, Love, Marriage”.

I sense now that I should preface talk of that sublation by explicitly adding two context that need self-digestion. There is the “study of the organism” asked for by

---

<sup>30</sup>A reach to “prepare our statement of the integral heuristic structure that we have named metaphysics.” (*Insight*, 484)

<sup>31</sup>It is as well to cite the shocking existential passage, since it is relevant to the prayer-patterns of the Tower People in the future. “So it comes about that the extroverted subject visualizing extensions and experiencing duration gives place to the subject orientated to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugates potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies” (*Insight*, 537).

<sup>32</sup>The task indicated in the previous note blossoms into a molecularization that constitutes a poise, a walk in being, the walk of a “character” (see below, notes 50 and 80). Some hints about this are in *Cantower 9*, “Position, Poosition, Protopossession”. My Website book, *The Redress of Poise*, is an aid to the climb.

<sup>33</sup>*Insight*, 610, line 9. See above, note 10 above: it involves an incarnation of the second canon of hermeneutics.

<sup>34</sup>The push for the full story is the task of Fusionism, which seems to me now to be a better title than Lonerganism for the movement of following Lonergan pointers. See Part Two of my *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, Axial Publishing, 2010.



Loneragan as a beginning of serious self-digestion.<sup>35</sup> And there is the seemingly simpler context of prayer- poise.<sup>36</sup>

First, then, you have to take a position<sup>37</sup> regarding the challenge of a beginning of your study of the organism, “study of the organism begins ....”<sup>38</sup> whether that study is the study of a flower, or a panda, or the Person of Jesus, or the quasi-organism that is the mystical body, a study pursued here, pilgrimwise or in the eschatological genetic dynamic of sweet surprise.

The study of the organism that is you, always in the presence of the fullest personal context,<sup>39</sup> needs to drive head-to-toe molecularly inward in the dance of such

---

<sup>35</sup>The serious self-digestion is expressed rather bluntly on page 755 of *Insight*: the famous “breathless and late” paragraph. One illustration may help here. What is consciousness? The question is a massive empirical challenge of this millennium, moving up from the irritability of plants through higher levels of self-presence in plant and animal to the shades of human consciousness, where different consciousnesses of inquiry, judgment, planning and decision will be specified by investigating the chemical patterns of heterarchies of brain neurodynamics.

<sup>36</sup>I have an elementary consideration of foundational prayer in *Prehumous* 5-8. Prayer-patterns relevant to the mediations to be effected by the eighth specialty are primarily kataphatic patterns. They are to be contextualized (see note 5 above) by the positioning and poisioning mentioned in notes 31-35. The contextualization is a matter of praying in the mode of the strategy of generalized empirical method pointed to in note 43 below. One expects, then, the **I** of the stating “**I** love you, Jesus”, to reach some contemporary plane of self-luminosity.

<sup>37</sup>The “taking of a position” is a necessity for everyone, but the advancing of communal position is formally and *per se* the task of the dialectic community, a task carefully named on *Method in Theology*, page 250. That task is to become a refined business of subtle additions: it will, in the main, have little to say to the various counterpositions of the past and present. Dealing with these is to be a challenge of the eighth specialty.

<sup>38</sup>*Insight*, 489.

<sup>39</sup>Again I recall the inspiring comment from *Verbum* quoted in note 5. I would further note the sophistication of context that is reached by contexts being held in a genetic sequence: recall note 27 above.

passages of *Insight* as that paragraph “Study of the organism begins ...”<sup>40</sup> I do not wish to enter here into the complexity of the dance, and the deceptive nature of the writing in *Insight*,<sup>41</sup> but I would note that I concretely illustrate the difficulty of the dance in a commentary on that paragraph which runs through 41 essays called *Field Nocturnes*.<sup>42</sup> Those essays range beyond the plant that is Lonergan’s topic there, and so they invite a like dancing round other paragraphs of *Insight*, some mentioned in the notes here, a dancing that would generate an expansion of the work *Insight* into a detailed pedagogy for later generations.

Secondly, I turn briefly to the issue of prayer. The seeds of the community of the Tower of Able need to blossom into Little Flowers of a new kataphatic non-mystical self-luminous<sup>43</sup> personal prayer that I wish especially to associate with the drive of the

---

<sup>40</sup>I had intended accumulating a strategic list of such passages that would lift the community forward towards “dealing with” (recall note 4 above) the future task of enriching the hypothesis regarding sanctifying grace, but that listing would involve complexifications due to needs of different individuals. I do leave you with a decent illustration of the pursuit in the commentary mentioned in note 42 below.

<sup>41</sup>Lonergan viewed *Insight* as an introductory text, much as Aquinas viewed his *Summa*. But for decades I have found it useful to view it as a graduate text, comparing it to a graduate text in physics that I was fortunate to use in the years just before 1957, when I confronted *Insight*. The text is Georg Joos, *Theoretical Physics*, Blackie and Son, London and Glasgow. second edition, 1951. That text is of the same length as *Insight*, and one finds in it e.g. 20 or so pages on each topic that is treated in books and exercises of the undergraduate years. The difficulty with *Insight* is that the next generation has to write those undergraduate texts. Think of the dense brilliant treatment of canons of hermeneutics crying out for comprehension and expansion.

<sup>42</sup>The series is a Website series, eventually merging with Cantowers 1-41 at number 42, to go on, as *Field Nocturnes CanTower* to the due number 117. [my original notion was to parallel Ezra Pound’s 117 *Cantos* with a million-word series]. References below will be to **FN**, *Cantowers*, and **FNC**.

<sup>43</sup>See note 38 above. The issue is the clear-headed pursuit of thinking and living in the existential context of the description of generalized empirical method that Lonergan gives in *A Third Collection* at the top of page 141: “Generalized empirical method operates on a combination of both the data of sense and the data of consciousness: it does not treat of objects

mind-set, minding-set, underpinning the print of **FLM**: we get on to that drive in the notes to the third last paragraph of this essay. But already I can pose the challenge that asks us to ferment forward in the two contexts named: the challenge of prayerfully intussuscepting the brief prayer: "Jesus, I love you".<sup>44</sup> Obviously, there are variants of this that must occur to you: translations into your own languages that would change the twist of my suggestions below - a relevant feature in that not only the word order changes, but some words seem to slip away, as "I" does in my native gaelic, "Gradhim Thu, a Iosa."<sup>45</sup> And there are variants that are cherished in different tradition: I think of Catherine of Siena's "Sweet Jesus, Jesus Love". Having recourse to such translations and variations is important to our global efforts here but it is certain vital to your vital involvement in the search for the meaning of your **I** of faith.

One can prayer the four words with a stressing of any of the four words, but the stressing that is of central interest to our problem of non-conjugate participation is the stress that is expressed here by bold-facing and enlarging: "Jesus, **I** love You."<sup>46</sup> The statement, best made aloud in mysterious confidence,<sup>47</sup> even in the loudness of the

---

without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject; it does not treat of the subject's operations without taking into account the corresponding objects."

<sup>44</sup> Obvious, I am restricting us here to the special categories of Christianity. And perhaps I should note that the meanings of the words in the prayer are to have the positional and contextual remoteness suggested above in various note. So, Jesus disappears as Jack and Jill do (See note 58 below)

<sup>45</sup>The word "I" does not have a Gaelic equivalent. For example, *Taim* means "I am" as "Gradhim" means "I love". I have to hand the Anglicized Japanese of the passage mentioned in the next note: "

<sup>46</sup>One can lift the prayer into various personal situations, to contexts similar to Peter's in *John 21: 15-17*.

<sup>47</sup>One may bring into focus here all the pointers made in other notes (see the short list of "ontic" notes in note 20 above), and add the question of the manner in which the "not my words but His" is mediately given in consciousness.

touch<sup>48</sup> of sign language, is conscious in the range of ways and levels noted heuristically in the first point. In so far as the heuristics becomes a habituated achievement, a post-Proustian presence to self, then you become the character required for life in The Tower, caring for the planes of plain meaning.<sup>49</sup> Further, some level of that habituation is required for statecraft,<sup>50</sup> for statement craft, for a state meant, if one is living within the science: otherwise one is talking quite beyond one's competence. Such biased beyond-talk is to be strategically excluded by the dynamics of functional collaboration: that is to be one of the Bell-curve statistical glories of Lonergan's invention of that Tower of Able.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup>I am thinking of touch as focused on both by Helen, in her leap to the truth about signs, and Merleau-Ponty, in his failed leap, through an analysis of touching, to reach the luminous post-Hegelian objectivity we reference below in note 57. Both struggles are relevant to luminous kataphatic prayer. See FN 28, "A Touching of Touch: Getting on your Nerves"; FN 32, "Seeing is Deceiving", FN 35, "Helen's Halting Hand", FN 36, "Desire and Distance". *Desire and Distance: Introduction to the Phenomenology of Perception* (Stanford University Press, 2004, trans by Paul B. Milan) is Renaud Barbaras' magnificent but unsuccessful effort to lift phenomenology to a luminous position. His previous book, *The Being of the Phenomenon: Merleau-Ponty's Legacy*, (trans by Ted Toadvine and Leonard Lawlor, Indian University Press, 2004), was directly concerned with Merleau-Ponty's final effort, a book mentioned by name in anticipation by Lonergan in 1957 (note 23, p.278 of *Phenomenology and Logic*). Merleau-Ponty's book appeared in French in 1964 (*Le visible et l'invisible*, Paris: Gallimard, 1964), and in English as *The Visible and the Invisible*, translated by Alphonso Lingis, Evanston Northwestern, 1968). An elementary introduction to the problem of Helen and the problem of touching-objectivity are available, in chapters 1 and 5, respectively, of McShane, *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, 1998.

<sup>49</sup>The concluding section, 3.6, of *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2007) gives a glimpse of this problem of care. The following chapter 4 places that challenge in the context of a key analogy of science: "The Calculus of Variation" (Husserl's thesis of 1882) as model of the new functional theological calculus. It gives a further perspective on the issue of The Standard Model (see notes 4, 5, 11 and 12 above).

<sup>50</sup>"Since our purpose is to speak about matters to do with character, we must first inquire of what character is a branch. To speak concisely, it would seem to be a branch of nothing else that statecraft" (The beginning of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia*)

<sup>51</sup>See Lonergan, 163.

Within that full context one attends to the claim of the statement, “Jesus, **I** love You.” The statement is made in the absolutely supernatural present order. The focal issue of interest and concern now is, What do I mean by **I**?<sup>52</sup>

Backed by the pointers given, we can move to intussuscept our intussusception of FLM. The intussusception is, of course, limited or problematic for the committed celibate, but the handling such limitations I must leave to the individual reader. But I think that it is helpful to note that there is a broader treatment needed of the subject that could be given the title “Finality, Love, Sex” that would give a new context for non-matrimonial love or self-love.<sup>53</sup>

I suggest a final helping shift of focus that gives you the possibility of seeing the book *Insight* in a fresh manner: a paralleling of the statement “I love you Jesus” or some

<sup>52</sup>The next five words in the text here are “backed by these two pointers”. But the backing needed to “go on” (I mention thus, discomfortingly, that same troubling point of the mid-paragraph of *Method in Theology*, 287: “one can go on”: can one?) is the personal meeting of the question of the Existential Gap (see Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, the index under *Existential*) in present theology. A fond parallel of mine might nudge. One can “go on” from and through Bruckner’s eighth symphony if one has ingested the five notes (doh -, me, fah, so, so[low]) as they emerge, a quiet bridge, and dominate that symphony. But what cherishing and self-cherishing is called for to so ingest? And what of the self-tasting of those underpinning, pinning, five notes in the symphony of each our life: be attentive, intelligent, reasonable, **inventive**, responsible?

<sup>53</sup>The question bubbled up in FN 23, “Here Hear”, notes 7-10, and is compactly raised in FN 28, “A Touching of Touch: Getting on your Nerves”, note 23, where I posed the question: “What, then, is *sexy* to mean in the third stage of meaning? The question bubbles out of the concluding chapter of Kristeva, much as the question, ‘What, then, is *objectivity* to mean in the third stage of meaning?’ The new meanings both require a global collaborative structure to make probable their public emergence.” The reference is to Julia Kristeva, *Colette*, translated by Jane Marie Todd, Columbia University Press, New York, 2004. I note Kristeva’s frontispiece quotation from **The Visible and the Invisible** (see note 49 above) centering on “that innate anonymity of Myself that we call flesh .... Flesh is .... an element of Being”. I am indebted here to the doctorate work of Christine Jamieson, who kindly made available to me her doctorate thesis from St. Paul’s University, Ottawa, *The Significance of the Body in Ethical Discourse: Julia Kristeva’s Contribution*. The question bubbles up now in so far as one seriously grapples with the final problem-laden pages of **FLM**.

equivalent such as “I am your lover, Jesus” with statements that bring us into the problem of chapter 11 of *Insight*, like “I am a knower.” The paralleling of “I love you Jesus” with such a statement as “I know the typewriter”<sup>54</sup> could well nudge us towards envisaging the drive of the missing second volume, *Insight and Faith*, that Lonergan wrote of in 1952:<sup>55</sup> but we won't go there in this context.

Instead, think now of reading the book *Insight* in order to make both it and the Bible disappear through the emergence - as a non-given - of a proper conception of self-attentive method and of its content. I am suggesting, then, through paralleling some such two short statements, a paralleling with chapter 11 of *Insight*, or indeed with the whole book *Insight*, not just the book journeyed but the book as habitually journeyed, at least re-journeyed with sufficient<sup>56</sup> success and perhaps recycled in spiraling climbs till the book comfortably disappears, as seen played in your head,<sup>57</sup> and you meet Bernard as Jack might sophisticatedly meet Jill.<sup>58</sup> Then one might find oneself enjoying the deep parallel between the space-time bridge of *Insight* and the bridge, Jesus, of Catherine of

---

<sup>54</sup>See *Insight* chapter 13, the second page.

<sup>55</sup>In a letter to Eric O'Connor, reproduced in Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010, 156.

<sup>56</sup>The existential difficulty here for many is to hold to the minimum that Lonergan invites when he introduces the definition of being in chapter 12 of *Insight*, and so be confronted, or infronted, with a personal decision by the printed position of page 413. See the next note.

<sup>57</sup>I think here of Lonergan's talk of that leap of his in our first conversation together, Easter 1961. He paced the floor of the little room in Lower Leeson Street, Dublin, where we were, talking of having to go ask somebody. I have often wondered what that somebody replied to the post-Hegelian insanity. On that insanity, see Mark Morelli, “Lonergan's Debt to Hegel and the Appropriation of Critical Realism,” *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology. Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, S.J.*, edited by John D. Dadosky, Marquette University Press, 2009, 405-422.

<sup>58</sup>See Lonergan, “Cognitional Structure”, *Collection*, 215.

Siena's *Dialogue*, the *Dialogue* considered not as an expression of mystical conviction, but simply of orthodox Christian Faith within the mode of theoretic embrace.<sup>59</sup>

I speak of the emergence of a non-given, and I would have you hold that focus in order to consider the objection of Charles Hefling to the transposition into contemporary theology, as a central entity, of sanctifying grace. I must ask you to avail yourself of his text if you are to puzzle this out personally rather than be perhaps misled by my selective citing.<sup>60</sup> The issue comes up neatly in a passage of Lonergan quoted by Hefling. Lonergan has been giving an sketch of the metaphysical account of soul as a source of neglect of the subject, and then remarks. "The study of the subject is quite different, for it is the study of oneself inasmuch as one in conscious. It prescind from the soul. Its essence, its potencies, its habits, for none of these is given in consciousness"<sup>61</sup> This fits in with Hefling's earlier claim of "a need for derivation from an analysis of conscious intentionality" of A, B, .... in a "methodological theology" if A, B, ... are to have a "warrant of their validity."<sup>62</sup>

I have no interest in venturing into the odd meanings of "methodological theology": rather I wish you to indulge in generalized empirical method as described

---

<sup>59</sup>There is a tricky set of questions here regarding expressions, like that of Catherine's *Dialogue*, dictated in a fervent rush, yet powerfully orthodox in what one might call ordinary theology. The mystic draws on contemporary and proximate traditions when articulating with some push for coherence: otherwise we are left with metaphor, as with St. Ignatius' talk of the Trinity as three bells.

<sup>60</sup>"Quaestio Disputata On the (Economic) Trinity: an Argument in Conversation with Robert Doran", *Theological Studies* 68 (2007). Various other people have entered the dispute in the years before and since, but best stick here with Hefling's clear presentation cited below as **Hefling**.

<sup>61</sup>Lonergan, "The Subject", *A Second Collection*, edited by W. Ryan and B. Tyrrell, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1974, 73. The second sentence is quoted by Hefling at the bottom of 650, and the last seven words are repeated early in the next page as back-up to his point.

<sup>62</sup>**Hefling**, 647.

discomfortingly in *A Third Collection*.<sup>63</sup> I add here two quotations from Lonergan that help that venture. First, there is the comment of Lonergan a little further down the page quoted by Hefling: "Subject and soul, then, are two quite different topics. To know one does not exclude the other in any way.

But it very easily happens that the study of the soul leaves one with the feeling that one has no need to study the subject and, to that extent, leads to a neglect of the subject."<sup>64</sup>

Secondly there is the precise general methodological claim that comes, conveniently, at the end of the previous essay in *A Second Collection*, itself a context for our reachings:

"Just as reflection on the operations of the scientist brings to light the real foundation of the science, so too reflection on the ongoing process of conversion may bring to light the real foundation of a renewed theology."<sup>65</sup>

The second claim points us to core light on what we are doing when we lift the statement "I love you, Jesus" into the context in which we are invited to muse over the statement "I am a knower" or "I know the typewriter, and it's not me".<sup>66</sup> Both statements are conscious statements of fact.<sup>67</sup> "I" occurs in both statements. What happens to the meaning of **I** if you battle through *Insight* chapter 11 with that new statement about the **I** of love?

---

<sup>63</sup>The description is given in note 45 above.

<sup>64</sup>As in note 61 above.

<sup>65</sup>"Theology in its New Context", *A Second Collection*, 67. One may think of the comment as pointing to a new *Quaestio Prima* of a *Summa*, or pointing to the two volumes envisaged by Lonergan in 1952 (see note 55 above).

<sup>66</sup>Recall notes 58 and 59 above. There is the massive post-Hegelian shift of context for the content of *Insight* chapters 12 and 13. So, too, Jesus slips out of sight and into mind.

<sup>67</sup>Here I slide past issues of the facticity of Faith-statements. See note 65 above and the text there.



Your question is, is **I** given in consciousness in either case? And if it is not, how is **I**'s "derived from an analysis of intentional consciousness"?<sup>68</sup> The derivation relating to unity, identity, whole, of the first statement, "I am a knower", whether of self or the typewriter or of Jack or Jill is the tricky enterprise of chapter 11 of *Insight*.<sup>69</sup> The **I** of "I love Jesus" as a unity, identity, whole, is in the ballpark defined by the second quotation above. But neither **I** is given in consciousness: certainly not, if you take *given* in the meaning **given** it by Lonergan in chapter 13 of *Insight*.<sup>70</sup> Chapter 11 helps us to make sense of the **I** of nature. How are we to make sense, convenient or hypothetical sense,<sup>71</sup> of the **I** of an absolute supernature, with God and **I** in a shocking<sup>72</sup> friendship?

The task of getting to grips with this is yours, especially if you have aspirations towards being a serious member of the new global omnidisciplinary science of theology. It is a big reach in our times, but later times are to support it through the spiralling and mediations of the Tower of Able.

On, then, abruptly, to the reach for the reach of **FLM** within these contexts: but not here. I could put brief effective words here, simply reminding an audience of a

---

<sup>68</sup>Hefling, 647.

<sup>69</sup>I have already commented on the tricky psychic weaving involved in lifting forward from chapter 11 to the position of page 489 of chapter 14. The deeper climb is to genuinely cross the bridges of *Insight* chapter 5 and chapter 8.

<sup>70</sup>*Insight*, 407- 407. See FN 21, "Observing Brains", section 4: "The Given".

<sup>71</sup>Both the human **I** and the **I** of God (quite strange: see *The Triune God: Systematics*, 397) "Do the divine persons say to one another 'I' and 'You'", moving forward in genetic dynamic in both searches. It is useful to think of the question, What is a circle?, to which there is an elementarily reply in chapter one of *Insight*. But what of Descartes' efforts, and Fourier's, and the related functions of complex analysis?

<sup>72</sup>Recall note 6 above. The shock becomes focused. The manner in which, nonetheless, the mystery becomes globally resonant (see *Insight*, chapter 17, section 1 for a further statement of the problem) is an issue of the minding and aesthetic mediation of molecular resonances.

shared ethos,<sup>73</sup> were I assured that the contexts mentioned above were shared contexts of the audience and the prior task a memory in its boned-in solution. But the sad reality is that the Standard Model that is to dominate the cycle of functional collaboration in a millennium, generating, with Bell-curve loveliness, “cumulative and progressive results”<sup>74</sup> is only at present a faint hope. Then my pointing is more an encouragement to read seriously and with fantasy a few passages or even single words that may help in sensing the dynamics of a shift to a new heuristic of sanctifying grace. The few passages, indeed, lead to a freshening of sections of *Insight* touched on in notes above, written a decade later in clear compendious obscurity.

But prior to such detailing,<sup>75</sup> left after all to you of these next years, I would like to emphasize what I call mood: the sharing of the 1930s mood of Lonergan that he carried into this work, a bent toward fullness that focused him on the restoration of all things in Christ, that tied him to economic studies and led him into grappling with both ancient history and modern physics. It was a mood that led him to express at length to his superior a deep lonely frustration, summed up in the concluding words of his letter: “what on earth is to be done? I have done all that can be done in spare time....”<sup>76</sup> It was the mood of an existential call, a call involving a Hopkinsesque self-taste that he wrote

---

<sup>73</sup>Obviously, the entire effort here is a call to the audience, but it is a call to the present audience to care for the future audience in pointing them to the bridges that were too far (see note 30 above) in this last half-century of Lonergan studies. There is here a central crisis, to be faced openly. The ethos is “an aesthetic apprehension of the group’s origin and story operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides and acts - and especially in a crisis.”(Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 230)

<sup>74</sup>*Method in Theology*, 4.

<sup>75</sup>The detailing was to be much fuller, but now is a matter of a few illustrative footnotes inviting the sort of effort regarding **FLM** that Lonergan talks of in the first pages of the Epilogue of *Verbum*.

<sup>76</sup>**Lonergan, 154.**

of later.<sup>77</sup> and the pull was the pull of the “dynamic joy and zeal”<sup>78</sup> of history, of the molecules of “the world of sense, its finality, its yearning for God.”<sup>79</sup> In our chats in the 1970s Lonergan remarked once, with a glint in his eye, that “when I wrote that essay [FLM] I had emergent probability”, but might we not say rather that emergent probability had him, that he was the “character”<sup>80</sup> he wrote of in the final chapter of *Method in Theology*?

But why do I invite this mood of reflection? The issue is “the grandeur of God”<sup>81</sup> in the extreme reach of Their absolutely supernatural embrace of the feeblest of spirit-finitudes.<sup>82</sup> A bone-marrowing limit-grace is the “final frontier”<sup>83</sup> vibrant in the maternal embrace constituted<sup>84</sup> by the so-tamely named *secondary esse* of the Incarnate

---

<sup>77</sup>*A Third Collection*, 132.

<sup>78</sup>*Insight*, 722.

<sup>79</sup>*Insight*, 745.

<sup>80</sup>*Method in Theology*, 356. Add the comment of note 52 above.

<sup>81</sup>Line one of Hopkins’ “God’s Grandeur”.

<sup>82</sup>Lonergan once spoke to Val Rice, outside the context of the Rice interviews,(see **Lonergan**, 110-12) of man being the most improbable of creatures.

<sup>83</sup>The final chapter of the Website book, *The Redress of Poise*, “Grace: The Final Frontier”, homes in on the secondary esse of Jesus. In recent months its radiance as maternal embrace becomes a plausible enrichment - it relates to concrete secondary determinations - to the view of its full finitude.

<sup>84</sup>A host of problems lurk here, regarding the meaning of *constitution* (See e.g. Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, the index under *Constitution*). My use above may seem loose in that context, but it is permissible in one’s thinking of the external term. “This created substantial act is related to the person of the Son of God. For the same act both perfects the obediential potency of the human essence so that it is actually assumed by the Son of God and constitutes the external term whereby this contingent fact is true, namely, that the Son of God has actually assumed this human nature” (Lonergan, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 115)

Word. That participation in divine paternity/maternity is a shocking divine-dream-up leap into 13.7 billion years of genuinely anticipatory cosmic groaning<sup>85</sup>: what further leaps in being is in Their Minding, meeting in a limit-fashion the exigence<sup>86</sup> in the bones of us gorillas in the mist?

The Word's adventure is towards a two-way "incorporation"<sup>87</sup> that is to blossom into an endlessly incomplete circumincession of Them in molecular dance with us and

---

<sup>85</sup>*Romans* 8: 19.

<sup>86</sup>The entire focus of this essay is, of course, on the exigence in each of us, and the Existential Gap we face as a group in coming to grips with it as an obedient natural resultance in this finitude. See the index to *Phenomenology and Logic* on both *Exigence* and *Existential Gap*.

<sup>87</sup>Here you have a key detailed invitation to the ingestion of the text **FLM** (one has to not only follow the elementary descriptive norms of *Method in Theology*, chapter 7, sections 1-6, but to lift oneself into the remote realms of the second canon of hermeneutics). The detailed presence in oneself thus constituted is the context for asking the question that is at the heart of this paper: What hypothetical embeddedness of the divine in finitude meets the demands of the data of my senses and consciousnesses? The embeddedness is an "incorporation in the body of Christ" (**FLM**, 33; see *Ephesians* 5: 30-31). See also the six occurrences on **FLM** pp. 46-47 of "incorporation / incorporate". Is there not ground for personally suspecting that "the ascent of the soul to God is .... a personal function of the objective common movement in that body of Christ which takes over, transforms, and elevates every aspect of human life", that it shares the friendly shocking lift towards a harmony with the graces of the Incarnate Word (see Lonergan, *The Incarnate Word*, Theses 12 ff).

within us. The dance begins in a will-surgings mind-bending cosmic call<sup>88</sup> that backfires<sup>89</sup> into a core lift of central form, a lift way too sublime and subtle to be viewed aggreformically in this life, or to be comprehended in the next.<sup>90</sup> We call that lift “sanctifying grace”<sup>91</sup>: but **what** is it? OR **who** is it? That quest is to be the sacred heart

---

<sup>88</sup>What is this cosmic call, this quest? The final paragraph of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 2 (Axial Publications, 2007) seeks to reach towards a symbolic lift towards the formation of characters of the quest: “ ‘All we know is somehow with us .... it lurks behind the scenes’ (*Insight*, 303). Skin-within are molecules of cosmic all, cauled, calling. The rill of her mouth can become the thrill, the trill, of a life-time, the word made fresh. Might we inspire and expire with the lungs of history? But the hole story is you and I, with and within global humanity, upsetting *Love’s Sweet Mystery* into a new mouthing, an anastomotic spiral way of birthing better the buds of Mother.” (*Ana- again, stomein*, to provide a mouth. ‘Using the device of anastomosis, Joyce attempts, in the last chapter of his last work, to bridge all the great ontological chasms,” Margot Norris, ‘The Last Chapter of Finnegans Wake: Stephen Finds His Mother,’ *James Joyce Quarterly* (25) 1987-8, 11.’ “

<sup>89</sup>Behind, within, the metaphor there is a massive complex development of the perspective on trinitarian presence in history symbolized by the “line” in the Metagram, **W3** (See **Lonergan**, 161). There is a shift from the phylogenetic to the ontogenetic, and the shift is in the context of the fuller heuristic of “natural resultance” mentioned above in note 22. Popularly put, there is the call of the passive spiration for the presence of the companionship of the active spiration, but a companionship in the human soul that is a slim participation, especially in that the second Person is a yearning absence. The everlasting genetically-structured adoption that is a participation in *Filiatio* is a pilgrim hope within a pledge of endless spiraling molecular circumincession.

<sup>90</sup>To put the matter startlingly, there is Paul’s exaggeration, about seeing God face to face, in *I Corinthians* 13: 12. St. Thomas was quite clear that, even for the mind of the Incarnate Word, the comprehension of God was an impossibility. Add to this the fact that if one does not comprehend Infinite Understanding, then one is infinitely remote from understanding that understanding. Of course, here we need analogies, e.g., from the mathematics of infinities: one can have a grip on a countable infinity yet be at an infinite remove from a grip on the continuum. Etc: into other transfinite zones.

<sup>91</sup>I recall, in this final note, the point made in note 1: sanctifying grace is mentioned once in **FLM**, our neutrino-nudge: perhaps I have shared a little of the need of layered genetic and dialectic contexts in pushing forward the search for the meaning of such grace? And might I not end with a pointing towards the eight different contexts that groan in the beginning of this millennium for emergence as functionally distinct and globally focused?

and immaculate heart of both our pilgrim prayer and our everlasting delight.

### **Appendix**

This essay implicitly raises the issues of ontic and phyletic growth in theology, which would have been the direct topic of this essay as I considered it earlier, in *Bridgepoise 5*, note 14, and in the beginning of *Bridgepoise 8*. The debate into which I entered here is a paradigm problem pointing to the need for a shift in theological disputes and collaborations, and I would consider my essay to be a poor sample of a venture mediated by the functional specialty of communications as it is to become in this century. At the moment, in Lonergan circles, there is an emergence of an articulation of the conviction that we need to move forward towards some attempt to lift theology into a functional collaboration. To that topic I intend to return in the final *Bridgepoises*, 12 and 13, and continue on into the new series, *FuSe*.