

*Joisting 6*  
**Jesus My Pilgrim Pacemaker**

## 6.1 Beginnings

How might I begin this short essay? I have already written the two following *Joistings*, and *Joisting 7* is perhaps best read now as expressing my problem here. Or indeed you might find you way back to Cantower 2, which begins with a poem, “Sun, flowers, Son-flowered / Speak to us of growth .....", and after 20 pages on the difficulty of listening to the sunflower’s answer<sup>1</sup> turns to the speaking of “The Organism that is God.”<sup>2</sup> There I recalled favorite poems<sup>3</sup> - you no doubt have your own - but most of all I recalled Thomas’ pointers towards understanding the organism that is God, to be slowly ingested over years. Yesterday, brooding over the problem of cultural ethos and communications of meaning I fantasized about a tradition that would have a series of books of contemplative pointers, 52 chapters in each, and a book for each year of adulthood. No, it would not be some cycle of three books, like we use in churches. Nor would it be, God help us, like the theology I did, where we had a three year cycle so that 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> year students attended the same class.<sup>4</sup> It would, rather, be like it is

---

<sup>1</sup>Chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk* focuses on listening to flowers and fields in a way that would help.

<sup>2</sup> In note 15 below and in the next *Joisting* I comment on the need to generate fresh imagery if one is moving forward in the contemplative mode of explanation. It seems to me that thinking of Jesus as organism is a definite part of that road.. It is indeed not just a convenient image but a fact of history’s emergence. A context for this reflection is, of course, that page 464[489] of *Insight*, and here we are giving new meaning to the sentence “Study of the organism begins ... “. This is the enormously complex topic regarding to the reading of insight that was raised already in the concluding section of *Joistings 2*.

<sup>3</sup>Poems e.g. by Hopkins and Plunkett, some of which will be cited in *Joistings 7*.

<sup>4</sup>There are deep issues here regarding the cultural assumptions of present religious consciousness, raised in another context in McShane, *ChrISt in History*, Axial Press, 2005. Chapter 4 there points to the key issue, of the insufficiency of description in the zone of special categories. Cantower 23 raises general issues about illusions created by subtle description.

in the good teaching and learning of physics: the third year undergraduate text giving pointers incomprehensible to second year students and so on.<sup>5</sup> What would the 10<sup>th</sup> year text say?! It would certainly say that there are “many other signs” of Jesus “not written in this book.”<sup>6</sup> And what would the 40<sup>th</sup> year book say?

It would be way beyond the strangelove vision of James Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*. Yet it would not be way beyond in a mode of mystic poetry - for the road I write of now is one of plain thinking carried forward in the vocation of future leisure<sup>7</sup> - but way beyond in signs of Jesus densified like the much simpler post-graduate equations that surround the much simpler things of physics.<sup>8</sup> It would take another richer road than the poor paragraph that ended my pointings of Cantower 2, a short section titled “Molecular Organisms of Ecstasy”: my effort to name us, “poor potsherd, patch, matchwood, immortal diamond”, each of us a patch on the seamless cosmic Christ. And perhaps my beginning should end where that Cantower ends, in obscure

---

<sup>5</sup>This relates to the difficult topic raised in note 8 of the next *Joisting*, the problem of pedagogy and popularization.

<sup>6</sup>*John* 20: 30.

<sup>7</sup>This is a hugely important challenge for humanity at present and in the post-axial future, as we struggle *For A New Political Economy*.(Lonergan, Vol. 21) A fresh inner dynamism and a proper dynamics of economic transformation must emerge to correct personal and national self-indulgences in “the strong drink of expansion”(Vol. 21, 98), falsely based and misdirected. So gradually society must move out of present conventions. “It must not glory in its widening, in adding industry to industry, and feeding the soul of man with an abundant demand for labour. It must glory in its deepening, in the pure deepening that adds to aggregate leisure, to liberate many entirely, and all increasingly to the field of cultural activity.”(Vol. 21, 20). “Such leisure may indeed be wasted, just as anything else can be wasted. But if it is properly employed, then it yields the cumulative development that effects a new transformation”(Vol. 21, 22).

<sup>8</sup>See the reflections on this in *A Brief History of Tongue*, 119. The discussion in that chapter is relevant to your search for your “type”, the question introduced to you in *Joisting 4*.

insufficiency?<sup>9</sup>

“We move round an imaging that somehow entwines a sensang of the Vortex that is the Eternal Idea Now establishing a nowthen bigbanging spiralwise towards a Great Bearcraunch<sup>10</sup> of echoing spirates. Densification of matter in fresh patterned geometries could mesh multibillion yearnings in anastomotic meshnerved circumcession. Somehow, in everthening surprise<sup>11</sup> The mystery of molecular finitude is that the Eternal Silent Voicing that we name God Gives itself a living wonder-us everlasting Throat.”

## 6.2 The Redress of Poise.

We are then, are we not, venturing on that traditional journey, “The Search for

---

<sup>9</sup>I leave the notes as they were in the original text, despite their opaqueness. They point towards the difficulty of the investigation of the organism Jesus in His neurochemical negentropic evolutionary relationships. Of course, the paragraph I quote here, very deliberately and riskily, is opaque, and you are justified in exclaiming that this section just climbs to obscurity. The obscurity and twisting of language is related to the present ethos of truncated and non-theoretic talk. Indeed, serious theoretic talk of Jesus is quite simply cut off, need a fresh push for a development of language beyond present imagination. Of course, the present ethos will quite simply cut off these remarks by shuffling round with the word ‘theory’. Nor, I suppose, does it help for me to return to the simple point that by theory I mean the result of a communal effort to understand adequately. Nor does ‘understand adequately’ mean amassing sophisticated information that is beside - but only beside - the point of Faith seeking understanding. See further note 12 below.

<sup>10</sup>*Craunch* is an earlier form of *crunch* meaning **echoic**. I would note that I am not, in the above, taking a position on end-cosmology speculation. Rather, I am hinting at the need for an imaging that would reach beyond the usual hierarchic structure. One of the big difficulties of any imaging is the bent towards embedding which even the best of physicist does not escape: the tendency to place finitude inside a ‘larger’ container. ‘End-times’ will be a topic of later Cantowers, particularly Cantower CXI.

<sup>11</sup>To give meaning to this is the task of the previous note. One needs to come to grips, on the level of the upper ground of loneliness, with the incomprehensive surprisingness of Eternal Joy Light for any finite mind, even the mind of Jesus, and on the lower ground of loneliness there is the continuum problem meshed everlastingly into our molecularity. Add the context of a needed precision regarding obediential potency. (See Lonigan, *Verbum*, 219: “The neglect of natural potency has some bearing on unsatisfactory conceptions of obediential potency”. See the index on *natural potency*).

the Historical Jesus”?

We are not.<sup>12</sup>

We are going, or you are being invited - perhaps an invitation that you took years ago - to follow Faith with a life-long search for understanding. The invitation here is to Whatting and Who-ing: a particular attitude among many regarding Faith. Recall our reflections of *Joistings 5*, on Types of Personality. But now we are talking about an adult growth foreign to the axial period, even though traditions of east, west and south have sought some such growth, but perhaps misdirectedly.<sup>13</sup> I reflected on such sad searching in the Epilogue to *Music That Is Soundless*, when I compared the gallant search of the Japanese Dogen (1200-1253) to his Italian contemporary Thomas (1225-1274).

---

<sup>12</sup>This blunt stand involves, in fact, complexities that need the emergence, in these next generations, of the differentiated poise of functional specialization. I already drew attention to John Dominic Crosson as a representative figure of this tradition by referring (*Joistings 2*, note 4) to the recent book, *In Search of Paul*, which he wrote in collaboration with Jonathan L.Reed. I quote from the book there, here, and in note 7 of *Joistings 7*, in a manner that should help you glimpse the massive problem. Here I draw attention to the chapter titled “Goddesses, Gods, and Gospel”. “This chapter is about the contrast between divine control and divine uncontrol, between the normalcy of *imperial*, or self-glorifying, divinity, and the challenge of the *kenotic*, or self-emptying divinity. Caesar and Jesus were both destined for divine Sonship, but although Caesar accepted it as domination, Jesus accepted it as crucifixion.”(*In Search of Paul*, 242). For a Faithful thinker, there is a blatant error here about the destiny of Jesus. Now pick up on the quotation at *Joistings 7*, note 7.

Since writing this essay in Spring of 2005 I have completed the book (Autumn 2005), *ChrISt in History*, which obviously adds a fuller context. It is to be available in December 2005 on the Website.

<sup>13</sup>Behind the “perhaps” is the large challenge for future functional reflection on the contrafactual. Later history may see the predominance of apophatic contemplation - one may think of Zen or ‘non-whatting’ prayer - in these past millennia as “better than it was” (*Method in Theology*, 251). But what is clear to me is the need to shift prayer towards asking “Who are you that love us?”. There are popular aspects of this related to ordinary prayer - and the vast majority of hymns - as heavily petitional. Think reverently of the gimme gimme of children; think of the “give us light” etc of many hymns: the light of agent intellect is a given. This all relates to the larger question of God’s place in abnormal suffering: where the blame rests is a question for a thinking prayer, not for a big empty Why?

But that is a question and a reality of my comparing, not yours.<sup>14</sup> You may be climbing now, with twenty or thirty years of those books I fantasized about, non-existent, but somehow in the book of yourself. But you may also be a beginner in that strange reach described so insufficiently in section 2 of the first *Joisting*, “About Turn (about)<sup>3</sup> “. Then you must patiently grow in understanding - molecules meshed in a growing nescience - that the turn about even at its early stage is a great feat of shedding old talk and thinking, or rather of reading old talk in new skins. Thomas Latin, like Lonergan’s Latin, “*De Verbo Incarnato*” or whatever, hides the lonely heart of each of these, reaching for a meaning that they do not dare to say, in the words of Catherine of Sienna, “Sweet Jesus, Jesus Love.”<sup>15</sup> So we must struggle for a linguistic feedback of authentic subjectivity, replacing the bogus objectivity of the theological search for the historical Jesus with some centering central naming. “Jesus My Pilgrim Pacemaker”, or

---

<sup>14</sup>It is, moreover, just a popular comparing. *Comparison* - one of the italicized words on page 250 of *Method* - is to name a complex and precise task in the new functional specialist theology. There some suggestive comments on this in the final section of chapter 5 of *Process*.

<sup>15</sup>One’s expression of piety obviously depend on one’s culture. “Sweet” is not a very contemporary designation, though I have heard couples address each other as “sweetie”. But words must be held to their cultural place: “cabbage” seems to work as a term of affection in French. “Pious” has connotations of fraudulence in contemporary English, but “Pius Aeneas” was a wholesome designation for Virgil. In note 2 of the following *Joisting* I hover around personal suggestions for naming the Trinitarian Characters: the three names **Speak**, **Spoke**, **Clasp**, may well suggest something suitable to you, for you. “Father” just doesn’t do it for many feminists, or for those whose experiences of childhood were warped. I would note that the replacement of “father” by “creator” leads to erroneous thinking regarding the divine consciousness: creation is a surge of a single consciousness.

The end of a footnote is no place to enter into the massive problems of patriarchy. So, for example, Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza contextualizes discomfotingly Crosson’s work (see *Joistings 2*, note 4; *Joistings 6*, note 12; *Joistings 7*, note 7) in *Jesus. Miriam’s Child, Sophia’s Prophet*, Continuum, New York, 1995, p. 9; see also 82-88. Fiorenza’s *Bread Not Stone. The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Beacon Press, 1984) adds a context on the problem of “Remembering the Past in Creating the Future”( the title of chapter 5), but the full context is the context of functional collaboration touched on in the next *Joisting*. The “fourfold dimension ... a hermeneutics of suspicion ... of remembrance ... of proclamation ... of actualization”( *ibid.*, 148) needs transposition into the eightfold way of functional collaboration.

some other name from your book of life, may tone your reading.. But whatever name, there is the shocking truth of that Divine Pacemaker's luminous molecular, eucharistic, hearthold, shiphold, wishbone, flexing of you towards a normalcy of eternal heartbeat. "Pacemaker ..... 3. *Med.* An electronic device implanted into the body and connected to the wall of the heart, designed to provide regular, mild, electric shock that stimulates contraction of the heart muscles and restores normalcy to the heartbeat "<sup>16</sup>

### **6.3 A Single Meditation, Perhaps for a 1<sup>st</sup> graduate year Book of Contemplative Pointings.**

What follows contains two extracts from *Process. Introducing (Themselves) to Young (Christian) Minders*, one from section 1.2 and the other from section 5.2. Both these sections are named "Minding Friends" and indeed the two chapters parallel each other, a parallel that ties in deeply in the strategy of kataphatic theology or positive contemplation. I begin in the middle of section 5.1, but obviously anyone can download the entire section, or the entire book, from the Website. The main parallel is between the extracts from Molly Bloom's speech at the end of James Joyce's *Ulysses* and the extracts from Jesus' talk at the end of the New Testament writings: John's Gospel. Molly's famous monologue, a massive sentence of self-revelation, is spoken from the bed shared by Poldy Bloom, lying feet-on-pillow beside her, asleep. Poldy has returned from the day, June 16, 1904, that is the book's memory.

So: on to the text ....

---

<sup>16</sup>I am quoting a Webster dictionary. Lurking here are pointings to a distant complex theology of the cosmic instrumentality of Jesus, meshed into a realism of the secondary determinations of our physics and chemistry that lace our universe together in God and in the God-man. The word "eucharist" used above points to the especially difficult issue of the character of the human conjugates of physics and chemistry and botany and zoology that somehow are to resonate in the full eternal realization of energy's quest. Thomas struggled with this problem in the context of a simpler and defective cosmology.

"About the concrete being of Poldy? His existence lies in bed, lies in deceit, with his way of groping with his eyes, yet rising up to in indeterminate loneliness for breakfast and acceptance, shouldering the busy day of our blooming hiddenness, our social disaster ... But let Molly speak:

\*\*\*\*\*

**. . . mouth almighty and his boiled eyes of all the big stupoes (739) ... yes imagine Im him think of him can you (740) ... I wonder is he awake thinking of me or dreaming am I it in (741) ... of course a woman is so sensitive about everything (742) ... still he knows a lot of mixed up things (743) ... of course hed never find another woman like me to put up with him the way I do know me come sleep with me and he knows that too at the bottom of his heart (744) ... he knew the way to take a woman when he sent me the 8 big poppies (747) ... nothing kills me altogether only he thinks he knows a great lot about a womans dress and cooking mathering everything he can scour off the shelves into it (752) ... he never can explain a thing simply the way a body can understand then he goes and burns the bottom out of the pan all for his kidneys (754) ... if only I could remember the one half of the things and write a book out of it the works of Master Poldy yes (758) ... I never thought that would be my name Bloom when I used to write it in print to see how it looked (761 ... I could have been a prima donna only I married him come looooves old deep down (763) ... I wish hed sleep in some bed by himself with his cold feet on me (763) ... I saw through him telling me all the lovely places we could go for the honeymoon Venice by moonlight O how nice I said whatever I liked he was going to do immediately if not sooner will you be my man (765) ... I suppose he thinks Im finished out and laid on the shelf well Im not no nor anything like it well see well see (766) ... there isnt in all creation another man with the habits he has look at the way hes sleeping (771) ... a nice hour of the night for him to be coming home at to anybody climbing down into the area if anybody saw him Ill knock him off that little habit tomorrow (772) ... nobody understands his cracked ideas but me still of course a woman wants to be embraced 20 times a day**

almost to make look young no matter by who (777) ... I don't care what anybody says it'd be much better for the world to be governed by the women in it you wouldn't see women going and killing one another (778) ... I'd love to have a long talk with an intelligent well-educated person I'd have to get a nice pair of red slippers (780) ... I'll just give him one more chance I'll get up early in the morning (780) .. yes O wait now sonny my turn is coming and I'll be quite gay and friendly over it (781) ... I'd love to have this whole place swimming in roses God of heaven there's nothing like nature the wild mountains then the sea (781) ... as for them saying there's no God I wouldn't give a snap of my two fingers for all their learning why don't they go and create something (782)... how he kissed me under the Moorish wall and I thought well as well him as another and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower (783) ...'

Molly, the known unknown, meets in memory and expectation the eyes and the lips of Leopold. Has he the capacity to understand, he and his daily bundle of questions? Yes ! And does his sensitivity match it with a lifting affective molecular response? Oh, only sometimes but, Yes ! And can he reach the real me, not a fancy, a memory, an illusion? Yes ! And could this concrete being of a man be in process of rising to tomorrow's occasion even without settled assurance of our form, our efficacy, what to do, the guts to do it ? Yes ! With a felt force in the solitude, darkness, loneliness of our personal and social disaster? Yes ! And I, Marryon Bloom too? ... "as yes I said yes I will yes". (783)

\*\*\*\*\*

## 5.2 Minding Friends

Our particular interest in this chapter is in a personal search for a foundational meaning of the Christian Ultimates, traditionally named Father, Son, and Spirit. How does one go about this search? In what follows I will oscillate between drawing attention to the tricky task of reading sacred texts within elemental luminosity and pointing forward to the complementary task of self-reading in Christian Faith.

Immediately, I invite you to pause over the nature, strategy, difficulties of the dual task. Yet it is not really an invitation to pause but obe to exercise in the manner of sections 2.5 and 6.5 (the division of sections reflects the duality of the task) so as to bear, gestate, in mind, a certain attitude. The attitude is remote and novel, and I emphasize this because of my own experience of discovering (uncovering, recovering) only at 55 what was staring me in the face these past three decades. Technically but obscurely the point is made in a brief statement of the First Vatican Council.<sup>17</sup> How does one come to understand Mysteries hidden in God? Through, by, analogies of nature, and this in two senses. The first sense, in our present problem, leads us to take the processes of our own spirit as offering a unique analogue to Infinite Spirit. But there is a second sense, implicit in the first sense as project. That second sense emerges when we reflect on the method by which we might arrive at the goal for the first sense. Let me make this point in the manner in which it was made, came, to me, startlingly.

Over thirty years ago I spent a large part of nine months reading one small book in physics, Schrödinger's *Space-Time Structure*: an elementary book, one might say, on an elementary topic, since physics is the simplest of the sciences. The reading, of course, is not some repetitive coverage of content. One grapples with the details of geometries, metrics and forces to which the text points; one moves back regularly to the empirical grounds and to the history of the struggle that led to the relevant *principia*, appreciating with each effort that one just hadn't got the *principia* straight yet; (nor had the community of physicists). The strategy, familiar in science, is what a medieval theologian might identify as a meshing of the *via analytica* and the *via synthetica* or what a contemporary thinker might recognize as a personal spiraling within a matrix of recovery and discovery. And the process is not unrelated to Joseph Schumpeter's claim: "Scientific analysis is not simply a logically consistent process that starts with some primitive notions and then adds to the stock in a straight-line fashion ... rather it is an

---

<sup>17</sup>Denzinger B. 1795, 1796, 1816.

incessant struggle with creations of our own and our predecessor's minds."<sup>18</sup> However, my main point is made by raising the simple question: is there not a parallel between the way one might genuinely read Schrödinger's book and, say, the way one might work at Aquinas' **qq. 27-43** of the *Summa Theologica, Pars I* or Lonergan's *De Deo Trino, Pars II*?

What is needed is a thorough personal soaking up of the parallels between sweat and method in the physicist (and in other successful 'lower' scientists) and sweat and method in the theologian. The soaking up is of historic process as *paideiad*; it is a humble soaking up of the cosmic message of these past centuries of physics and theology, that the children of this world (the students of light) are wiser than the children of light. The physicist focuses on elementary motions within the world-manifold as presented in the extended data of sensible consciousness; the theologian is invited, in Faith, to focus gracefully on motions within intellectual consciousness. The physicist works in the remoteness of a world of theory within a critical global context, a small fish in a great ocean of collaboration. The theologian may settle for being "a big frog in a little pond."<sup>19</sup> aesthetically and religiously alive perhaps yet remote from the groaning challenge of theory, system, spirit.

Many of you will find my parallel with physics elusive and frustrating, so I move to a more comfortable parallel, one which startled and delighted me when I was struggling with the structure of this chapter. In section **1.2** I had opted for selecting extracts from the last 40 pages of Joyce's *Ulysses* as a basis for reflection on the elements of meaning in you and Molly. Why not do the same for the last 40 pages of the Bible? Candidates for that place are the *Apocalypse* and the Gospel attributed to John. I settled for the gospel and the paralleling of Jesus and Molly. But the reader might like to work

---

<sup>18</sup>Joseph Schumpeter, *History of Economic Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1954, 4.

<sup>19</sup>A remark of Lonergan made during his Easter visit to Dublin, 1961.

with another parallel I had in mind: the last 40 pages of *Finnegans Wake* and the *Apocalypse*. We are back to the search for invariant human elements, for what you have in common with Joyce, Molly, John, Jesus.

So we turn to the text of John, focusing not on 'elements of liveliness required of a Cosmo'<sup>20</sup> nor on 'the Great Suggester Don Poldo de la Flora'<sup>21</sup> but on expressions of liveliness of the Cosmoknot, the Great Suggester of "The Way" (John, 14, 6), Dom Jesu de la Via:

\*\*\*\*\*

**.. what do you want? (1, 38) .. before Philip came to call you, I saw you under the fig tree (1, 48) .. I tell you most solemnly, we speak only about what we know (3, 11) .. Yes, God loved the world so much that he . . . sent his Son (3, 16-17) .. anyone who drinks the water that I shall give will never be thirsty again (4, 14) .. God is spirit, and those who worship must worship in spirit and truth (4, 24) .. the Father, who is the source of life, has made the Son the source of life (5, 26) .. the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life (6, 32) .. anyone who does eat my flesh and drink my blood has eternal life (6, 54) .. if any man is thirsty, let him come to me (7, 37) .. you will learn the truth and the truth will make you free (8, 32) .. I tell you most solemnly, whoever keeps my word will never see death (8, 51) .. Do you believe in the Son of Man? .. he is speaking to you (9, 36-37) .. I am the gate. Anyone who enters through me will be safe (10, 9) .. Do you believe this? (11, 26) .. Father, I thank you for hearing my prayer. I knew indeed that you always hear me, but I speak for the sake of all those who stand round me, so that they may believe it was**

---

<sup>20</sup>I refer back here to the discussion preliminary to the Molly Speech in chapter 1. The use of a character Cosmo Polis, or Cosma Polis, was a regular classroom device in discussing what one wished of and in a companion, a minding friend.

<sup>21</sup>*Ulysses*, 778.

you that sent me (11, 41-42) . .if anyone serves me, my Father will honour him (12, 26) . .what the Father has told me is what I speak (12, 50) . . and whoever welcomes me welcomes the one who sent me (13, 20) . .Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me? (14, 10) . .I shall ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate to be with you forever, that Spirit of truth (14, 16) . .when the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, he will be my witness (15, 26) . .it is for your own good that I am going because unless I go, the Advocate will not come to you (16, 7) . . he will lead you to the complete truth, since he will not be speaking as from himself . . all he tells you will be taken from what is mine. Everything the Father has is mine (16, 13-15) . . and now I leave the world to go to the Father (16, 28) . . eternal life is this: to know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent (17, 3) . . Now, Father, it is time for you to glorify me with that glory I had with you before the world ever was (17, 5) . .who are you looking for? (18, 3) . . am I not to drink the cup that the Father has given me? (18, 11)

. .I am thirsty (19, 28) . .it is accomplished (19, 30) . . I am ascended to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God (20, 17) . . . happy are those who have not seen and yet believe (20, 29) . . I tell you most solemnly, when you were young you put on your own belt and walked where you liked; but when you grow old you will stretch out your hands, and somebody else will put a belt round you and take you where you would rather not go (21, 18) . . if I want him to stay behind till I come, what does it matter to you? You are to follow me. (21, 22).<sup>13</sup>

\*\*\*\*\*

“.... and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower”<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>James Joyce, *Ulysses*, conclusion.

The parallels are yours to exploit: you, the known unknown, meeting in memory and expectation ... the locked-up indeterminate sensitivity of the John-group and Jesus, of “you and me, that intertwines the core reach, capacity, need for understanding, ‘what is it, Molly?’, ‘Poldy, where were you?’, “what do you want? ... Rabbi, where do you live?”.

And what of the Cosmologue? Is there in Him that same layered dynamism? And could it be that His and “Cosmo’s and our layered dynamism is far more difficult to discover than the layered dynamism of the oak or the humming bird? That in its not being discovered but monstrously modernly covered, it will remain grimly trapped in the busy day, the busy academic day? But then should I not at least make my Linnaean start”.<sup>23</sup>

Now we could indeed “end here as in 1.2, for we have arrived at the same challenge. “Us. Then. Finn again! Taker. Bussoftlehee, memeor mee!”, but the challenge is made new, Faithfilled, and the reach is for the Mind of Christ, like ours in its dynamics.

But what of its content? The question is one that merits the larger context of sections 5.3 and 5.4 when “thou send thee” as intimate project becomes a fine thread towards a glimpse of that content. Here I would conclude by asking you to return, in homely fashion, to the selection from the fourth Gospel, to notice, self-attentively, “The keys to. Given! A way. ...”.

Just as Molly talks intelligently, reflectively, committedly about the patterns of her relations, so too does Jesus. Molly is sensitive, “so sensitive about everything”, sharing “cracked ideas”, reaching out in extravagant hope, “I’d love to have this whole place swimming in roses God of heaven there’s nothing like nature the wild mountains then the sea ...”. So too with Jesus, but the talk is “most solemn” (3,11; 8,51; 21,18), dialogue not monologue. And within that dialogue He speaks of (and with) a deeply-

---

<sup>23</sup>The quotation is from the parallel part of chapter 1 of *Process*.

shared group in which He belongs: Father, Way, Advocate. As I pondered over this on my way to the Bodleian library I thought with reverent irreverence of contemporary music groups, strange characters with shared viewpoints, perspectives, rhythms. But the Jesus Group, so to speak, is altogether more solemnly weird, with the unity of a minding that is “far out”, yet somehow each one of the group identifiably “ a character”, an understanding character, a character of understanding. How can we glimpse these intimate characters except through the intimately-related characters of our own understanding, our own minding?<sup>24</sup>

A final remark. Joyce did not know the dynamics of Molly’s consciousness nor did Jesus know the dynamics of his own consciousness. But one can mediate a reading of “the data on Jesus” or “the data on Molly” by an understanding of consciousness, just as one can mediate a reading of the vines of Galilee by a twentieth-century understanding of *vitis vinifera*. Similarly, one can read “the data on Jesus” with a systematic perspective mediated in Faith by history, in continuity with St. Thomas’ style of reading the fourth Gospel.

---

<sup>24</sup>See Lonergan, *De Deo Trino II*, Gregorian Press, Rome, pp. 86-92. (*Pars Tertia* of *Assertum* 1, if you happen to have the forthcoming English translation)