

## CONTEMPLATION AND THE OTHER 1833 OVERTURE

I am still on track here regarding “Studying Scripture: Turn Wright” but I do not title this essay as “III” since it is a broader topic, a topic that meshes with the previous website essay on contemplation of 2016, [HOW 13](#), “Interior Lighthouse.” The response from “traditional contemplation” to that essay has not been very positive, indeed the essay has been found obscure. All the sadder this, in that I am talking about the response of what could be called the Lonergan tradition of what it considers a decent contemplative mode. All I will say here is that the old vintage of contemplation is just not in the ball park of Lonergan’s climb and hopes. That would emerge from a serious reading of what I now call “the other 1833 Overture”—the first such is, of course, the sixteen last lines of page 250 of *Method in Theology*. There it is to be made clear, cyclically, in perhaps this millennium, that worlds of common sense contemplation are to be grounded in the world of interiority fostered and matured by humanity’s climb. This, you should notice, meshes with the broad heuristic that includes “the full spread of religious cultures”<sup>1</sup> that is the unwritten third volume following *Futurology Express* and *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.

“There it is made clear”?: but that is sadly not being seeded now. The sixteen lines I refer to as “the other 1833 Overture” are the end of section 3, “Religious Experience,” in chapter 5, “Religion” of *Method*, badly read in the present tradition, and badly neglected in the neglected climb of the first 1833 Overture, where it is waiting, an essential component of the dialectic of the disputing quests.

But I had best simply present the beginning of the sixteen-line overture.

18 “distinguished from and grounded in the world of interiority. To  
 19 speak of the dynamic state of being in love with God pertains to  
 20 the stage of meaning when the world of interiority has been  
 21 made the explicit ground of the worlds of theory and of common  
 22 sense.”

---

<sup>1</sup> I quote the end of the preface of the work mentioned above, *Allure*. There I made that point regarding the missing third volume.

I invite a pause over the last word of line 18: “To.” How are we to come “To” “speak”?

My answer belongs to what I “toss into the circle of”<sup>2</sup> 250’s “1833 Overture” is briefly expressed in “The Interior Lighthouse.”<sup>3</sup>

“To”? I recall my conversations with Lonergan in the summer of 1966, when he was troubled about getting into writing *Method in Theology*. His tension was centred on not being able **to**, as he put it, **to** “get all of *Insight* into the first chapter.” I was watching out for his strategy when I indexed *Method* in December 1971, and was much pleased when I hit what is now pages 286-87.<sup>4</sup> There you find the description of “level of the times”<sup>5</sup> competence in reading “the other 1833 overture.”

But it took me many years to feel seriously the kick in the ass of the mid-paragraph of 287, which, yes, I should type here. LOL: it starts at line 18: another overture?! The bold facing is mine, and the red alert.

“Such differentiation vastly enriches the initial nest of terms and relations. **From such a broadened base one can go on to** a developed account of the human good, values, beliefs, to the carriers, elements, functions, realms and stages of meaning, to the question of God, of religious experience, its expressions, its dialectic development.”

Is there much point in me going on? Is not the challenge clear, to rethink and rewrite the early chapters of *Method*? But no, not at all: paradoxically it is grasped clearly and effectively “only by those who have done their apprenticeship.”<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The heuristic notion of “tossing into the circle” was developed in [Disputing Quests 5](#), “Scripture Studies: Turn Wright.” It expressed oddly the challenge of *Method in Theology*, p. 250, lines 25–33.

<sup>3</sup> The challenge there, especially for those who aspire to whirl into the new functionally-collaborative theology, or to guide others into that new self-control (*Galatians* 5:22) of meaning, is to find in *Insight* a book of common prayer that leads to a shift from apophatic to kataphatic theology. On the problem see the 5 website essays, [Prehumous 4–8](#), “Foundational Prayer”.

<sup>4</sup> There was, of course, the earlier blunt pointing on page 260, ending, you should note, a long paragraph that begins: “Such speech, however, is found clear and accurate and explanatory only by those who have done their apprenticeship.” The problem of “To speak.” And the answer at the end of the paragraph: “to say it all with the greatest brevity: one has not only to read *Insight* but also to discover oneself in oneself.”

<sup>5</sup> *Method in Theology*, line 7 of 350 and lines 5–6 of 351. The context is the elitism of systematic theology.

<sup>6</sup> See note 4, third line.

It is for some few in these next generations to find their way beyond the dreadful deceitfulness of Lonerganism.

I pause over the word “to” (18) that leads to “speak” (19). Does “speak” not remind you of the first Trinitarian Person? But first, flow with God: then “to” becomes “Two,” and you are in chapter 19 of *Insight*. But properly is that “two” not you and the Spirit? Still, there is the intimate weaving of Jesus round your molecules: does not the “to” become three? And there is the cauling of the first Person, making the experience a four-sum. Then, mysteriously, one can climb to the *tremendum*<sup>7</sup> of the relational acts in God and an existential Agonbite of Inwithto<sup>8</sup> hidden in the words *Clasping Cherishing Calling Craving Christing*:<sup>9</sup> and so find that “to” is a five-sum.

And see: we have not yet got off line 18! But what is this 2, 3, 4, 5 stuff? It is not at all strange? If I come TO speak of a problem in the physics of electricity the TO is a hovering minding of Maxwell’s 4 equations, quantum-colored, and indeed many more Inwits: indeed, I am in with the Standard Model and its problematic gleanings and leanings.

The TO in the present case of the end of line 18 is a poise within what I name **W<sub>3</sub>**: a fitting name, “Double You Three.”<sup>10</sup> And the dynamics of that doubling is weaved in there in the whirlwind diagram: it is a poise in and Wit-in the elitist systematics of *Method* 350–51 that holds dear The Symphony of Jesus in a genetic hold of the story of stories about the mystical

---

<sup>7</sup> “Note that the meaning of *tremendum* varies with the stage of one’s religious development.” Lonergan, note 2, *Method*, 106.

<sup>8</sup> On the discontinuous sublation, into Trinitarian searching, of the Kentish middle-English work (translated from the French) *Ayenbite of Inmyt* see the final chapters of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, especially pages 230, line 3 and 235, note 50. *Allure*, of course, deals at some length with the other pointers skimmed over in this paragraph, like the immanent bright-eyed causality of Jesus.

<sup>9</sup> The drive of the *Posthumous* series of 21 essays is towards being gripped by this 5-some. A context is my Epilogue to *Seeding Global Collaboration*, “[Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling](#).” There is an Appendix to that Epilogue, “Rescuing Sexuality.” I make no attempt here to give pointers towards integral sexual contemplation.

<sup>10</sup> The full W<sub>3</sub> prayer is “Double You Three in me, in all, Clasping, Cherishing, Calling, Craving, Christing”. The companion prayer, is “Grace, Grace, Grace, attune us to the Allure of the Scent of a Nomen” (see *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, 199–200, 223).

body.<sup>11</sup> Does this not offer help, over a decade or so, to remove the reading of the rest, or the unrest, of this other 1833 overture from common sense, winding it into a sublation of **theoria**, where *theoria* is “the name of contemplative prayer”?<sup>12</sup> Contemplative prayer, yes, for the TO is InWithTo, and the other 1833 overture is The Others’ 1833 Overture, even as you read here.

I do not wish to weave us further into Lonergan’s remote meaning of this passage, or the full section 3 on “Religious Experience”: I merely add two helpful contexts round the word “repentance” (line 27 of 107) and around *Galatians* 5:22, the only scripture mentioned in that section, (at line 12–13 of 106). *Repentance* was used by him about 15 years earlier on page 722, lines 3, 17, 22, 28, 32, with its modified reality *repentant*, *repents*, at lines 3 and 10 respectively. The whole page is about repentance, whirling one up to the final two lines that invite us, implicitly, to bring our resonance with the Second Big Bang into harmony with the Claspings Craving Spirit-lift of the first Big Bang: “good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills with that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.”

Implicitly? The Spirit haunts the inviting title of *Insight* and every word that follows read by your optonomy. So, one may read freshly in a freshened context the first paragraph of “Mission and Spirit” which begins with “being-in-the-world,” “self-understanding” of self and also self-understanding of the world,<sup>13</sup> pushing in that first paragraph towards Lonergan’s concluding reference to Rahner’s “Christology within an Evolutionary View of the World.” Lonergan subtly dodges the deficiency in Rahner in the next sentence: “Rahner prudently omitted from his account the long series of discontinuities reaching from subatomic particles to mankind.” Have you been dodging or omitting that reality of your lonely molecular brain? Perhaps you might climb on through “Mission and Spirit” to meet Lonergan typing of *Galatians* 5:22’s “self-control,”<sup>14</sup> five years after he typed it into section 3 of *Method’s* chapter 5? How

---

<sup>11</sup> The problem of a heuristics of the *mystical* body is raised in *Insight* 763–64. Its solution is hidden in the word *Comparison* of page 250 of *Method*. See P. McShane, *The Road to Religious Reality* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2012), 17–21; 38.

<sup>12</sup> Lonergan, “Mission and the Spirit,” *A Third Collection*, 27.

<sup>13</sup> Notice, cycle round ontically and phyletically, that strange pointing of the first sentence, towards a self-understanding of the world. It is to be the heart of the distant positive Anthropocene Age.

<sup>14</sup> “. . . love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, self-control’ (Gal. 5:22)” is how “Mission and Spirit” ends. You might self-ask in what manner the new self-control of meaning of the positive Anthropocene age is embraced by the heuristics of the heuristics of *Method* 287, lines 18–23.

further Ozilly remote was his meaning in that second typing? “It’s no use going back to yesterday, because I was a different person then.”<sup>15</sup>

Have you now a better glimpse beyond Kansas of the Oz of tomorrow’s you in God? Are your neuromolecules leaning towards dancing in Wonderland?

---

<sup>15</sup> Lewis Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*. The mention of Oz and Ozilly reminds me to thank Conn O’Donovan for our ongoing conversations regarding these pages. He lives a questing 86, down-under in Sydney, Oztraling Lonergan.