

## *Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling*

Philip McShane

This essay has six sections. The first section points to a creative jump regarding the third stage of meaning that ties in with the third line of Lonergan's spread of words on page 48 of *Method in Theology*. The second section focuses on new meanings of human evolution, mainly within general categories of meaning. The next section lifts our thinking into a focus on special categories. Section 4 turns to a single article of Thomas' *Summa Theologica* to illustrate the transition in theology involved in Lonergan's shift of the meaning of science. Section 5 talks of our stumblings in this volume. The final section muses about the road forward towards the distant goal –9011 A.D.–of “Arriving in Cosmopolis.”

### 1. A Third Stage and Third Line of Meaning

I might well consider this to be part two of an essay written by me in a summer month of 1961. Its title was “The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God.”<sup>1</sup> It comes 53 years later than that first part: surely this is a record? Already there is a terrible density in the first part, a density requested by Courtney Murray: put the message of the five *Verbum* articles in a compact form. But the density of that first part is just a modest effort of a first-year theological student who had yet to venture formally into Trinitarian theology. The density of the second is of initiating the venture into seeding a new Trinitarian theology after a half century of persistent climbing into the question, “What might being be?” Perhaps a gentler title for this

---

<sup>1</sup> It was published in *Theological Studies* in 1962. I had moved, from teaching mathematical science in University College Dublin, into the study of theology, in the autumn of 1960. That year I wrote “The Contemporary Thomism of Bernard Lonergan”, published in *Philosophic Studies* (Ireland) in 1962. But the previous year I had offered it to Fr. Courtney Murray, who found it too philosophical but asked me to do an article that would present the core of the *Verbum* articles. Years later Fr. Crowe was amused by the story and remarked that Murray would never have done that had he known that I was in first year theology. I was to do the course on the Trinity in the academic years 1963-4, so I was invited to move to Heythrop College, Oxfordshire for that final year of theology. That eased the nerves of the professor in Milltown Park. I spent most of the fourth year of theology writing “Insight and the Strategy of Biology,” published in the Lonergan *Festschrift*, *Spirit as Inquiry*, edited by Fred Crowe (Herder and Herder, 1964). Meantime I had published “Theology and Wisdom,” *Sciences Ecclesiastiques*, 1963, “The Causality of the Sacraments” in *Theological Studies*, 1963 and “The Foundations of Mathematics” in *Modern Schoolman*, 1964. On the side I managed to get the usual S.T.L. degree in theology and arrange to avoid going to the Gregorian University for doctorate studies. This odd flow of events is relevant: as a scientist I was a displaced person in the theology of the time. But now, am I still a displaced person?

second part might have been, “The Fact of Intelligible Emanations in God.” The gentler title would hide from the reader, at least initially, the existential gap, the Beethoven pause, the Proustian weave.

But even the initial reading of that alternate title might halt you in the blunt odd word *fact*.

“What, then, is being?” is only a strategic twist on the road to the weave in molecular patterns of absolutely supernatural facts.

Thomas would have no difficulty with the word *fact*: indeed, he would have preferred the word *fact* in the title of the first part, my first essay. Would Lonergan have difficulty with *fact*, or indeed with any of the facts pointed to by either of my titles? I think not. He regularly delighted in my strange titles and now can only bodilessly grin at my suggestion that I am really only conjuring up a more factual version of the third line of his own odd spread of words on the top of page 48 of *Method in Theology*. The line reads:

“liberty            orientation, conversion            personal relations            terminal value”

Recall his comment in *Insight*: “In the first place, there is such a thing as progress, and its principle is liberty.”<sup>2</sup> Liberty is there, emergent fact of the Rift Valley of Primitive Africa. In the last place there is terminal value, and no doubt you may think of it in terms of Aristotle’s final causality, but here I am thinking of the fact of the friendly universe, and the claim of John in the name of Jesus, “As you, Father, are in me and I in you, may they also be one in us,”<sup>3</sup> the whole hominid hundred billion brained parade. So, in reality, liberty is Clasped, Embraced, and the fact of terminal value is a Hailing Cauling One.

But we must pause over this third line of *Method* 48, as I have done many times before. If one takes seriously the end of the second line then this third line doesn’t belong. “What, then, is being?” It is the good of order.

But we are in this dicey domain of history, and the good of order is incomplete. Is it to be always so? A strange and worthwhile question about the everlasting; but here we think only of the tomorrows of the emergent good of order.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Insight*, CWL 3, 259.

<sup>3</sup> *John* 17:21.

And thinking thus we can settle for line three being sneakily lurking in the previous two lines, a disturbing reality of pre-human and human history. And we can settle for Lonergan's version of it.

But our conference and volume go further, and some of the collaborators are explicit about that further reach, that Cherishing in finitude which is the Hailing, the Caressing, that is a Divine speaker Calling.

The calling is the sequence of emergent goods, "always concrete."<sup>4</sup> And the sequence calls—is it not a part of the calling?—for its genetic conception in whatever fullness the human group can rise to "on the level of one's age,"<sup>5</sup> "on the level of one's time,"<sup>6</sup> but always everlastingly beyond, beyond especially the battered tadpole of our so-far wandering from the Rift Valley.

So, Lonergan is painfully led to his dream of the tower, a dream I claim to be lurking in that final line of *Method in Theology's* word spread of page 48.

But might it also lurk in you?

That is the issue, the potential molecular and minding issue pointed to in you, in this volume. It expresses a Christian stand on the bold-faced question raised at the beginning of chapter 8 of *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human*: "**Do you view humanity as possibly maturing—in some serious way—or just messing along between good and evil, whatever you think they are?**" But the question is posed here in the fullness of tower-entry.

That fullness is captured in the words bracketed by *Embracing* and *Cauling*: *Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of*. "The Symphony of"? We are back with the main message of the book, *The Road to Religious Reality*, and I do not wish to compact that meaning here other than to note now that the issue is the towering presence of the second Trinitarian Person between the third, Embracing, and the first, Cauling. What is at issue, the issue in you, is a cyclic taking off from the final words of Lonergan's systematic treatise on the Trinity: "joined to the Spirit in love and made living members of the body of Christ we might cry out, Abba, Father!"<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The first sentence of the chapter on "The Human Good," in *Method in Theology*, 27.

<sup>5</sup> *Method in Theology*, 351.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 350.

<sup>7</sup> *The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 521. This is the translation given for the Latin of the previous page. That Latin is identical to the Latin of page 329 (Rome, 1957) of *Divinarum*

My footnote seven points to the identity of the text I used in 1961 and the present text, and it brings you to read freshly the title and its claim “Bernard Lonergan Evolved.”

## 2. Evolving

How might I intimate that fresh reading? Some of you are members of SGEME, but perhaps scarcely recall what the letters of the word *SGEME* meant, quite apart from the serious meaning of the word that concludes the society’s name: *The Society for the Globalization of Effective Methods of Evolving*. Evolving? It has at least a general meaning for you, but has it the beginning of the meaning, the mark, that Lonergan mentions in the Preface of *Insight*, the meaning of “the elapsed twenty-eight years” that “have left their mark upon me”? What might that mark have been on the fifty-year-old man?

More important—for the mark is a remote hidden molecularity—what might be your view of sharing that mark?

So I come to putter round the hidden molecularity of the word *luminously*. My co-author James Duffy refers in his essay to Teilhard de Chardin’s book, *Science and Christ*.<sup>8</sup> Chardin, a marked man, writes powerfully as if he were communicating with somebody. He is not luminous about his failure to do so, in my sense of *luminously*. He is, of course, not alone in that. Non-luminous communication of serious personal depth is an axial thing, though you find oddities like Proust in various fields who tune into the sad reality of faded 18-year olds: “not old folk but young people of 18, very much faded.”<sup>9</sup> Luminous communication is to eventually emerge, weaved into a HOW-talk that will, for example, eliminate the necessity of such appeals as Lonergan made at the conclusion of his *Verbum* articles about cultured reading.<sup>10</sup> When that language is an ethos of trail-presentation then its mark will be a shared global pattern, a marrowed sense of adult growth. Need I go on about that here? Indeed I do—only the rare person has the marrow marks, at any age, of the plodding climb to meaning, and the becoming stranger to themselves of last month.

---

*Personarum conceptionem analogicam evolvit Bernardus Lonergan* (translated: Bernard Lonergan evolved an analogical conception of the Divine Persons).

<sup>8</sup> Teilhard de Chardin, *Science and Christ*, Collins, 1965.

<sup>9</sup> Marcel Proust, *Remembrance of Things Past*, Random House, New York, Vol. 2, 1042.

<sup>10</sup> See *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, *CWL* 2, 223.

But I do wonder now about any going-on here, puttering about the “commonly obscure gap.”<sup>11</sup>

I am raising — am I really? — the question and the quest in you for a sensibility to the existential gap between today’s horizon and tomorrow’s, between any horizon and the field: “The field regards metaphysics as such, but the horizon regards metaphysics as possible-for-me, relevant-to-me.”<sup>12</sup> Lonergan, after a quarter of a century searching, typed his fifteen-hundred-page climb on a little machine, and there was *Insight*, a printed handful in 1957. He was too busy climbing to talk scientifically about the climb, and this was true even of his last book, *Method in Theology*. He had, as he began that book in 1966, a powerful sense of the climb to which he was inviting his colleagues in theology, and he shared that sense and the concomitant gloom about the project with me that summer.<sup>13</sup> But we did not share, for neither of us had, a comprehension of adult growth, one that was a formal comprehension. It is a problem of reaching and expressing the adult growth of a comprehension of everything.

Now this comprehension of everything in a unified whole can be either formal or virtual. It is virtual when one is habitually able to answer readily and without difficulty, or at least ‘without tears,’ a whole series of questions right up to the last why? Formal comprehension, however, cannot take place without a construct of some sort.<sup>14</sup>

Lonergan’s writing there is about getting a grip on the constitution of Christ. Our chat here is about something like getting a grip on our getting a grip on that topic, or any topic.

That formal comprehension is quite remote from present culture, indeed I suspect from the efforts of this next century. Heavens, we don’t have a formal comprehension of the growth of a sunflower!<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *Insight*, CWL 3, 565.

<sup>12</sup> *Phenomenology and Logic: The Boston College Lectures on Mathematical Logic and Existentialism*, CWL 18, 119.

<sup>13</sup> In particular, what to put into chapter one baffled him.

<sup>14</sup> *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, CWL 7, 151. The end of the paragraph is relevant to our musing: “Thus, if we want to have a comprehensive grasp of everything in a unified whole, we shall have to construct a diagram in which are symbolically represented all the various elements of the question along with all the connections between them.”

<sup>15</sup> I had dabbled in the topic of adult growth in the 1950s, and later pondered over the works of Maslow and Aresteh, with a first serious blossoming of talk in the second chapter of *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young [Christian] Minders* (1989), but my better start of musing on the task was in 2001, in the end pages of *Lack in the Beingtalk: A Giants*

So what is to be effected by my short musing on the genetics of evolving a minding? As I continue to weave round this topic—after writing this section and indeed section 4 below—it dawns on me that I am engaged in yet another article within the formula of the volume. Even, accidentally, but with a cunning twist now, having the same numbering scheme.<sup>16</sup> Here, then, in section 2, is the discovery-content to be handed on. The discovery-content is my single line as a suggested replacement for the third line of Lonergan’s spread on *Method in Theology* 48, and the luminosity of growing in its understanding.

Instead, then of

liberty          orientation, conversion          personal relations          terminal value

I offer

Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling.

But the subtlety of my offer is that the line is poised in a searching for a luminous towering meaning of personal relations, with little *ps* and capital *Ps*. And in that offer there is in fact a set of lifts of the meaning of the search for personal relations, and here I only mention one facet of that set. There is a new twist to the prayerful reach for and attainment of Cosmopolis weaved into a reach for a genetics of asymmetric friendship.

The line points to the emergence of a metatheoretic consciousness that is to define humanities climb in its personal intimacies and its phyletic glory, a defining that is to be an increasingly kataphatic luminosity, “so that joined to the Spirit in love and made living members of the body of Christ we might cry out, ‘Abba, Father’.”<sup>17</sup>

---

*Causeway* [published by Axial Press, in 2007]. A key nudge forward in the *Cantower* project of the next decade was the essay that became [Cantower 2](#): “Sunflowers Speak to Us of Growing.” On the problem of reaching a theory of botanical development see “Method in Theology and Botany,” Part One of [Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations](#).

<sup>16</sup> I leave this suggestion as I made it here, with the intention of turning my 6 sections into 4 by the device of sub-sectioning. But it would have been a pedantic move. Still, it is a nice exercise for the reader to see how the six sections might have fitted into the formula of four that dominates most of the articles in the volume.

<sup>17</sup> Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 521. These are the final words of Lonergan’s treatise on the Trinity, the pointers to the beginnings of the post-axial praying that is to be both theology and common sense in the later stages of the third stage of meaning.

### 3. Special Categories

The new turn expressed in those last paragraphs of section 2 loops out of my previous sketchings for this section. Yet musings on hand-on strategies for my foundational stand mesh with the large original project of talking about the challenge to face huge foundational discontinuities in theology. Fortunately James Duffy has already dealt with aspects of that challenge in taking up the topic of my five Cs that relate to the radiances in history of the Divine Persons: Claspings, Cherishing, Calling, Craving, Christing. He articulated aspects of the search for the meaning of *Cherishing*, that OM of the first Trinitarian Person that wormholes us all into a sort-of infinite finitude.<sup>18</sup>

The search for the meaning of that absolute supernatural is, however, of the same ilk as the search of hypothetical normal humans for meaning in other zones.<sup>19</sup> But that natural normative search has been botched in various ways since the beginning of the axial period. The lift out of that botched state is one I identified, in my listing of 7 functional policies, as "The Tomega Principle."<sup>20</sup> I titled it Tomega with a bow to Chardin's Omega point and in doing so I recognize now that I was fiddling with the perspective of pure nature much as Lonergan did in *Insight*.<sup>21</sup> The Tomega

---

<sup>18</sup> The conclusion of my Epilogue homes in on this strangeness of finitude as a core venture in the theology of these next millennia.

<sup>19</sup> A context is "The Natural Desire to See God," *Collections*, CWL 4. See note 21 below.

<sup>20</sup> The listing occurs in section 4 of [Cantower 41](#), "Functional Policy," written in 2005. That *Cantower* ended the first surge towards 117 *Cantowers* (the number of Cantos written by Ezra Pound) and was followed by a long effort to understand *Method in Theology* page 250. Later I focused a similar long effort at understanding content and context of that wonderful paragraph beginning, "study of the organism begins ..." (*Insight*, CWL 3, 489), which ran to 41 essays, [Field Nocturnes](#), another lead into the concluding *Cantowers* which finally reached the number 158 (117 + 41).

<sup>21</sup> See note 19 above. Lurking over my Epilogue are questions about the nature of Christian philosophy, questions I have entertained over decades. I think of Lonergan's review of books on the topic in *Shorter Papers*, CWL 20, 222-23, which ends marvelously thus: "I am led to suggest that the issue which goes by the name of a Christian philosophy is basically a question of methodology at its deepest level, the one that investigates the operative intellectual ideals not only of scientists and philosophers but also, since Catholic truth is involved, theologians. It is, I fear, in Vico's phrase, a *scienza nuova*." A simple answer can talk of a *de facto* Christian philosophy. *De facto*, functional collaboration emerged out of a problem in Christian theology, even though, as various contributors here note, it is a problem that ferments forward out of other areas. Again, *de facto*, the maturity of analyses of minding, with its need to discover the meaning of "is? is! is.", is a Christian achievement, even if verification in science nudges towards a methodological answer. One should note here that a lot of inter-author dialogue of Lonergan studies does not advert sufficiently to the fact that Lonergan's study of mind in *Verbum* is way out of the ballpark of contemporary philochat, clustered round various road-houses, where "the halfway house is idealism." *Insight*, CWL 3, 22. And finally, there is the issue of personal relations at the

principle is indeed borrowed from a slightly deceptive—certainly appearing empirically wobbly—perspective on human thinking that Lonergan proposes: “Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view.”<sup>22</sup> Lonergan is flying high here, flying in the face of his sad comment on theologians: “Theologians, let alone parents, rarely think of the historical process.”<sup>23</sup> But before I pick up on that and on what I call my fiddling, let me present you with my venture of establishing the Tomega Principle. I do so at length because it is important to see the Cantower struggle freshly, in this new context of the problematic of luminous growth.<sup>24</sup>

I come now to [4], the Tomega Principle. You will find the principle formulated for the first time in my writings in *Cantower* 4 of July 2002, although it was part of my dynamic from ... way back! And perhaps my drawing attention to this, by inviting you to pause over this, will help you to “handle,” hearthold, get your molecular head around about about about this doctrine and these doctrines.

The Tomega Principle is printed out on page 7 of Cantower IV, and I read now my comments there. I meant just to quote the definition and move on, but, my my, that page was worth my reading again for the first time with its burst of fresh meaning nudging me along my dark galactic trail. So, I will type the whole page in here, thus talking to myself again, beginning again to taste the tease of Lonergan’s marvelous leaf 417 [442] of *Insight*. To think that I missed the key pointing of it in my readings of forty years! So: let me give you the beginning of section 1.2 of that *Cantower*, titled “A Pert Direction.”

‘What we are reaching for, THEN, is a can-tower self-luminosity of molecular intelligence implementing its explanatory self-tasting in an efficient spin-in and spin-off of noo-feedback.

---

heart of this essay. Note 1 of Lonergan’s Epilogue to *Insight* is quite insistent about the strange real-world context of such hello-saying.

<sup>22</sup> *Insight*, CWL 3, 442.

<sup>23</sup> “Finality, Love, Marriage,” CWL 4, 47.

<sup>24</sup> I do hope you catch the humour of this statement. What “length” is required “to see”? I look back myself at the length of more than a decade reaching to now, now see freshly. How do I get you to see? I think now of the leads in one of my favorite books, Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind* (Phoenix pb, 2002) about “the nuts and bolts of thinking” (p. 312). Really seeing, getting these insights seeded and sown? “The process of laying them down permanently takes up to two years. Until then they are still fragile.”(p. 268). Furthermore, the permanent theoretic laying down that is our topic is quite different from the laying down which results from habits of scholarly consciousness which can leave you in “no man’s land.” *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, CWL 6, 121.

There you have it, in foundational fantasy, but not yet in doctrinal bluntness.

Here, then, you have a pert—saucy—attempt at doctrinal bluntness. That gives you one of my senses of *pert*. The dictionary may also give you PERT, initials for Program Evaluation and Review Technique, and that also pertains here. But the central meaning is the naming of Candace Pert.<sup>25</sup>

I am not settling here into a particular functional specialization - indeed the *Cantowers* in general can be read as popularizations, literary invitations, **C<sub>59</sub>**,<sup>26</sup> pointing towards the later hodic adventures. But it may be as well to be saucy up-front with a metadoctrinal statement of Lonergan that I make my own. Let us isolate it boldly, titling it ***Tomega***.<sup>27</sup>

**Tomega: “Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view.”**<sup>28</sup>

This sentence begins a powerful paragraph, a powerful stand, against commonsense eclecticism. Only a few years ago I began to grasp its significance as a foundational statement, a statement of general categorial orientation relevant to all human inquiry and life, a claim that goes counter to an accepted culture of specialization, a consequence of the fact that organisms live in a habitat but the human organism lives in the universe. Furthermore, in these last few years, the sentence has been further lifted, embraced, molecularly braced in a self-mediation—like a luminous watch<sup>29</sup>—by work that merges with and transposes the efforts of Candace Pert. And now I read, with fresh strange eyes, the last paragraph of my effort of 1989: ‘The third stage of global meaning, with its mutual self-mediation of an academic presence, is a distant probability, needing pain-

---

<sup>25</sup> Candace Pert, *Molecules of Emotion*, Touchstone, New York, 1999.

<sup>26</sup> See *A Brief History of Tongue*, Axial Press, 1998, 108, for the relevant matrix. The “9” signifies that the communication reaches beyond the matrix of collaboration: see the diagrams on pages 109 and 124.

<sup>27</sup> ‘To Omega’ brings to mind, perhaps, Chardin’s vision of an Omega point. But I have in mind also Aristotle’s view of the finest life, and Thomas’ view of human happiness, and Lonergan’s view of the significance of leisure, and my own view of the radical failure of contemplative traditions East, West, and South.

<sup>28</sup> *Insight*, CWL 3, 442.

<sup>29</sup> The implicit reference here is to Lonergan’s discussion of the mediation of Christ in prayer, where he moves up through analogy with the workings of a watch.

filled solitary reaching towards a hearing of hearing,<sup>30</sup> a touching of touching, ‘in the far ear,’<sup>31</sup> ‘sanscreed,’<sup>32</sup> making luminously present—in focal darkness—our bloodwashed bloodstream. It is a new audacity, a new hapticity, to which we must aspire, for which we must pray.’<sup>33</sup><sup>34</sup>

I have thus quoted at some length to let you sense the years of climbing beyond that final quotation from *Process*, a book that focused for a year on the problem of handing on. It was, of course, like many of my works, rejected by publishers, and the hand-on message and appeal remain, till now, a dangling baton in the human race.

But I include it here with startling fresh glimpses of what was wrong in my first appeal in Florida for a “third way, difficult and laborious.”<sup>35</sup> I was poised then as a scientist,<sup>36</sup> but the dominant ethos of the group was the ethos of a humanities molassed, mole-assed, in “academic disciplines.”<sup>37</sup> I brooded over the failure of that conference, its papers and discussions, as I took flight back to Ireland with the task of editing the 72 disciples. Now I see a little better the trail of non-science after Thomas, the wonderland of name-droppings in philosophy and theology and in general literate and literary criticism. I think now of Stephen J. Joyce—James Joyce’s grandson—remarking (the odd language is his), at a 1986 conference of Joyceans in Copenhagen, “if my grandfather was here, he would have died laughing.” But the devouring of Lonergan’s precise metascience by academic name-droppings is no laughing matter: it has become a vulgar immorality.

---

<sup>30</sup> “Merced Mulde” “Yssel that the limmat?” (*Finnegans Wake*, New York: Viking, 1939, 212, line 26; 198, line 13). The strange reduplicative process is the central drive and fantasy of this *Cantower*.

<sup>31</sup> See John Bishop, *Joyce’s Book of the Dark: Finnegans Wake*, University of Wisconsin Press, 1986, 343-46.

<sup>32</sup> *Finnegans Wake*, 215, line 26.

<sup>33</sup> P. McShane, [Process: Introducing Themselves to Young \(Christian\) Minders](#), 1989, 162-63. The notes internal to this passage are from the original.

<sup>34</sup> I am quoting here from [Cantower 41](#), “Foundational Policy” 14-16, with an inner quotation from [Cantower 4](#), “Molecules of Description and Explanation,” 7-8.

<sup>35</sup> I am repeating, of course, the two words that end the first page of *Method in Theology*. At the 1970 “First International Conference on Lonergan” in Florida, the book was not yet around, apart from its fifth chapter, “Functional Specialties,” which had appeared in *Gregorianum* 50 (1969). I had the advantage of being tuned into this “third way” by Lonergan in the summer of 1966, and I had fleshed out the need in musicology for such functional collaboration in one of my two Conference papers, “Meta-music and Self-Meaning.”

<sup>36</sup> See the conclusion reached at the end of note 1 above.

<sup>37</sup> *Method in Theology*, 3.

What, then, to do about handing on? I have drawn a parallel between the non-science that followed Thomas and the present state of Lonergan studies.<sup>38</sup> Why not try a little venture into a corner of Thomas that connects that corner with present needs? So: we have the following section. And might not a further digestive or indigestive intake of our stumblings here help? So, there is here section 5. And there is always the other type of venture to which we turn in the final section, the venture noted by Lonergan at the end of his essay on “Healing and Creating in History.”

Is my proposal utopian? It asks merely for creativity, for an interdisciplinary theory that at first will be denounced as absurd, then will be admitted to be true but obvious and insignificant, and perhaps finally be regarded as so important that its adversaries will claim that they themselves discovered it.

#### 4. A Simple Illustration

My simple illustrating hovers round the question raised by Thomas: “Whether the gifts of the Holy Spirit are conveniently counted as seven?”<sup>39</sup> but it might be more interestingly put as the question, “How does verse 2 of *Isaiah* chapter 11 conveniently hit the streets of New or old York, of Berlin or Beijing?” If you stay in the mood of our musings about evolving in section 2, you might, indeed should, have your focus on the question, “How does this text weave around my bones?”<sup>40</sup>

The issue of the text? The reading by you now of *Prima Secundae* q. 68, a. 4. What I would have you begin effectively to grasp is that you may not be, indeed, as a human, are wildly not,<sup>41</sup> up to any serious scratch with the first rule of reading, “understanding the object.”<sup>42</sup>

But let us start with the problem of having the text, so off we go to *Wikipedia: seven gifts of the Holy Ghost*, to find the Thomas’ text, the Vulgate, lined up with Hebrew,

---

<sup>38</sup> In the Prologue to *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2013).

<sup>39</sup> *Prima Secundae* q. 68, a. 4.

<sup>40</sup> I hardly need at this stage to note the normative operative presence of the strategy of generalized empirical method as described at the top of page 141 of *A Third Collection* (edited by F. Crowe, S.J., Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1985).

<sup>41</sup> We are dealing with our absolutely supernatural reality, everlastingly and joyously elusive in *patria*.

<sup>42</sup> *Method in Theology*, 156. It is the section title.

Greek and English versions. We already have problems crossing the page: how did *pietas* get in there? We need research help, indeed functional research help.

But back to the first rule from *Method* we go, for deeper discomfort. What is the object, and when is it? *When* seems a crazy twist, does it not? Yet it was in Thomas' mind, chasing forward from the previous question 67, all of which deals with faith, hope and charity after death,<sup>43</sup> and in question 68, article 6, he has a blunt response about the gifts "in patria": "they are to be most perfect. "they"? They? Are we not caught here is that new third line of *Method in Theology*, 48, with Gift and Givers dancing with us in molecular patterns that are a clutch of terminal value? And might you not now resonate with that previous Epilogue of mine, "Being and Loneliness" which begins with Herman Hesse's "... each member, each group, indeed our whole host and its great pilgrimage, was only a wave in the eternal stream of human beings, of the eternal strivings of the human spirit towards the East, towards Home ..." <sup>44</sup> and ends with the words "Infinite Surprise"? <sup>45</sup> And please, please don't mistake my slim understanding **there** of forty years ago with my shabby better grip now<sup>46</sup> on this present writing subject's marrow-minding harrow-blading "the stooks rise around"<sup>47</sup> the subject-as-subject reaching towards all and all of us and Those Subjects-as-Subjects.

But why not lift that "don't mistake" to a "HOW<sup>48</sup> not to mistake" achieved in some serious communal fashion? Knowing the object turns out to be "our whole host in its great pilgrimage" stumbling towards a heuristics of the object and a never-

---

<sup>43</sup> A discomforting pause is called for here, perhaps beginning with the expressed light-weight musings of Lonergan on faith, hope and charity in chapter 20 of *Insight*. Then there is the discomfort of noting a prerequisite for seriousness in the "sixty three articles in a row" (*Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, CWL 1, 94*) that are the context of thinking out virtues and gifts. But beyond that I would note the lift the whole enterprise gets from bowing to the molecularity of virtuous activity. It is a neurodynamic achievement of flexible circles of ranges of recurrence-schemes. For a start here see [Quodlibet 3](#), "Being Breathless and Late in Talking about Virtue."

<sup>44</sup> Herman Hesse, *The Journey to the East*, London, 1970, 12. Quoted in my *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations: Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*, 101, at the beginning of the Epilogue.

<sup>45</sup> *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, 111.

<sup>46</sup> I think of my three books of 2012-13 mentioned in these notes, but would draw attention especially to the climb represented by the 21 [Posthumous](#) essays. But one must note as still unexpressed the refined sublation of the canons of hermeneutics that are hinted at here throughout this section. Indeed, the core pointing is towards the need to conceive the luminous towering heuristic of what I call 60910: the paragraph that crosses from *Insight* 609 to *Insight* 610.

<sup>47</sup> From the first line of G.M. Hopkins's "Hurrahing in Harvest," a poem that gives "lift up heart, eyes" (line 5) to our enter prize.

<sup>48</sup> It seems important to draw attention to that larger project of a luminous methodological language, a language which strains to establish a **Home Of Wonder**.

luminous sense of “all that is lacking.”<sup>49</sup> The stumbling takes shape as a sliver of “a new front-thesis on the mystical body, that front-thesis eventually to be integrated in the sublated genetic systematics of all such theses through the ages.”<sup>50</sup> The pre-sublated genetic systematics is the content of the meaning of **Comparison**, the center-piece of the strategy of the fourth functional specialty. The sublation consists of a community, in four situation-rooms, picking up on the “level of the times”<sup>51</sup> nudges towards refinements. In Thomas’ time such nudges would be a better version of his 6 pointers against the convenience of sharing his way of thinking about the gifts of the Spirit.<sup>52</sup> In our time such pointers might come out of amygdalic considerations of the patterns of response, in the full heuristic of their chemodynamics: that heuristics also being a front-system of a genetic grip on the genetic dynamics of the integral human operator.

I slipped past, in that dense paragraph, the vast difficulty of present Lonerganesque imagination in thinking of the present cyclic operation of any pre-sublated genetic systematics. Such pre-sublation, at a first level, refers simply to the Standard Model in any discipline. I borrowed the notion of Standard Model, perhaps a decade ago, from contemporary physics. It is what is assumed to be operative in the Tower labours of any science, and, under internal strain, in revolutionary efforts in that science. But it is important to recognize the operations at what I might call a secondary level, indeed suitably so named, since I am talking, though loosely, about the difference between primary relativities and secondary determinations.<sup>53</sup>

This puzzling can carry us, in the present section’s musings about reading, into the task of reading **to**. The reading **to** is circumstantial, and, taken in its fullness of reading **to** and **into** it, must be thought of as effective at least within some normal law statistic. That **reading to and into** is intrinsic to the science, any science, in the new ethos of which I write.

One may continue my paralleling with physics and think of Maxwell’s equations, primary relativities that may be gradually recontextualized or even replaced, but

---

<sup>49</sup> *Insight*, CWL 3, 559.

<sup>50</sup> P. McShane, *The Road to Religious Reality*, Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2012, 38.

<sup>51</sup> *Method in Theology*, 350.

<sup>52</sup> The six pointers are the usual *videtur quod non*—“it would seem not”—that was part of Thomas’ strategy. How such pointers weave into the first four specialties is not a simple matter.

<sup>53</sup> See *Insight* chapter 16, section 2 and *The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, Appendix 3.

advances can occur—and often are core of doctorate work—where possibilities of significant secondary determinations emerge.<sup>54</sup>

As I write it becomes only too clear to me that I am rambling round a large book,<sup>55</sup> indeed perhaps a large book simply on the eighth functional specialty in the dynamics of its recycling through the first specialty of successes or failures.<sup>56</sup> But the rambling does fit into the purpose of this short section, which points to the complexity of the replacing of Thomas' effort. We have touched on problems of functional research, interpretation, history and the consequent strategy described on *Method 250* that would replace, in this case, Thomas six pre-puzzlings. But these puzzlings are followed by the “*Respondeo dicendum*,” which calls, in our new context, for the large complexity of talking forward, bringing in further twists on the meaning of **reading to**. One may think of Thomas' response as fitting in with Lonergan's optimistic sketching in *Insight*: “addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint,” though the dynamics of UV + GS was way beyond Thomas' imagination. The work of addressing, as Lonergan found ten and a half years later, needs to be split into a sequence of audiences, a bucket-brigade, if it is to be effective. There are eight situation rooms towering over the global situations of classrooms, banks, churches, parliaments, where the gifts of the Holy Spirit need airing and chemicalizing,<sup>57</sup> and “such situations are the cumulative product of previous actions and, when previous actions have been guided by the light and

---

<sup>54</sup> This is a well-known strategy in doctorate theses in the full range of sciences and indeed humanities: one brings to bear an established theoretic—primary relativities—on secondary or boundary conditions. See the following footnote.

<sup>55</sup> In the final section I write of the road forward, and mention thesis-writing. Here I note a neat thesis-topic: “Functional Specialization and Question X of Thomas *Summa*.” Any question would do, indeed, as here, a single article is enough. I have skimmed over suggestions about that large book in the present case. There are a host of foundational questions as well as the functional structuring that I hint at in the text. I cannot, however, resist noting the sublation of the meaning of “fear of the Lord” that occurs in a full subject-as-subject sacrament-of-the-present-moment ingesting of (discernment)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> This is a hugely important aspect of the re-cycling process. An achievement of a village or a campus cycles round and in the process gains potential secondary determinations that may fit all villages, all campuses. But the fit can fail, and that failure is a source of enlightenment for the later rounds of cycling. I would note here, in passing, that the “which have other grounds” of line 12 of *Method 250* are not spun off but swing in especially to the situation rooms of the eighth specialty.

<sup>57</sup> There is, for instance, a serious literature regarding amygdalic responses inviting us to intussuscept “fear of the Lord” in a homely manner that can poise each of us to admit, into the sacrament of the present moment, a chemo-verbal self-address, “of course, I continue to be a messer.” The messing, of course, is in the reality of our drift since the Rift Valley.

darkness of dialectic, the resulting situation is not some intelligible whole but rather a set of misshapen, poorly proportioned and incoherent fragments.”<sup>58</sup>

Have we not a new context for musing over the claims of the final page of *Method's* chapter on “Meaning,” about “educated effete,”<sup>59</sup> that concludes with the much-corrected final sentence, “Never has the need to speak effectively to undifferentiated consciousness been greater.”<sup>60</sup>

But mainly my effort here has been to give an added hint about the nature of the great leap from Thomas to a “third way, difficult and laborious”<sup>61</sup> that leaps beyond the alchemy of “academic disciplines.”<sup>62</sup>

## 5. Our Stumbling Efforts

Have we not now freshened the context for musing over the stumblings of this volume? The “fresh third line” suggested, presented, by the Epilogue’s title is a piece of the foundational lift I have been aiming at in these past five years. Musing over that lift now in relation to the seeding problem should help all of us to envisage in a practical beginners’ fashion the tasks that face us in this leap beyond alchemy.

The key piece that I have selected for our helpful musings here is the short piece by Lonergan titled “The Genetic Circle.”<sup>63</sup> I quote the entire piece.

That circle—the systematic exigence, the critical exigence, and the methodical 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 onto certain points in the world of interiority. One finds that one has not got hold of everything, gets

---

<sup>58</sup> *Method in Theology*, 358. Lonergan adds a footnote here: “On this topic see *Insight* pp. 191-206, 218-232, 619-633, 687-730.” The page references are to the first edition of *Insight*, trackable in *CWL* 3 without difficulty.

<sup>59</sup> *Method in Theology*, 99.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>63</sup> *Early Works on Theological Method I*, *CWL* 14, 140. I note that the piece belongs to 1962, so prior to his discovery of the functional structure of collaboration. The piece has already been commented on by me and others in this volume.

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.

Pat Brown's Introduction to this volume has already weaved successfully round the various stumbling contributions and their significance. I move on here by noting how appropriate some of Lonergan's words here are to our efforts in this volume. "One gets a certain grasp of science and is led onto 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." This Epilogue was made available to the contributors prior to our Vancouver Conference, prior to the opportunity for revisions in the light of the conference, and I asked the group not to take into account the lift of foundations pointed to in my epilogue: it was difficult enough to gather ourselves, as it were in random dialectic, round the contributions of the papers and that week's discussions. My Epilogue is more about the full road forward, and the place of the title of this Epilogue in that road in Christian theology is to be my final topic in the next section.

So let us reflect with energetic and creative imagination on the "certain grasp of science," the "certain points in the world of interiority," the shaky hold on everything.

Most obviously, our efforts were scattered, dippings into various disciplines, expressions of "certain points" that were regularly not original, not fresh lifts to the cycling of our non-existent science, not related in any obvious way to one another. We were doing exercises in order to find our way into "The Genetic Circle" that Lonergan did not envisage for three more years after the quoted piece of writing. But note that he was talking unequivocally about a science, although he was well aware of stumblings and beginnings: "there is a genetic process from the world of community to the world of theory."<sup>64</sup> So, we and you notice, in our efforts, that we stumbled away, as best we could, from the ethos of academic disciplines. We pretended to be "at the level of the times,"<sup>65</sup> as any wise doctorate student does in a doctorate thesis. But none of us were. Further, part of the paradox of luminosity and adult growth is that elder members of our group were regularly better tuned to "all that is lacking" than younger members. I, then, more than others, knew what a shabby shot we were having at getting the show on the road. I had, especially, learned a great deal about the needed shabby start from decades of mucking

---

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.* In the next section titled *Aberrations and Deviations*.

<sup>65</sup> *Method in Theology*, 350.

around.<sup>66</sup> I point to one instance that should encourage: my struggle with Fred Crowe's gallant efforts. It took me some years to get from my struggle with his work to a beginner's grip on the character of the functional researcher.<sup>67</sup> We—and many of the writers in this volume were involved—struggled towards a more refined grip on that character in us through the first *FuSe* seminar, an enlightening process that revealed to us just how far we and Lonergan studies generally were, for example, from the parts of the standard model sketched by Lonergan in *Insight*.

Now the marvelous thing about this failure to rise to *Insight's* challenge is that “The Genetic Circle” shifts it from center-stage. The shabby start we need, “the certain grasp of science,” is a grasp of the cyclic collaborative character of the work. So, we read Lonergan's paragraph differently fifty years after he wrote it. We start in the world of community, a community that has not clicked to his leap to a new science. So, this little group of writers “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.”

The reflection begins now, after our seeding effort, and it is a reflection that we wish to share. What is functional collaboration? This volume and its conference is just not it. What is it to ask “What is functional specialization?”? It is to ask a scientific question that has little data:<sup>68</sup> so we are thrown forward into creative heuristic boggly-genetic imagination backed by our stumblings. “One gets a certain grasp of science and is led on to certain points in the world of interiority.” In the conclusion of the next section I will turn to the point of interiority represented by my title. But here I wish, plead, pray, for our focusing on the need within globalization on an interior visioning that is bent, Toweringly, on eliminating totalitarian ambitions. “That's a fundamental concern of method, eliminating totalitarian ambitions.”<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Still with me, vividly, is the summer moment of 1969 in the Bodleian library when, looking at the shelves of the collection on musicology, there issued the gospel, “this is the way to the musey room” (*Finnegans Wake*, 8). The result was “Metamusic and Self-Meaning,” a paper for the International Florida Lonergan Conference of 1970 on functional collaboration as needed in musicology.

<sup>67</sup> I refer mainly to F.E. Crowe, *Theology of the Christian Word: A Study in History*, Paulist Press, New York, 1979. I worked on it pretty-well since its appearance, but I tackled its character as functional specialist history a decade ago, in section 4 of [Cantower 38](#), “Functional History,” with fairly negative results, apart from noting its brilliance as a pedagogical work. Later I tackled the book again, in the five [Humus](#) Essays, 8 – 12, and began to see its role as functional research, which led me to views expressed in the first ten [FuSe](#) Essays, numbered 0 to 9.

<sup>68</sup> [Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations](#) (2008) deals with this issue in chapter 10, “Metaphysical Equivalence and Functional Specialization.”

<sup>69</sup> “An Interview with Bernard Lonergan,” edited by P. McShane, in *A Second Collection*, edited by William Ryan and Bernard Tyrrell, Darton Longman and Todd, 1974, 213.

The concern is as old as Paul's *First Letter to the Corinthians*, and my two points—here and at the end of the next section—echo neatly the need to bracket I *Corinthians* 13 between I *Corinthians* 12 and I *Corinthians* 14. I have said enough, over the past 45 years, about that bracketing. I think now of the wish and prayer of my native Gaelic, 'Go neirigh an bothar linn,' may the road rise with us. And of course it will, within an emergent probability of the absolutely supernatural. But that absolute nudges us to change what is bracketed, I *Corinthians* 13, the Clasp of the Big Bang, into a scientific symphony in our bones: eventually, acceleratingly, within an effective slick click clock cluck Clutching recurrence-scheme of Remembering of the Future.

## 6. The Road Ahead

It might well be that—ho, ho me being dead—would help the road rise, to recall again my Gaelic phrase. But let us not bank on that, surely a rather trivial motivation to “slip away before they're up.”<sup>70</sup> I do hope, however, that my musing here will ground cynicism about whatever laundering laudations occur at various conference centers on my demise. Unless, of course—“Ho hang! Hang ho! And the clash of our cries as we spring to be free”<sup>71</sup>—they include effective repentance and apologies not just to Lonergan but to “the order of the universe” and “that order's dynamic joy and zeal.”<sup>72</sup>

I look now on the present narrow fixity of Lonergan studies with growing horror at its damaging of the deep and long-lasting progress envisaged by Lonergan. The damaging is most evident in the misdirection of these next generations of students, who are being steered into “academic disciplines” rather than into the “third way, difficult and laborious” that is the heart of Lonergan's revolutionary thinking.<sup>73</sup>

I have, in these past few years, very deliberately moved to a limited out-spokenness, even adding the satire of the name “The MuzzleHim Brotherhood.” It is a limited out-spokenness, slipping past the task of pointing in constructive criticism to the trapped scholarliness of most of the present Lonergan leadership. But it is of considerable value for us to pause now over the character of that task.

---

<sup>70</sup> *Finnegans Wake*, 627.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> *Insight*, CWL 3, 722.

<sup>73</sup> I surely need not reference again those beginning paragraphs of the first chapter of *Method in Theology*, that scream of our gracious freedom.

Let me be bluntly clear. The task is not one that fits into the cycle of functional collaboration as skimpily illustrated by section 4 above. It is a task that is to be the fruit of an undeveloped eighth specialty, or if you like what I talk of as C<sub>9</sub>. To think of it otherwise, and to act on that thinking, would prolong the present muddlings.

A parallel should help. There are the present muddlings that belong to the pseudo-science of economics. How are we to break forward from them? [a] by pushing for elementary reforms of the beginnings of economic education in the later grades of school and in popular media; [b] by serious efforts to identify and eliminate the destructive contribution to recent history that is the mix of trading with the foibles of commodity money transactions, a galloping illness of at least the past eighty years.

I recommend that those interested in what Lonergan suggested in his life-commitment give time both to the parallel in economics to what it parallels in Lonergan studies.

Note, first, that [a] and [b] in economics involve communications in the sense I write of as C<sub>9</sub>. In its maturity it is to be the fruit of the eight specialties, but in its initial stages it is to be a matter of generating a popular ethos regarding some elementary disorientations, not at all an easy task. Helpful here, of course, are the reflections of Bruce Anderson and Michael Shute in the present volume, as well as their and my own past efforts.

But best stick here with the paralleling of this with the task of shifting theology, and in particular Lonergan studies, into its proper role, “a *regina scientiarum*, not merely a constitutional monarch,”<sup>74</sup> or someone fiddling in Rome. Perhaps there is a problem here of a new name rather than the old wine bottles of *theology* and *philosophy*: so I have written of *futurology*.<sup>75</sup> I would not have us distracted by my suggested name. The important thing is the change of popular ethos in theology that is to parallel and twine with the shift in economics.<sup>76</sup> Something of the strategy is captured in the first part of a book footnoted immediately, *An Introduction to Modern Economics*—a fairly elementary ramble through the story of economics that

---

<sup>74</sup> Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 126.

<sup>75</sup> The search for a new name of global concern has occupied me for a decade. *Futurology* seems to fit the bill. I would note that it especially challenges philosophers and theologians that emphasize merely viewing the past in scholarly fashion, or such a fashion as to get no further than taking some position on what is real, without a serious facing of the future. In Lonergan studies, for instance, one finds little serious work on the forward specialties.

<sup>76</sup> The twining, apart from functional twining, is a deep twining around a fuller concrete meaning of *promise*, which would bring together the meaning of money and the promise of the New Testament.

ends with the claim, “It is time to go back to the beginning and start again.”<sup>77</sup> And perhaps there is something parallel to this ramble and conclusion in the more complex ramble of my early seminars,<sup>78</sup> where there emerged in the first seminar—on Functional Research—an identification of the Lonergan school’s neglect of “fruitful ideas.”<sup>79</sup>

Scattered pages of my scribbles about strategies that would help to remedy that neglect nudge me now, not to write on, but to leave those leaves drift into dust.

So: “my leaves have drifted from me. All. But one clings still.”<sup>80</sup> “Just a whisk brisk sly spry spink spank sprint of a thing theresomere saultering.”<sup>81</sup>

My title, then, THEN<sup>82</sup>: *Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling*. Surely theresomere is a saultering of the future? Forget the Tower stuff if you must, then, THEN, and think only of the Bower. “I will build my Love a Bower”<sup>83</sup> is the song of Sufi and Zulu. But there can be that inner singing of globalogians that weaves the singing into science and lays down loggias for piccolo peeks and peaks. The singing can and will Gracefully and globally marrow-

---

<sup>77</sup> Joan Robinson and John Eatwell, *An Introduction to Modern Economics*, McGraw Hill, London and New York, 1973, 52.

<sup>78</sup> This was an ambitious project of on-line seminars cycling round functional collaboration. They were to be 25 seminars, each lasting 3 months, documented in a proposed cluster of well over one hundred *FuSe* essays. There are about 35 *FuSe* available on-line.

<sup>79</sup> *Insight*, *CWL* 3, 254 & 264.

<sup>80</sup> *Finnegans Wake*, the final page, 628.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 627.

<sup>82</sup> I end with brutal brevity, yet the brevity is alleviated by the reference to—and of course, an invitation to read—[Cantower 5](#), “Metaphysics THEN.” This was the *Cantower* in which I bade farewell to Pound’s *Cantos*, winding my musings into the old Scottish song about building a bower (see the next note). I paused over the notes to his final 117<sup>th</sup> *Canto* and asked “what are we to make of the closing rhythms as he climbs to the last of his 800 pages while we envisage a love-bower shared, encircling and encircled, circuminced?” (24) Haunting the *Cantower* and, indeed, this whole epilogue-enterprise, are those strange final lines, his last poem, from Samuel Beckett, quoted at the end of the first footnote in *Cantower 5*: “go end there / where never till then / till as much as to say / no matter where / no matter when”

<sup>83</sup> This is the title of the first section of [Cantower 5](#). The other sections are titled “By Yon Clear Chrystal Fountain”; “And All Around the Bower”; “I’ll Pile Flowers from the Mountain.” **All around the bower** was to be the meaning of the diagram within section 3, named later  $W_3$ , sensed still later as finite cravings’ **Double You Three**. The diagram points to the full task, a task pointed to in the previous note by the quotation from page 24 of [Cantower 5](#). The contemplative lover needs, e.g., to climb through *Insight* 15 and 16, or Appendix 3 of *CWL* 12, to begin the climb to adequate intimacy with the Three. James Duffy’s paper points to a beginning, and Michael George’s venture into “craving” (“Finality, Love, Marriage”, *Collection*, *CWL* 3, 49) opens up the issue of the presence of sexuality in the Bower.

mindedly Sonflower into the Father's Cauling so as to turn time slowly into the Middleman's tuneblood, not a mythic turn but a cyclic turn of finitude's Trinitarian meaning **W**ithin and **I**n and **T**owards truth, for "the real issue, then, then, then, is truth."<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> *Insight*, *CWL* 3, 572, slightly wormholed.

## Appendix: *Rescuing Sexuality*

### 1. Context

In a concluding episode of the British television series *House of Cards* Ilsa Blaire reveals wonderful fifty-year-old breasts, both prone-poised and swaying in apparent sexual frenzy, and her acting partner, Paul Freeman, displays his nicely-aged arse. Have we not here a Christian problem, in the performance, in the watching? Is it not, to say the least, naughty to be watching such a naked display of sexual delight? Moreover, should we not fault the performers, even if the frolics are fiction? The fictional characters are caught in adultery, and the performers' lives are surely pushing beyond the edge of decency. But let us lift this further into what we can certainly consider higher Christian realms, the realms of St. Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises*, where he presents us in the conclusion with the challenge of "Contemplation for Obtaining Love." Is it quite beyond our fancy to include the sights and tastes and smells portrayed by those actors in our reach to thus obtain a glimpse of the divine?

The issue raised by the last remark might be associated with the parallel problem that Matthew Fox discusses in the 25th chapter of his book, *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ*.<sup>85</sup> The chapter is titled "The Cosmic Christ and a Renaissance of Sexual Mysticism." Read it and weep. But here I am not writing about mysticism but about ordinary interpersonal living with the wondrous allure of the Divine.<sup>86</sup> We can be led back, by Fox's musings, to sniff out the tradition lurking in the penumbra of the word *naughty* of the first paragraph, a tradition about which Bernard Lonergan puzzled in the concluding pages of his essay of 1943 on "Finality Love Marriage."<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Matthew Fox, *The Coming of the Cosmic Christ. The Healing of Mother Earth and the Birth of a Global Renaissance*, Harper and Row, 1988. I remind you that this little essay is an appendix to my Epilogue to *Seeding Global Collaboration*, which I aimed to keep within a few pages. So, I develop little here, but perhaps I help to stir the healing and the renaissance of which Fox writes.

<sup>86</sup> "Allurexperiences," all your experiences, is the topic of the central [Posthumous](#) Essay, central in both senses, being the 11th of twenty-one essays moving round the present topic.

<sup>87</sup> The full reference is given in the next note. Thomas, on this issue, did not seem to be deeply puzzled as he carried forward from Augustine. Indeed, Aristotle—and his own obvious lack of experience—led him astray when he struggled with feminine humanity's meaning. From conversations with Lonergan, I know that he did struggle with that meaning very personally. What, then, are we to think of his "Qualification" in the concluding section of his brilliant article? The third sentence of "A Qualification" reads: "The precise implications of this doctrine are not too clear." Were they clear to him, but left as a challenge to the reader? He rambles round the mesh and mess of Augustine and Aquinas, pointing to the need to tune orgasm to the symphony of the journey to "our eternal

## 2. The Insight

There is a nice shock value in expressing the key insight to be conveyed in the words of that same essay of Lonergan, so here is its verbalization by him.

Now towards this high goal of charity it is no small beginning in the weak and imperfect hear of fallen man to be startled by a beauty that shifts the center of appetite out of self: and such a shift is effected on the level of spontaneity by *erôs* leaping in through delighted eyes and establishing itself as unrest in absence and an imperious demand for company.<sup>88</sup>

The shock here is that Lonergan is writing about Christian marriage, but I am asking for a fuller reach towards the meaning of sexuality, towards a larger divine delight of being with the children of men,<sup>89</sup> towards a massive creative cognition—not, then, a recognition—of the allure<sup>90</sup> of sexuality within “the order of the universe”<sup>91</sup> so that, in later millennia, good will will will well and it will be true that “good will wills the order of the universe and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.”<sup>92</sup>

## 3. The Handing On

I have so far not talked of functional collaboration, although I am following the general 4-piece formula suggested for these contributions. But the title of this section brings us quite obviously to the topic. To whom am I handing on, typing about, this insight, or set of insights? At first insight, the answer may seem easy. You are reading this and recognize a problem named by Lonergan in those final pages of the article “Finality, Love, Marriage,” and, further, you react in your own way to my suggested push forward from Lonergan.

A key feature in our sharing here is my invitation now, herenow, to pause over my remote meaning for the word “suggested.” While I follow the general formula, I do so in a skimpy appendix, skimpily. To some readers, like Daniel Helminiak, my skimpy pointings are a confirmation of the fruit of their own long struggle to escape

---

embrace with God in the beatific vision” (end of page 51). His Conclusion ends with an appeal for scrutiny, corrections, and developments. See the text, and the further comment in note x on pages 263-264, regarding “the author’s wish.” The appeal and the wish were quashed by a central power.

<sup>88</sup> Bernard Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage”, *Collection, CWL 4*, 31-32.

<sup>89</sup> *Proverbs*, 8:31.

<sup>90</sup> See note 86 above.

<sup>91</sup> *Insight, CWL 3*, 722, end.

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

Catholic madness.<sup>93</sup> But for many there is a huge psychic block. Harry Stack Sullivan writes in *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry* of a parent's horror at their little girl's attention to her genitals: did they birth a monster? Was it such a parental horror in Rome regarding Lonergan's 1943 attention to our genitals that cried "hands off" in 1944? It will take more than a little scandalous appendix to shift the millennia of neurotic madness.

So I have not talked of this appended effort in terms of, say, a functional interpretation. It will take many full functional cyclings and re-cyclings<sup>94</sup> to lift us to the religious experiences of the *Kama Sutra*, to lead us to "view gender / As a beautiful animal / That people often take for a walk on a leash / And might enter in some odd contest / to try to win strange prizes."<sup>95</sup>

#### 4. Further Context

My appendix is tagged on as a comment on footnote 83 of my Epilogue, where I mentioned a prayerful presence of sexuality. The prayerful presence in question is a kataphatic presence, not then some mystical achievement.<sup>96</sup> Yes, we are talking about the *Ascent of Mount Carmel*,<sup>97</sup> where Elijah's servant first found nothing, but, after seven climbs, saw "a little cloud no bigger than a person's hand, rising out of the sea."<sup>98</sup> Yet John of the Cross insists on saying "nada," seven times. For me the little cloud, after more than seven climbs, indeed more than seven times seven years of twisted climbing, finds newly the little cloud of *Insight* 691, "In the twenty sixth

---

<sup>93</sup> Daniel Helminiak's climb is laced, with exceptional openness and honesty, through his book, *The Transcended Christian: What do you do when you outgrow your religion?* Createspace, 2013.

<sup>94</sup> The **pretend** of this volume of essays is that we share a communal Standard Model that hovers round the meaning of the symbol  $W_3$ . It will take many cycles in this century to reveal the depth of the pretense.

<sup>95</sup> Hafiz, "How Does it Feel to be a Heart?" quoted from Daniel Ladinsky, *I Heard God Laughing*, Penguin, 2006, 36.

<sup>96</sup> I need hardly here draw further attention to my life-long appeal to the cultivation of a contemplation that is essentially an incarnately thinking effort. But it is worth recalling my more recent emphasis on the luminous use of analogy in that thinking. Affirmation, negation and eminence as a poise gives a climbing clarity to our lives with our Infinite Friends when affirmation dominates our conversations with Them, our searchings into Their Presence with us. The darkness of eminence is focused: see *CWL* 11, Thesis 5. Recall the challenge of "Foundational Prayer" that was the topic of the five essays [Humus](#) 4-8.

<sup>97</sup> The italics recall John of the Cross's work of 1578-79, which directs the searcher in a different way than the way talked of in the previous note. But there is, at times, in his writings, a sexual overtone that invites incarnate openness. So, the sixth stanza of the opening poem reads, can be read breastfully, "Upon my flowery breast, / Kept wholly for himself alone, / There he stayed sleeping, and I caressed him, / And the fanning of the cedars made a breeze."

<sup>98</sup> I *Kings* 18:44.

place, God is personal.” Am I freshly back, or rather forward, to the seeing and the seizing of the beginning of my Epilogue?

Have you climbed once, slowly?<sup>99</sup> Then I say, as Elijah said to Ahab, “Go again seven times,”<sup>100</sup> and you will meet not *nada* but **Nadia**. That 26th place can be a new open-nerve to a seeing of Thomas’ twenty-seventh place.<sup>101</sup> But you must find your own new name, a mouth-stone twisting *Revelation’s* promise.<sup>102</sup> **Nadia**? It may only be personal to me, though its meaning in Russian and related languages is, providentially, **hope**, with **calling** as an Arabic meaning.<sup>103</sup> But for me the name leaps out from my Gaelic version of the 26th place, *Dia pearsanta*.<sup>104</sup> But how personal, *pearsanta*, is *Dia*? The Gaelic there, if lifted by Faith to a plural, *na* brings *Na Dia*, **Nadia**: what should be monotheistically *An Dia* is lifted to be the grammatical-conflicting *Na Dia*, begging for the 27th place. But do not mind my Joycean ways.<sup>105</sup> “Go again, seven times” till your Clapsed mind finds, in your neuro-molecules, a name that brings to you, in your little cloud of that First Person’s loveliness, the lusciousness of the *Song of Song’s* Beloved.

---

<sup>99</sup> Are you and I, here, in the 1833 Overture of *Method in Theology*, page 250? The issue is leaving the God of Abraham and of the philosophers behind and climbing with Einstein, eyes on the secondary intelligibles (*Insight*, 649-51) and poised for an altogether new Christoffel, Christ-offered, Tensor. See Lindsay and Margenau, *Foundations of Physics*, Dover, 1957, 364.

<sup>100</sup> I *Kings* 18:43.

<sup>101</sup> I am referring, of course, to the 27<sup>th</sup> question of the *Summa Theologica*, *Prima Pars*, lifted into this new little cloud of God-grasping.

<sup>102</sup> *Revelations* 2:17. “To anyone who conquers, I will give some of the hidden manna, and I will give a white stone, and on the white stone is written a new name.”

<sup>103</sup> A rather startling set of accidents, like the double meaning of “Double You Three,” and in the bottom of the diagram of  $W_3$  you find clues in my early struggling with a Trinitarian theology of history: the Father is associated with hope and named *Attractor*.

<sup>104</sup> *Dia* is the Gaelic word for God. It is not here, accompanied with the word ‘an’ (pronounced *un*), but it can be: thus, ‘the god’ is *an Dia*. The next sentences in my text point to the curious twist of giving the plural for ‘the’—*na* (pronounced *gna*)—without shifting to the plural in Gaelic for ‘gods.’ *Na Dia* is just bad grammar. It neatly mixes plurality with singularity.

<sup>105</sup> Still, I would ask you to mind, mind-mind, the profound existential side of my language problem. Thomas puzzled over naming the Holy Spirit, but there was no problem, for him, with naming the First Person *Father*, as Jesus did. I have, here and there, raised problems regarding that naming, as feminists have, as neglected or abused children need to. The deeper issue is the precise meaning of *generation* when the generator, so to speak, emerges amoeba-wise, with the generated. Not, then, a Christian sublation of myths like those of Castor and Pollux, but the fresh directional mind-meaning of the Field-search struggled towards in *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, *CWL* 2. And a step towards the coming convergence of global religiosity: the Beloved of high religious reaching is the Hope of the world.