

# Himig Ugnayan

A Theological Journal of the  
**INSTITUTE OF FORMATION  
AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES (IFRS)**

**Volume XVI, AY 2015-2016  
SPECIAL EDITION**



---

**INSTITUTE OF FORMATION AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES (IFRS)**

**Quezon City, Philippines**

---

## For the Joy Set Before Us of Effective Field-fostering Reviewing

---

Philip McShane

It is obviously no accident that my title steals from a recent magnificent book by Fr. Brendan Lovett.<sup>1</sup> It was, however, a glorious accident that led me to tackling here Sarah Coakley's powerful work, *God, Sexuality and the Self*, the first of four volumes of systematic theology.<sup>2</sup> Brendan pointed out the work to me shortly after I had been invited to write for this *Festschrift*. At the time I was pushing forward on various fronts, the two fronts relevant here being [1] the cultivation of strategies of leading from conventional reviewing of any reality to a functional reviewing; [2] the rescuing of sexuality from a massive global ethos of its disparagement. Might I weave these two searchings into a tribute to Fr. Brendan?

Brendan and I, of course, go way back: indeed to his student days in the 1960s, when he claims that I nudged him on into his glorious searching way. While in the five decades since we have had little contact, we followed the same pattern of searching for a new structure of Christian outreach. We have both been trying to twine our imaginations round the new way of global care so gently presented by Lonergan, and that effort is the core of the two books, *For the Joy Set before Us*, and *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.<sup>3</sup> I wish to air that new way once more here, but in a

---

<sup>1</sup> *For the Joy Set Before Us: Methodology of Adequate Reflection on Mission*, Peter Lang, 2008.

<sup>2</sup> Sarah Coakley, *God Sexuality and the Self. An Essay on 'On the Trinity'* [sic], Cambridge University Press, 2013. I shall refer to this book throughout as *Coakley I*. The overall title of the series of volumes is *On Desiring God*. (*Coakley I*, xv)

<sup>3</sup> My full title is *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History: Teaching Young Humans Humanity and Hope* (Axial Publishing, Vancouver, 2015). It weaves Lonergan's *Insight* and *Method in Theology* together round the genius of

manner that displays quite simply how anyone may enter that way by way of the first functional specialty advocated by Lonergan in his reach for a solid positive discontinuity in effecting human progress.

Both our books are viewings and reviewings. In my book I comment on Brendan's book thus: "A sound effort to link the new way with present scholarly work in Lonergan Studies is Brendan Lovett, *For the Joy Set Before Us: Methodology of Adequate Reflection on Mission*."<sup>4</sup> That comment could have been enlarged into a review. But what kind of a review? That is the question that dominates this little essay.

I face the challenge immediately here, not by pausing over Brendan's work, nor by directly taking up the task of viewing the book by Coakley that he recommended to my viewing. What I wish to do now, a very novel venture for me, is to try to bring you along quietly towards a quite fresh and strange meaning of both *recommend* and *review*.

I do so—and this is to be a key feature of that elusive HOW-language that I pondered over in the past 18 years—by being autobiographic, in a ramble around three instances of letters of Lonergan **recommended** to me for **reviewing**. The bold-faced font there is simply an eye-catching, I-catching, device: you are being invited to Star-trek where no one has gone before: apart from myself and I am still gearing up for serious tripping.

The first letter was a letter of May 4<sup>th</sup>, 1954 from Lonergan to Fr. Fred Crowe. A particular piece in it puzzled Fred and he forwarded the letter to me perhaps a half-century ago. It is as well to quote the odd piece: "The Method of Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating  $[1 + 1/n]^{nx}$  as  $n$  approaches infinity. For the rest: ordo universi. From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God, i.e., metaphysics as I conceive it but plus transcendent knowledge." The piece is not easy to interpret, and that was Fred's humble point. And, despite solid scribbled reviewing efforts over decades in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, I was never satisfied with my own

---

Jesus. I shall refer to this book below simple as *Allure*, and to Brendan's book simply as *For the Joy Set Before Us*.

<sup>4</sup>*Allure*, 92, note 23.

efforts. Most recently I shared my musings with Pat Brown, and you may find his push for interpretation in the volume *Seeding Global Collaboration*.<sup>5</sup>

The second letter is one that caught my eye as I worked my way, a decade ago, through my collection of Lonergan's letters to Crowe. My reviewing was startling to me, and I expressed that startledness in a short essay at the time.<sup>6</sup>

The third letter is one that Lonergan wrote to Fr. MacKinnon in 1962. I was asked to, recommended to, review it in September 2015, after I had finished *Allure*. My musing over the letter led, once more, to a fresh startledness. So I replied, thus startled, to my correspondent, later that September. Since the reply is not available to you, I add a substantial version of it here. You will find it spreading its wings so as, providentially, to fly into zones of Sarah Coakley's book. Here we go then: please do not be discourage: skim along sufficiently to get an inkling, an inklink, a neurodynamic stirring.

"I have mused over that 7-page letter, a generous effort on Lonergan's part. Generous especially in that he was dealing with ignorance and error. Most of the stuff may be consider old hat, [it would get spun out pretty quickly in the new culture] except for puzzles raised in the final paragraph, about the metaphysical equivalents of fields. Of course, the full package of questions persists, in our present atmosphere of academic disciplines and thoroughly muddled methods in physics. E.g., re content: Bohm was a serious contributor in those days and is in fact still around [See e.g.—some handy books at my elbow—the indices [under Bohm, Bohmian, etc] to Jeffrey Bub, *Interpreting the Quantum World*, Cambridge University Press, 1997 and Roger Penrose, *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*, Vintage Books, 2005, and Richard Healy, *Gauging What's Real. The Conceptual Foundations of Contemporary Gauge Theories*, Oxford

---

<sup>5</sup> See both Brown's Introduction and his own article in that volume, published by Axial Publishing in 2016.

<sup>6</sup> *Humus 2*, "Vis Cogitativa. Contemporary Defective Patterns of Anticipation" (available online at: <http://www.philipmcs Shane.org/humus>). The startledness was the heuristic suspicion that we can be led to understand, through neurodynamical investigation, a cultural superego blocking imagination and understanding, one that haunts these past millennia.

U.P., 2007.

I mention these, however, not just to note Bohm's influence, but to make a point about commentary. Commentary in the normal sense, gradually to become obsolete, would need to be in a context of such works and much more. [re: the **much more**, below!] So, for instance, the interesting part of the letter, on page 7, about the metaphysical equivalent of fields, could be talked about succinctly and communicatively only to someone who was in the ballpark given by these three books and, of course, many others writings, someone who would be in tune with the tradition that emerged after Faraday introduced the notion of *field* in the mid-1840s and that climbed all the way to the suggestion of a Higgs Field, and what that suggestion is and why it is significant. I could at this stage quote my comment on the Higgs problem in note 73 of *The Road to Religious Reality* (2012) where I give the references to popular efforts to handle that, efforts that in the full push forward require a grip on the metaphysical equivalent of fields, space-time structures, etc. But, to quote the beginning of that note 'There is no value in going into this here but I would like to make some points e.g. regarding the challenge of redeeming *haute vulgarization* (see note 84, op. cit.)'

But I need to make different, and I hope useful, points regarding redemption in our present context of research and commentary. My commentary, then, is not a commentary but a commentary on commentaries, or might I say a heuristic comment on future functional commentaries? It moves the redemption of *haute vulgarization* to the issue of the full global redemption of commentaries through treating any document as a situation and placing it in the global hierarchy of situation rooms talked of skimpily in chapter 16 of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.

So, think now of the Lonergan letter as parallel to splashes and tracks of experimentation in particle physics made available by researchers capable of noticing anomalies, something beyond repetitive usuality. In the present case, I pick up the letter, pick up on its tracks of gatherings as a physics interpreter might pick up on screened data on scatterings. Within the full context of a geo-historical context, I find 'the usual' in the first six pages, with Lonergan trapped in an earlier context – February 1965 is just under three years away, with its shift in the standard model. 'The usual'

here, unlike in physics, is a muddle of over-reaching discussion, and this is pretty clear from Lonergan's—ineffective could be noted and enlarged on - comments. But in the new context, we are pushed, by new and terrible norms, into a way "difficult and laborious" (*MIT*, 4). The genetic context of commentaries laid out in brutal neglected simplicity in the paragraph bridging *Insight* 609-10, bridging the existential gap between random ineffective comments and the effective talk to town and gown of C<sub>9</sub> [bridging: think of that other bridge of the first page of *Insight* chapter 5, a bridging implicitly re fields], is lifted into the field of FS, edging properly towards the Field beyond horizons (*CWL* 18, 199). Not to entertain and enter that is to settle in the flat earth society of endless learned chit-chat, or arrows waved at German tanks a million (recalling Bernard Lonergan, Questionnaire on educating students, *CWL* 17).

What do I do, then, with the letter, as interpreter?', thus speaking to myself and to you as a methodologist. I skip past 'the usual' of it to interpret that last paragraph.

Now here is where we hit multiple trickinesses. I am working with a non-shared standard model either in physics or in methodology. My perspective is summarily expressed in the unknown FS + UV + GS, contextualized by W<sub>3</sub>. Still, suppose I wish to talk to historians who have a 'usual' grip on the events running from Farady's first lecture of 1844 right up to the context that Healy (reference above) hovers over. I cannot: I am an evolutionary sport. The proper history must come later.

I could, no doubt, undertake an interpretation: but in my 84<sup>th</sup> year, with various other irons in the fire?! LOL. So, I do as I am doing here. But where is here? It falls, not into any of the eighth situation rooms, but into the situation, a C<sub>9</sub>, of your understanding and your reaching out to future Lonergan audiences. There is, granted the non-existence of the new standard model, [on the problem of its metaphysical equivalents, see chapter 10 of my *Method in Theology. Revisions and Implementations*], a very slim statistics of my successful heuristic pointing. One needs to move into the questions of "what is a field?" in a full concrete sense. Where is the Lonergan scholar who is willing to tackle the introductory book [I point to it to supplement, but not to replace, Lindsay and Margenau] of Ian Lawrie, *A Unified Grand Tour of Theoretical Physics* (Bristol, 1998) and battle forward through fibre bundling to

the oddities of a full panoply of particle fields somehow haunting every point? [see Lawrie, chapter 8, “Forces, Connections and Gauge Fields”] This is quite beyond Lonergan’s simple but brilliant identifications in *Insight* (462-3): “mass-velocity will be a conjugate act; the mass, defined by its intelligible relations to other masses, will be a conjugate form; the space-time continuum of the trajectory will be a conjugate potency; what has the mass will be individual by its central potency, a unity by its central form, and existing by its central act“, which dances on the earlier identification recorded by me in note 13 of page 13 of *CWL* 18. [What a context for handling the weaving of the Higgs Mechanism into the ‘intelligible relations to other masses’!]

These identifications are luminously available only to a physicist who has seriously found the world of inner words. A community of such would face the tasks of the eight situation rooms, but initially it would be a scattering of partial achievements. Still that scattering would be the stuff of a gathering that would seed an identification of the metaphysical equivalents of functional specialized tracks in computed images of human endeavor.

We would be on the edge of sniffing the global value of serious contemplative thinking about our molecular journey as whatshows.

There are many things to be noted about the later moving beyond the second stage of meaning and that move’s redemption of street life, but one seems important to note immediately: what I may call the transforming flow-back into previous accountings of genetic advances. In the present case going back to that remarkable fellow Farady, we can eventually get a coherent grip [frogs-I view of tadpole] of what he was reaching for and what he was reaching with and within. Similarly, we can talk, with a full heuristic of FS-60910, of the reality named *vis cogitativa* in terms of the potentiality of evolving chemical patterns. Think, then, in fantasy, of a full context of reading, say, the global literature on **fall**, instead of **field**: of discovering what *Genesis* was reaching for and reaching with and within in its talk of Adam, and the stumblings in the same tandemness of Paul’s *Romans* and later of Augustine, and still later stumblings by the 20<sup>th</sup> century Vatican, transformed by the self-luminous redemption of sexuality. We are – ho ho – a Faraday away from a beginning of explaining the settled neurochemistry of Mc

Kinnon’s stale views!”

I refrain from commenting on that letter apart from some nudgings later in this essay. But note how it moved, nicely and accidentally, into the context of Sarah Coakley’s volume, *God Sexuality and the Self*. So we may now turn our attention to that work. How are we to attend, how are we to comment, how are we to review? HOW am I to suggest your reviewing, and your potential shifting of your own operative meaning of reviewing? The capital HOW at the beginning of the previous sentence is simply a tease towards fantasy of the future to which we shall return later. I cannot suggest HOW, because How-Language does not exist.<sup>7</sup>

Might I now move on to some juggling with **reviewing** and **commenting on** *God, Sexuality, and the Self*? I note the accident that at this stage in my musings the book arrived in my postbox, and I began the climb into Coakley’s meaning after that first sentence of this paragraph. As I climb and struggle and juggle it seems to me best to prepare the ground of the reviewing and commenting before plunging into that task.

Of course, I have no illusions about that preparation either in my reader or in myself, and in my competence of doing some John the Baptist stint or stunt. There is here no Lonerganesque, “the answer is easily reached,”<sup>8</sup> calling of my fingers to typing, to typologizing. We both need patience now and in these next decades with my efforts and yours to twist and turn strategically.

Immediately it occurs to me that there is a great contrast between Lonergan’s writing in the early 1950’s about the ‘easy reach’ of a grasp of space and time and his writing about, yes, the same problem of space and time at the beginning of *Method*. While, in 1966, he began his chat to me about his new approach with “it’s easy” three years later he wrote about the new way being “difficult

---

<sup>7</sup> The suspicion of a future HOW-talk lurked behind chapter 2, “How-Language: Works?” of my *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, 1998. My heuristic of it has grown over those last two decades but it is still slim. Its development would relate to an effective view of adult growth. On that issue see both my *Lack in the Beingstalk*, (Axial Publishing, 2006), 161-63 and *Allure*, 229.

<sup>8</sup> The beginning of the final dense paragraph of the fifth chapter of *Insight*. And indeed, are we here not talking about the same topic of the final section, “The Concrete Intelligibility of Space and Time”?

and laborious”. What’s the snag, the block? What, perhaps, is blocking you and indeed blocking the gallant lady Sarah Coakley?<sup>9</sup>

Might we not profitably have a shot at doing a little preliminary broad viewing and reviewing? So I place before us, for viewing both in the old style and in the new – still to be tackled here and in this century– four paragraphs that bracket the first chapter of *Method in Theology*. I present now for our viewing and reviewing the first three paragraphs of the book, followed by the third last paragraph in the chapter.

“Thought on method is apt to run in some one of three channels. In the first, method will be conceived more as an art than as a science. It is to be learnt not from books or lectures but in the laboratory or in the seminar. What counts is the example of the master, the effort to do likewise, his comments on one’s performance. Such, I think, must be the origin of all thought on method for such thought has to be reflection on previous achievement. Such, also, will always remain the one way in which the refinements and subtleties proper to specialized areas will be communicated.

There are, however, bolder spirits. They select the conspicuously successful science of their time. They study its procedures. They formulate precepts. Finally, they propose an analogy of science. Science properly so called is the successful science they have analyzed. Other subjects are scientific in the measure that they conform to its procedures and, in the measure they do not, they are something less than scientific. So Sir David Ross remarked of Aristotle: ‘Throughout the whole of his works we find him taking the view that all other sciences than the mathematical have the name of science only by courtesy, since they are occupied

---

<sup>9</sup> See note 6 above. But note also an enlightening way of twisting the meaning of the sentence above. “What is blocking” can be taken as a statement not a question, a strategy I have used for decades. “What is you” but that what is meshed in a neurodynamics that has been oscillatingly blocked by a long history, ontic and phyletic, from this finite “order’s dynamic joy and zeal” (*Insight*, 722, last line). So we might edge towards an explanatory heuristic of the battered initial meaning of “the fall of humanity”, and towards an included heuristic of the seventh gift of the Holy Spirit, too long trapped in Isaiah’s “fear of the Lord,” when the heuristic could ground, in a swing through the specialties, a tranquil calm, in the presence of the Beloveds, of constant faltering returnings. On initial meanings see note 59 below.

with matters in which contingency plays a part.’<sup>10</sup> So too today the English word, science, means natural science. One descends a rung or more in the ladder when one speaks of behavioral or human sciences. Theologians finally often have to be content if their subject is included in a list not of sciences but of academic disciplines.

Clearly enough, these approaches to the problem of method do little to advance the less successful subjects. For in the less successful subject, precisely because it is less successful, there is a lack of masters to be followed and of models to be imitated. Not will recourse to the analogy of science be of any use, for that analogy, so far from extending a helping hand to the less successful, is content to assign them a lower rank in the pecking order. Some third way, then, must be found and, even though it is difficult and laborious, that price must be paid if the less successful subject is not to remain a mediocrity or slip into decadence and desuetude.”<sup>11</sup>

“In the eleventh place, transcendental method offers a key to unified science. The immobility of the Aristotelian ideal conflicts with developing natural science, developing human science, developing dogma, and developing theology. In harmony with all development is the human mind itself which affects the developments. In unity with all fields, however disparate, is again the human mind that operates in all fields and in radically the same fashion in each. Through the self-knowledge, the self-appropriation, the self-possession that results from making explicit the basic normative patterns of the recurrent and related operations of human cognitional process, it becomes possible to envisage a future in which all workers in all fields can find in transcendental method common norms, foundations, systematics, and common critical, dialectical, and heuristic procedures.”<sup>12</sup>

Here you find my first strategic twist: an identification of an invariant of the transition from old to new at the end of Lonergan’s first paragraph: “reflection on previous achievement ... will always remain the one way in which the refinements and subtleties proper to specialized areas will be communicated.”

---

<sup>10</sup> W. D. Ross, *Aristotle’s Prior and Posterior Analytics*, Oxford, 1949, p. 14. Cf. pp. 51ff.

<sup>11</sup> *Method in Theology*, 3–4.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

I hope that you and I can weave creative ontic and phyletic magic out of those twenty three words as we ingest together the bits and pieces of my ramblings. My ramblings are, I can claim, as eccentric as Sarah Oakley's, and both of us tack along leaning, in strange parallel, into the Spirit's breezing. So I happily borrow from her Preface. "In short, it is written for all those who continue to seek a vision of God for today, one attractive enough to magnetize their deepest human longings so as to *order* their desires in relation to God."<sup>13</sup>

I can surely make a like happy borrowing regarding Thomas Aquinas's intentions and labours as he ventures into his own shot at systematic order in the *Summa Theologica*, "one of the most breathtaking attempts in Christian tradition to provide a *complete* inventory of Christian doctrine, ethics, and sacramental practice, and their relation to contemporary philosophical and interreligious discussion."<sup>14</sup>

So, Thomas, like Sarah, moves in on his task with "reflection on previous achievement", but it is for both of them a tough solitary task. Thomas dominant context is Aristotle – recall now our Lonergan paragraphs above. Might he have moved better if he had paid more attention to the Arabs or if he had had access to early Chinese or Native American or old Australian wisdom or if he had to hand the *Shobobenzo* volumes of his contemporary Japanese Dogen Zenji (1200–53)?<sup>15</sup> And then there is his contemporary Jalal ad-din Muhammad Rumi (1207–73), who marvelously vibes with all three of us.<sup>16</sup> We could pause profitably here, even at great length, over these contexts and the sad limited effort of Thomas in that first

---

<sup>13</sup> *Coakley I*, xv–xvi. The italics on *order* are hers.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>15</sup> I quote relevantly from the Frontispiece of my *Music That Is Soundless* (1968: latest edition, Axial Publishing, 2005). "All our activity is rooted in the eternal nature of 'everyday mind.' Most of the time we forget this but Buddhas are always aware of this fact. If we have *hosshin* – the resolve to attain supreme enlightenment—surely we will enter the Way of Buddha. This desire for enlightenment must be self-generated; it cannot come from others. Enlightenment is the natural activity of 'everyday mind.' This is the way of learning through the mind." (*Dogen Zenji, Shobobenzo*, translated by Kosen Nishiyama and John Stevens, Tokyo: Kawata Press, Volume I, 1975, 13)

<sup>16</sup> See the quotations from Rumi in the text below after footnote reference 30 below.

question the *Summa*, but I simply repeat what I said compactly elsewhere. I would note that, in the text, the Galilean worldview means the view, not of Galileo, but of Jesus.

"We must skip on to Thomas' beginning, his ethics of inquiry, sadly narrowed by Aristotle. It was too soon in history for him to notice that the Galilean worldview gives a dictionary and a pictiography of science beyond Aristotle and philosophy, beyond science and science fiction.

One cannot squeeze a doctorate thesis into a paragraph, especially one that would seed a massive lift in Thomist studies and cosmic glory. But there it is, Thomas' first question inviting us to sniff out his problem of organizing a science of God's doings. Think of Thomas's challenge: the mission of Jesus to be woven into the level of the times of Aristotle. The ten articles within the question range gallantly through Thomas' problems regarding scripture and argument, and the place of this queen of topics and the place of God's doings in it. The shortest article there is article four, about the problem of the science being practical. Does he really fiddle his way round that problem decently? Still, what an adventure it was, that middle-aged Middle Aged push for a coherent grip on Faith and Insight."<sup>17</sup>

Thomas' task and effort can be compared to that of Sarah, though I suspect that Sarah had and has a better context of support from colleagues and students.<sup>18</sup> Sarah does not have a magisterial first question: indeed she modestly weaves her way selectively through some authors and sources that help us to share her struggle.<sup>19</sup> Will her struggle and her nudging towards a contemplative turn bear fruit, or will it be nicely ignored? Flashing into my mind here, a quote from the Frontispiece of Brendan Lovett's *It's Not Over Yet*:<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> I am quoting from chapter 18, "The Joy of Being Human," of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* (Axial Publishing, 2015), p. 206.

<sup>18</sup> On the sad early fate of Thomas effort see Leonard E. Boyle, *The Setting of the Summa theologiae of Saint Thomas*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1982.

<sup>19</sup> Obviously I am pushing for a quite different type of sharing. However, like her effort, mine is also to a broad audience. Indeed, it may be that functional collaboration might ferment as a general cultural pressure in the face of present global idiocy and academic ineffective putterings.

<sup>20</sup> See note 41. The quotation is from Wilfred Owen, the poet of World War I.

“Near Golgotha strolls many a priest”: her stand on contemplation as key to theology will, I suspect, be no more welcome than mine.

I do not wish yet to divert us into contemplating the character of that contemplation. I wish us to cling to a contemplative musing on the twenty three words: “reflection on previous achievement ... will always remain the one way in which the refinements and subtleties proper to specialized areas will be communicated.” Lonergan follows that suggestion with the pointing: “There are, however, bolder spirits,” and among them I would like to boldly list Thomas, Sarah and myself. Lonergan’s paragraph after that pointing hovers round Aristotle, and he very much has in mind Thomas’ *Quaestio Prima*,<sup>21</sup> but he weaves that second paragraph on down to a biting conclusion: the descent from such Aristotelian and modern scientific seriousness to the sad conventions that haunt “academic disciplines.”<sup>22</sup> He is poised to nudge both Aristotle—the fourth paragraph quoted above requires re-reading now—and the contemporary patterns of discourse, off the scene. “Some third way must be found,” and he would claim—a bolder spirit indeed—that he has found it.

Sarah too is on the hunt for a “*cantus firmus*,”<sup>23</sup> “a ‘more excellent way’ than the two false alternatives (fideism and secularism) that currently feature large in the theological cultural wars.”<sup>24</sup> “It is such an alternative third way which precisely eludes this false choice, that I shall seek to exemplify in this volume and its successors.”<sup>25</sup>

Back we go to our twenty three words, on the hunt for a ‘more excellent way’: “reflection on previous achievement ... will always remain the one way in which the refinements and subtleties proper to specialized areas will be communicated.”

Suppose we fantasized about having a shot at getting there by

---

<sup>21</sup> In the file which Lonergan gathered round his creative insight of functional collaboration of February 1965 there are clear indications of his return to the first question of the *Summa Theologica*.

<sup>22</sup> These are the last words on page 3, the first page of *Method in Theology*. They scream for the new full reviewing that I write about here.

<sup>23</sup> *Coakley I*, 18. It seems to me that the *Cantus Firmus*, a goodly metaphor, is better thought of as a *Standard Model*, one shared by all areas.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

getting us together in our hunting, our hinting, our henting?<sup>26</sup> Is it such a crazy thing, in our new world of internetted globality, to think of a new global empiricity about “reflection on previous achievement?” Sarah and I and Thomas and Gregory of Nyssa and the quarky Spirit want a “getting us together,” but what I am nudging us towards is a getting us together about getting us together, you and me and Sarah.

I would have us follow, had we space and time, Sarah’s pointers towards a getting together on and in the meaning of *desire*, “desire is the constellating category of selfhood, the eradicable root of one’s longing for God,”<sup>27</sup> but best now that we pause over the globalization that I hovered over in talking of Thomas’ limited searchings. I do so, moreover, by picking up on Sarah’s reach beyond the division of fideism and secularism. There is at present a rumbling stumbling in secular concerns, scientific and non-scientific, about getting together, a movement that seems to be shaping around the getting together that Lonergan hit on in 1965. I think immediately of the pressures towards thinking of ecology and the related zone of climate change, our ranging here can profitably take up present concern and nudge it, within its “specialized area” towards “reflection on previous achievement”. I am thinking here of the appeal of Stewart Brand for global collaboration as it weaves on after the neglected reflections of Arne Noess of 3 decades ago.<sup>28</sup> And we can turn our desiring inquiring into a spread of other specialized areas and see people reaching for a getting together that parallels or fosters Lonergan’s suggestion of 1965.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> In *Allure*, in various ways, from chapter one forward, I have twisted language to move us towards a discontinuous glimpse of the slowness of the ontic and phyletic climb towards explanatory insight and refined wisdom. Few, in our times, have serious sense of our embeddedness in initial meanings. Fantasizing about having a shot is my serious appeal for a strenuous stirring of stultified neuromolecules.

<sup>27</sup> *Coakley I*, 58. The index of the book on desire intimates its centrality.

<sup>28</sup> Stewart Brand’s recent work, *Whole Earth Discipline. An Ecopragmatist Manifesto*, Atlantic Books, 2010 is a recent powerful appeal, but the brief reach of Arne Noess (*The Ecologist*, 18, 1988), “Deep Ecology and Ultimate Premises,” offered a more structured mediative direction.

<sup>29</sup> I might well list here stumblings of Lonergan students towards beginnings, but let me simply recall note 5’s reference to the volume *Seeding Global Collaboration*. I would, however, note a series of emerging volumes that pivot on a neat way of inviting attention to a genetics of meaning. William J.

But what of fideism? I am thinking now of Sarah's abundant remarks about its flight from the spirit, from its own inner potential, and would have you turn such remarks—again following a Coakley nudge—back around early Christian days. But details would be too much for our present little ramble about viewing and reviewing.

What Sarah and I agree solidly on is the need for a massive shift that somehow gets to the roots of both disorientations. We both attempt, and invite the attempt, to identify those roots in different groupings. So, where she pauses over Christian art I pause over secular talent shows.<sup>30</sup> Are not both zones ripe with people of Rumi's mood: "You were born with wings; why prefer to crawl through life?" "Stop acting so small. You are the universe in ecstatic motion. Set your life on fire" "What you seek is seeking you." What I am doing very differently is adding a fresh meaning to the crowning image of her iconographic climb:<sup>31</sup> the vortex there is being seeded as we write and read.

There is the whirl of desire to be released, the vortex

magnetized by the Spirit's Clasp from the beginning of Day One.<sup>32</sup> But now the breezy Spirit is bringing that whirl into human minding: it can have the appearance of a secular seeding but the seething seed is in the Galilean world view dodged so far by all the global searchers for progress. Before I move on should I not pose that searching here, to you, "an enabling incubator for such reconsideration?"<sup>33</sup> And should I not pose it with Spirit questioning that cries for a "Yes I said yes I will yes?"<sup>34</sup> The question lurks in the secularist or fideist heart, faith-foiled or faith-filled-foiled: "Do you view humanity as possibly maturing—in some serious way—or just messing along between good and evil, whatever you think they are?"<sup>35</sup> What say you, what says the cosmos groaning in you?

If your suspicion is a yes, a holding to a molecular Spirit-whirled hope, then do we not need to let some contemplative global incarnation pick up on Spirit-nudgings, and to do so in a fullness that shifts, in axial fashion, the meaning of our 23 words? "reflection on previous achievement ...will always remain the one way in which the refinements and subtleties proper to specialized areas will be communicated."

Might there not be a lift in urn to Lonergan's searchings of 1962, and to the pointings of my reflections on his answer to MacKinnon's letter. In the summer of that year he and the quarky Spirit pushed forward his answer to the theological muddles of that time, muddles that persist a half-century later. Twenty weeks after his nudging of MacKinnon he has climbed further and points to refinements of "reflections on previous achievements." He is still 32 months away from the vortex of which I write, and yet is it not a shock to see the reach there that haunts the paragraph on Aristotle

---

Zanardi. *The New Comparative Interpretation: A Primer*. Second, revised edition (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2014). Clayton Shoppa and William J. Zanardi. *Cracking the Case: Exercises in the New Comparative Interpretation* (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2014). Clayton Shoppa and William J. Zanardi. *What Is an Environment? A Study in the New Comparative Interpretation* (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2015). The authors, pushing for a grip on the fourth specialty, use a neat strategy of dealing with the present thin heuristic of development by closing in on pairs of 'timeslices'. Case studies in Art History, Ecology, Sociology, Environmental History and Neuroscience should attract the attention of a broad range of scholars to Lonergan's breakthrough in methodology.

<sup>30</sup> Coakley is to reach out to other art-forms in the volumes to follow. I contrast that effort with my simpler edging of reflection towards contemporary aesthetic patterns of human loneliness, like talent shows (See *Allure* 211ff) within which lurk a Trinitarian theology (See *CWL* 11, 639-85) "in both an ordinary and a symbolic way" (ibid., 685). The issue of the 23 words is to gather us round, spin us round, thinking about getting beyond contrastings and normal comparisons to the genuinely total theology that Coakley talks about. To do that would be to push into what I symbolized in the final paragraph of my comment on Lonergan's letter (above, on page 7) as FS-60910. The piece of *Insight* referred to there is the key: *Insight* 609-10. The work of Zanardi and Shoppa, mentioned in the previous note, leaves no doubt about the difficulty of the push.

<sup>31</sup> The Image is that of Marlene Scholz, "The Blessed Trinity," presented on page 259 of *Coakley I*.

---

<sup>32</sup> See, for a context, my Epilogue of *Seeding Global Collaboration*, "Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling."

<sup>33</sup> *Coakley I*, 80.

<sup>34</sup> These are the concluding words of page ii of *Allure*, words taken from the ending of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. They end a short reflection, titled *The Finding of the Wholly Frail*, on the image of the front cover of the book. *The of* there has a gracious ambiguity, and indeed the short reflection and its conclusion gives the mood of a joyous positive Spirit-crafty answer to the implicit question in Coakley's title, *God, Sexuality and the Self*.

<sup>35</sup> The statement is the lead into chapter 8, "The 8-Fold Cyclic Way Folds Other Ways," of my *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human*, (Axial Publishing, 2013), p. 77.

that I quoted above from page 24 of *Method in Theology*? So we may reverently pause our desire over his dozen lines on the *Genetic Circle*.

“That circle—the systematic exigence, the critical exigence, and the methodological exigence—is also a genetic process. One lives first of all in the world of community and then learns a bit of science and then reflects, is driven towards interiority to understand precisely what one is doing in science and how it stands to one’s operations in the world of community. And that genetic process does not occur once. It occurs over and over again. One gets a certain grasp of science and is led on to certain points in the world of interiority. One finds that one has not got hold of everything, gets hold of something more, and so on. It is a process of spiraling upwards to an ever fuller view. That circle – systematic, critical, and methodical exigence – does not occur just once. It occurs over and over again in the self-correcting process of learning.”<sup>36</sup>

The divine desire that Sarah Coakley writes about so eloquently moves towards lifting the schemes of recurrence of space-time into the space-time minding of those schemes. 30 months later Lonergan is lifted into that leap in finite being, the possibility and probability of twirling into the hearts of human minding a new effective “reflection on previous achievements”. We need to think concretely of such probabilities, of the spread of single events such as Sarah’s book, and then envisage types of recycling, recircling, of sets of such events.

“In this case, we may suppose that the probabilities of the single events are respectively the same as before, but we cannot suppose that the probability of the combination of all events in the set is the same as before. As is easily to be seen, the concrete possibility of a scheme beginning to function shifts the probability of the combination from the product  $pqr \dots$  to the sum of  $p + q + r + \dots$ . For in virtue of the scheme, it now is true that  $A$  and  $B$  and  $C$  and ... will occur, if either  $A$  or  $B$  or  $C$  or ... occurs; and by a general rule of probability, the probability of a set of alternatives is equal to the sum

---

<sup>36</sup> *Early Works on Theological Method I*, University of Toronto Press, 2010, *Collected Works of Lonergan* volume 22, 140. I am quoting from the Monday (July 16, 1962) lecture of the second week of an Institute ‘On the Method of Theology’: the lecture is titled “Knowing, Believing, and Theology”.

of the probabilities of the alternative.”<sup>37</sup>

Lonergan sees this shift, without saying it there,<sup>38</sup> as “not only a new and higher collaboration of intellects through faith in God, but also a mystery that is at once symbol of the uncomprehended and sign of what is grasped and psychic force that sweeps living human bodies, linked in charity, to the joyous, courageous, wholehearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed by transcended.”<sup>39</sup>

Is he not thus weaving his contemplation round the same hope that flames out from Coakley’s contemplative struggle with “the tangled root of desire”?<sup>40</sup> Might their hopes and struggles weave together, lifted forward in a quite new style of “reflection on past achievements,” finding a fresh Spirit-questioning way into the way, the truth, the life? So, to recall again Lovett’s little work, *Its Not Over Yet*.<sup>41</sup> and point crazily to the future: have we not “done enough splashing about in the methodological shallows of the sea of faith”?<sup>42</sup>

There is much that can be done to fill out my borrowing from Sarah Coakley to edge us on, moving forward her questions in an entwining movement.<sup>43</sup> “to these questions I must now urgently attend, and so reveal methodological features of my ‘unsystematic systematics.’”<sup>44</sup> That comment ends chapter one: we are only

---

<sup>37</sup> *Insight*, 144.

<sup>38</sup> The central effort of the book *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* is to add a new balance to the drive of *Insight*, with its deliberate silences, by weaving its glorious heuristic into the heuristics both of *Method in Theology* and of Jesus.

<sup>39</sup> *Insight*, 745.

<sup>40</sup> *Coakley I*, 51.

<sup>41</sup> The title of the book (Claretian Press, 1999) came from Roland Litzemberger, a young artist who produced a series of 6 paintings under that slogan. “He wished to convey that the Passion of Jesus is to be placed within the ongoing story of the passion of humankind, in solidarity with the sufferings of all times and places. It cannot be understood apart from this wider on-going story.” Lovett, *Op. Cit.* 2.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>43</sup> Here you may well pause to discern my tricky balance between the two types of reviewing that is our fundamental, our foundational topic.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 60. Readers familiar with my own works will sense here a massive opening to the functional location of systematics, and to the quarky weaving of the full functional system into that seventh specialty.

beginning our journey together, but I am running out of space in this short essay.

I shall return in conclusion to slim hints about other issues raised by her next 300 pages, in the context of the letters referred to at the beginning, but now it seems best for us to face a major issue where a superficial reading of her work would lead a reader familiar with my work to see deep conflict between us.

Simply put, is Coakley not taking a clear stand on the apophatic,<sup>45</sup> where my stand is equally clearly on the kataphatic?<sup>46</sup> The answer is yes, but in meaning our divergence is minimal. Simply put again, we are both taking a considered stand on the need for a contemplative turn in theology. Simply put still more, I do not think that Sarah would disagree with the central bent of my little book, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, expressed in the prayer, “Grace, Grace, Grace, tune us to the Allure of the Scent of the Nomen.”<sup>47</sup> And, in a further simplicity: whether she agreed or disagreed her doing so would be kataphatic. Indeed, and finally, I claim that her push is for kataphatic contemplation in its fullest and darkest sense.

It would be helpful, for your brooding on this, for me to point vaguely to the anaphatic in my own bent towards the kataphatic. It becomes less and less vague, and paradoxically darker and darker, in so far as one faces the contemplative climb with a focus on your own slow-growing meaning of analogy. The meaning can be named as a psychic quarky<sup>48</sup> triplicity of affirmation, negation and

eminenting.<sup>49</sup> Here I can refer back to my source at note X for the quotation on the genetic circle. That quotation is in the centre of a compact lecture on “Knowing, Believing, and Theology”<sup>50</sup>: there is no short cut to its comprehension.<sup>51</sup> So, here, you may well be poised over this text with the vaguest of meanings for affirmation, a “commonsense understanding,”<sup>52</sup> most likely clouded by present academic global truncated subjectivity.<sup>53</sup> The whole vocabulary of contemplation, East and West, Avila and Buddha and talked-of native worlds, is a warped commonsense muddle. What, then, might be your meaning for negation and eminenting? How might you bring now that clouded poise to bear on the now, then, and always truth expressed by Hafiz, “that God / Will then lean down / And start combing you into / His /Hair”<sup>54</sup>? You might resolve to do so over a life. Then you can grow decade by decade into a new poise, and a strange commitment to serious daily contemplative time with the circuminencing triplicity of beloved Subjects.<sup>55</sup> It “involves a

---

earlier I talked of the “quarky Spirit”: did that, does that, give you pause? The Spirit never acts alone. Then you have the puzzling usage of quarky in note 44.

<sup>49</sup> I here conjure up the new word, eminenting. I would note it as pointing to a reading poise in theological contemplation. Think, for instance, of the challenge of reading, through a life, the words *absolutely supernatural* on page 746 or 747 of *Insight*.

<sup>50</sup> CWL 22, *Early Works on Theological Method I*, 128-55.

<sup>51</sup> Indeed, there is the long cut through the next millennia intimated by the pointing of the passage quoted already, from Lonergan to Crowe in 1954, which is worth quoting here. “The Method of Theology is coming into perspective. For the Trinity: Imago Dei in homine and proceed to the limit as in evaluating  $[1 + 1/n]^n$  as  $n$  approaches infinity. For the rest: ordo universi. From the viewpoint of theology, it is a manifold of unities developing in relation to one another and in relation to God, i.e., metaphysics as I conceive it but plus transcendent knowledge.”

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

<sup>53</sup> “The neglected subject does not know himself. The truncated subject not only does not know himself but also is unaware of his ignorance and so, in one way or another, concludes that what he does not know does not exist” (Lonergan, *A Second Collection*, in the essay “The Subject”, p. 73. What is sad and startling is the subtle truncation within students of Lonergan.

<sup>54</sup> Quoted from the Poem “When the Violin (Can forgive the past / It starts singing)”, p. 23 of *The Gift, Poems by Hafiz The Great Sufi Master*, translated by Daniel Ladinsky, Penguin Compass, 1999.

<sup>55</sup> I am at a loss here in pointing or referencing properly. Perhaps the reference to the title of *Allure*’s chapter 19 gives a start: “The Well of Loneliness”. In that chapter I lift chapter 19 both into the triply “bright-I”d Trinitarian Presence and invite the push beyond thinking and talking of God as an object (see *Method in*

---

<sup>45</sup> See the abundant index to *Coakley I* under *apophaticism* and *contemplation*: a quite clear indication of her dominant interest in ‘appropriately apophatic sensibility’ (*Coakley I*, 45).

<sup>46</sup> The issue is clearly raised in *Allure*, 43-48, in the Appendix, “Reaching for a World View, to chapter 4, “Religion: The Complementary of Classical and Statistical Investigations”. A context is provided by the five essays (4–8) on “Foundational Prayer” in the *Prehumus* series on my website.

<sup>47</sup> The prayer dominates chapters 17 and 19 of *Allure*: see pages 187 and 209. A decent commentary on it would be lengthy e.g. weaving round the convenient naming of three Divine Persons, a problem that concerned Thomas Aquinas. At least, though, I should mention my suggestive twisting in the prayer round the title of the 1992 film, *Scent of a Woman*.

<sup>48</sup> Here I use suggestively the name of those inseparable three types of quarks. The usual use of the world analogous hides the triplicity. A few pages

lifetime's undertaking of discernment and (graced) practice."<sup>56</sup> "The very act of contemplation—repeated, lived, embodied, suffered—is an act that, by grace, and over time, inculcates mental patterns of 'un-mastery', welcoming the dark realm of the unconscious, opens up a radical attention to the 'other', and instigates an acute awareness of the messy entanglement of sexual desire and desire for God."<sup>57</sup>

I borrow here approvingly from Sarah Coakley. A slow self-attentive contemplation of those borrowings in the context of her book-packed references to that effort, will, I hope, bring you to glimpse that what is operating in her contemplation is the clouded stance of triplicity that dominates the axial global stance on contemplation. There is desperately needed, in our times of puttering blindly towards the new Han Dynasty,<sup>58</sup> of "a radical attention to the

---

*Theology*, 342, lines 1-2). One grows, then, THEN, towards reading the beginning of section 7 of *Insight* chapter 19 is a darkly radiant subjectivity, Subjectivities: They understand Themselves and, in themselves, you reading. The X-Mansion which you seek to arrive – not a tenth Mansion of Teresa but in a quite different Interior Castle – is the transformedly informed places 13-26 of *Insight* 683-92, but with your focus on Their grip on the actual order, "the most perfect thing" (CWL 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 349), and you there in tuning collaboration. But not **there** in any space- time **there**-sense: there indeed is the high point of stepping off from mythologies of The Visible, from the stumbling flaws of an existentialism's hovering and hoovering round Merleau-Ponty's *The Visible and the Invisible*. (See, on my website, *Field Nocturnes* 24-38). One is poised in the Triune Minding's Claspings Cherishing Cauling, Craving, Christing. But how? That is a matter of the tenth mansion.

<sup>56</sup> Coakley I, 321.

<sup>57</sup> Coakley I, 43. Here, again, there is a liberating road to be taken. Critics of Coakley rightly point to the slimness of her discussion of sexuality, granted the title of this volume. But it is a topic cramped by abominable ancient and contemporary mythologies. I regularly refer to the nudging of Lonergan in "Finality, Love, Marriage," CWL 4, 17-52, blocked the next year ecclesiastical mythmakers in Rome (see *ibid.*, 263-4, note x). There needs to be a solid heuristic retrieval of Lonergan work that would open us to the splendor of that "infinite craving on a finite object" (*ibid.*, 49). I excuse my own slim comment, a demand of brevity, by referred you to the recent addition to my website: *Lonergan Gatherings* 12, "Finality, Love, Courage," (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org/lonergan-gatherings>) where I tackle related issues in a way that parallels the work in this essay: a viewing and reviewing of a letter by Lonergan on the issue of contraception.

<sup>58</sup> Brendan Lovett's book, *A Dragon not for the Killing*, powerfully identifies that puttering by modern myths over the millennia of China, including that dynasty of 2000 years ago. The back cover of my recent book, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, and, of course, its content, pushes for a deeper

other," a transition from that commonsense puttering with initial meanings,<sup>59</sup> a transition that is at present in the realm of fantasy. "The transition from the world of community to the world of theory is from an understanding that is implicit, given with human living, to an understanding that expresses itself systematically."<sup>60</sup> So we come back, or forward, to the central topic of this little article, the problem of an effective transition to what Coakley names neatly "unsystematic systematics."<sup>61</sup>

For me that unsystematic systematics is in the larger systematics of a functional collaboration as a seventh step towards redeeming town and gown meaning, and I can only point here to its diagramming, W<sub>3</sub>, in other contexts.<sup>62</sup> It seems to me the present best heuristics of the field. "The field is the universe, but my horizon defines my universe."<sup>63</sup> Within that field, in a complex containment, is Sarah Coakley's horizon, which ties in and ties up her meaning of field and fieldwork.<sup>64</sup>

Here, in the four simple words, *in a complex containment*, you may sense a pointer towards the shift in the meaning of *reviewing* written about at the beginning of this essay. Much of the above commentary on *Coakley I* can be thought of as reviewing in the normal sense. In the full sense of **W<sub>3</sub>, Double You Three**, the reviewing is to be a genetic cycle or vortex that is to whirl forward

---

meaning for *Han Dynasty*, the third stage of meaning about which Lovett has been so eloquent.

<sup>59</sup> The problem of being bogged down in initial meanings is a giant crisis of our long axial times. I touched slimly on the question in *Allure* (see, for example, note 4 on page 209). It is the world of those who control the globe – apart from corporate monsters that control most of the controllers. Initial meanings are generally dressed up by these folks in polysyllables and mathematics, and occasionally the dressing is patterned by reductionist chemistry and metaphors from general physics.

<sup>60</sup> "Knowing, Believing, and Theology," the article's concluding words; on page 155.

<sup>61</sup> Coakley I, 60.

<sup>62</sup> The diagram is in *Allure*, p. 90. There is the fuller context of its occurrence in Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, (Axial Publishing, 2010), 161. The full challenging context is named there in chapter 10.

<sup>63</sup> Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 199.

<sup>64</sup> For a first glimpse of her meaning see the index of *Coakley I* under *fieldwork*.

contemplatively what is good in the volume. In a smaller but still novel sense it puts Sarah and I into the conversation of the fourth specialty, especially the conversation as it is described in Lonergan's *1833 Overture of Method in Theology* 250.<sup>65</sup>

So we come swinging round to my comments on Lonergan's letter to MacKinnon as they vaguely intimated a larger way of viewing the field, be it Faraday's field, the Higgs field, or Coakley's field. I have remarked on Coakley's critics and their commentaries. My comments flow in the same shabby ineffective context.<sup>66</sup> The culture is dominated by Aristotle's view of system, and it lives within the occult entity, systematics.<sup>67</sup> The critical issue of beginning a new effective way is the issue of admitting the need for structured collaborative communication into consciousness. Is such an admission possible, probable, likely? It is, at present highly unlikely, and it is sadly so especially when the community that has gathered round Lonergan are hell bent on protecting their little ponds from his towering vision.<sup>68</sup>

So I return to our 23 words and to the promise I made at the beginning to suggest a way forward through you and I settling for some sort of self-insertion into the first of Lonergan's specialties, functional research.<sup>69</sup> We pause again over the 23 words: "reflection on previous achievement ... will always remain the one way in which the refinements and subtleties proper to specialized areas will

---

<sup>65</sup> There is a way in which, without venturing into the whole vortex, Sarah and I might make our way through Lonergan's 1833 Overture (lines 18-33 of *Method* 250) but the fuller context of the new *cantus firmus* would soon emerge. But, as with my Lonergan colleagues, the venture is highly unlikely at present.

<sup>66</sup> "The better educated become a class closed in upon themselves with no task proportionate to their training. They become effete. ... The culture has become a slum" (Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 99). On the slum as situations calling for the hierarchy of 8 situation rooms described by Lonergan, see *Allure*, 183.

<sup>67</sup> On occult entities in theology, see *Allure* 80-82.

<sup>68</sup> I have reached out for 50 years now on this matter of collaboration, and Brendan Lovett is unique in following me in my foolishness. We are making no progress. I followed the unsuccessful publication of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* with a new series titled *Lonergan Gatherings*, which sought to be the beginning of a dialogue. Silence regarding such dialogue reigns in a sick Lonerganism.

<sup>69</sup> I am contracting, in my three brief pointings, from the treatment I gave the first specialty in *FuSe Zero-9*. This series of essays is available at: <http://www.philipmcschane.org/website-series>.

be communicated."

The reflection that I would ask you to consider doing is one [1] that tries to ingest the optimistic answer to our question at note 36; [2] that homes in on any semblance of achievement in determining patterns of progress; [3] that does so within the generic ethos of the first functional specialty: "This is worth recycling."

Of course, the evident present candidate for [2] is the remainder of Coakley's book that I said I would return to: but now you see that rather do I return to turn you to it. The turn, as you may note from the trinity of suggestions in the previous paragraph, is bracketed by [1] and [3].<sup>70</sup> Whether you tackle one or other of Sarah Coakley's later chapters, or some other writing—even a previous effort by yourself, [1] should be pushing your mind and molecules towards a larger self-attentive grip on the cosmic story and [3] should give you a shove towards identifying some significant details.

The core of your achievement should be a poise of asking, in a collaborative manner, for an interpretation of what you identify as worth recycling. This nudges you out of old style viewing and reviewing towards the "difficult and laborious" style of wanting a team-effort that would lift the supposed worthwhile into a whirling remote meaning, a meaning that is destined to hit the streets in fresh ecological and neurodynamic patterns. This is quite remote from such a search as would, say—is this a trivial example?—identifying the beatitudes as worth recycling, but not through the mill, the tower, of serious understanding.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> An interesting quest for you here: is there something vestigially Trinitarian in my three pointings? See *Summa Theologica*, q.45, a.7. This quest also raises questions about Sarah Coakley's struggle with inner and outer imagings of the Trinity: a topic quite beyond the scope of this short essay of suggestions.

<sup>71</sup> This is a topic I raised in *Allure* (see page 114). A parallel is found in Lovett's *A Dragon not for the Killing*, chapter 2, "Ambiguities in Cultural Transformation", at note 13: In the midst of modern crises of cultural transition in China there was a Jesuit appeal to the ethos of the beatitudes. "The Sermon on the Mount must have sounded like romantic escapism. 'Is that all you have to offer us?' incredulous Chinese intellectuals asked the sons of Matteo Ricci." The deep issue is the meaning of *identification*. Might I put it bluntly at this later stage in my little article? If commonsense cultural transformation is to occur—the sort of stuff that goes with the ordinary meaning of reviewing—a massively different cultural transformation of minding has to be effectively identified, thus grounding, in a millennium or so, the beginnings of a sane

And what, now, might you think of my letter about Lonergan's reply to MacKinnon? What of it is worth recycling? And what is worth recycling of those four paragraphs from the first chapter of *Method in Theology*? And what of my central challenge to Sarah Coakley, or anyone else who would have us follow an apophatic bent in order to change history? That central challenge swings us all back to the challenge expressed by Lonergan so neatly and sadly: "one has not only to read *Insight*, but also to discover oneself in oneself."<sup>72</sup> But the swing back is through the pressure of history to swing round and spiral up: Lonergan, the foster father of global functional care, bows to the graced motherhood of history.

---

global humanity. Incidentally, in *A Dragon not for the Killing*, Lovett manages to give me "the second last word" (conclusion of the final chapter). I am pleased now to return the favour!

<sup>72</sup> *Method in Theology*, 260.