

Posthumous 4

Conversing with Divine Persons

“A chan eich bod yn feibion, anfonodd Duw
Ysbryd ei Fab i’n calonau, yn llefain, Abba! Dad!”¹

The previous essay, “A Commentary on **Inside**,” was a lengthy lead into the present shorter one, a shortness characteristic of the other, regular, essays in the series.² I note immediately, however, that it is quite possible to venture forward with me on this topic without that previous climb.³ Indeed, I held grimly to shortness here and avoided subtleties in the text by using footnotes, so that my main point would come across simply. The third section in *Posthumous 3* was titled “A commentary on **Selves Inside Insight**” and the three boldfaced words could well have been our starting point here, but comments on it only turn up in occasional footnotes.⁴ I leave it to you to judge how best you may ramble

¹ *Galatians 4:6*, quoting my Welsh Bible, *Y Beibl Cymraeg Newydd*, Aberystwyth, 1988. The *King James* translation reads, “And because you are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.”

² The previous essay was lengthy in that it also is an essay commissioned for the Journal *Revista de Filosofía* (2013). In fact, as you see, the present essay, with notes added, is of equal length.

³ The essay is written so that it can be read first without adverting to the notes, but that reading has to be in the suspicion that there is something wonderfully seminal in a new twist on speaking with God and also something deeply wrong with present theological talk. Ho ho: should I have said above, “Please read footnote 3 on the first reading!”? But no, you probably read the notes so far, nudged by the obscurity of the Welsh at note 1. So now you know, you can read the rest first time round without the notes. But I think it worthwhile to add a little point here regarding the word *with* in the phrase ‘speaking with God’, in the context of the two suspicions. I suggest a pause over the phrase when applied to the Holy Spirit. The phrase becomes in that case “speaking with Grace.” Grace there is the name of a Person with whom we can speak in the normal sense of *with*, but there is that larger sense of *with* in which you and Grace speak together. Think now of our conversation here in terms of the three of us, and then in terms of the five of us. Who are these with whom we talk? There is a disturbing answer in note 29 which relates both to the seminal shift and the sad disorientation. Perhaps you might take that note in on your first read?!

⁴ I make a start here by commenting on my commentary on **Insight** and **Inside** that is the previous essay. Commenting on these has been my life work, and such comments are pointers, invitations, challenges. Lonergan remarked once that his *Verbum* articles were “five years’ work for anyone who disagrees with me.” My humorous comment on that is that it is fifty years’

forwards with me here in this most difficult of topics, how you might move into footnotes as and when it suits you (discerningly)^{3, 5}

The topic can be presented easily when posed as the question, “How best can I converse with God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit?”⁶ This morning I continued my musings of years about the question, “How best can I converse with the Father?” I shift now from “I” to you, to any Christian. Then you can share the problem when you think of any of us with our background of tangled parents and grandparents, muddles of authority, etc. etc. It puts me in mind of a letter that Lonergan wrote to Fred Crowe about the troubles caused in later life by early disorientations. “Incidentally, re anxiety, what the Freudians call the Super-Ego is Aquinas’ *cogitativa*: just as little birds know that twigs are good for building nests

work for anyone who agrees with him. I am pointing, in my comments to a challenge for this millennium. So, here is my first impossible footnote chord to the melody of the text: how are we to read the text from *Galatians* with which I began, in Wales or anywhere else? Might I point ahead in an essential fashion and claim that the text is worth recycling in the sense given *recycling* by Lonergan and me?

⁵ On the symbolism ()³, see note 23. Do not rush to follow up this footnote, which refers you to the conclusion of the first chapter, “The Value of Lonergan’s Economics for Lonergan Students,” of my Website book, *The Redress of Poise*, written in the mid-1990s (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/redress.pdf>). The bracketing, a practice of mine in the *Cantowers*, refers to the needed luminous triplicity of, e.g., discernment, if we are to climb out of commonsense discernment, climb into Tower care of humanity’s distresses. The final chapter of *The Redress of Poise* has the title: “Grace: The Final Frontier.” It is on this topic but, heavens how the meaning has changed for me. I am now a long, fresh, open way from my astonishment in that essay about the secondary *esse* of Jesus; I am making progress towards glimpses of that other personal supernaturality, sensing how “the Holy Ghost over the bent / World broods with warm breast and with ah! bright wings.” G. M. Hopkins, the conclusion of the 1887 sonnet, “God’s Grandeur”

⁶ Presenting a topic in question form is a fundamental strategy, and here I recall my first strange leap in that strategy regarding the topic of The Trinity, as I was vesting – it was in the late 1960s – to celebrate and preach to a community, half of which were nuns and half retired prostitutes. The four questions are in the Preface to the later edition (Axial Publishing, 2000) of my *Music That Is Soundless*, but they are worth repeating here as suggesting the strategy of a life-climb for Tower or town in Trinitarian at-home-ness, Om-ness. So here you **have** them: When did you last have a real conversation? When were you last understanding, understood? When did you last **speak**? When did you last **listen**? The reach is for a particular conversation, the reach is for you, subject-as-subject in the eternally-hidden loneliness that is the reality of “the field” in each of us. “The field is the universe, but my horizon defines my universe” (Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 199. Check the index under *subject-as-subject*.)

and the little lambs know that wolves are bad, so little human beings develop a cogitative about good and bad; it reflects their childish understanding of what papa and mamma say is good or bad and in adult life it can cause a hell of a lot of trouble.”⁷ “Father” can have all sorts of twisted meanings blocking our effort to talk to the first Person of the Trinity. Sometimes I think that I should try for a broader name, like OM from the *Upanishads*,⁸ or indeed a creation of my own which seems good, Omada.⁹ Sometimes I muse over the use of the Welsh, *Dad*,¹⁰ or its equivalent in other languages, and wonder – in metaphysical concreteness – how it resonates in each local reader’s psyche.¹¹ There is no simple answer to the

⁷ I am quoting from the 13th of 129 letters of Lonergan to Crowe. This letter is dated 27th December 1955. I first quoted this letter in *Humus* 2, “Vis Cogitativa: Contemporary Defective Patterns of Anticipation” (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/humus-02.pdf>). There I moved to consider the notion of an axial superego, and in the present essay the central issues are related to this axial warp, and to anxieties associated with its present dominance.

⁸ I think here of Richard V. De Smet’s work and quote from his *Guidelines in Indian Philosophy*: “the very name ‘upanisad’ ... has been explained etymologically as the teaching obtained from sitting (*sat*) devotedly (*ni*) near (*upa*) a teacher.” (Quoted in the presentation of De Smet’s chapter 3 in *Divyadaan* 21/2 (2010), 257. That volume was edited by me with title “Do You Want a Sane Economy?” Progress towards that sanity is upa-most in minding here: it is a blossoming of the Covenant of Promise seeded by Grace, pointed to in Jeremiah 31: 33: “Deep within them I will plant my Law, writing it on their hearts.” More on the *Upanishads* in note 48.

⁹ This effort relates to the twisted views of parenting in cultures or in persons, splicing a reverence for that sacred mysterious out-breath with ma and da. The following footnote, and note 54 below, point to the deep complexities of ‘noising abroad’ our “infinite craving.” “Finality, Love, Marriage”, *CWL* 4, 49.

¹⁰ There are massive complications relating to these musings, some of which involve the **boldfaced** reflections on linguistic neurochemical dynamics that were a topic in *Posthumous* 3. So, that context hovers over my musings about the six occurrences, in chapter 17 of John’s Gospel (vv. 1, 5, 11, 21, 24, 25), of the phrase “O Dad.” One need not get into problems about the Celtic pre-vowel in the vocative to sense a psychic nudge towards a fresh reading of the speaking. There is a speaking to you in the very print, and indeed that speaking meshes with the Solitary Speaking of the Father in God. *CWL* 12, 397, 399. Perhaps “O Dad” might rescue you from warps, from rocks of ages? You mesh your lonely noise with the call of the Welsh Jesus.

¹¹ I think here of Lonergan reaching out for the meaning of “Simon Kimbangu ... in whom the Spirit of God was manifested and who has opened the revelation of Christ through African religious experience in fresh ways.” “Emerging Religious Consciousness of Our Time,” *A Third Collection*, 70. But the context I am reaching for in these essays is one that includes the metawords, **Wi**, (See *Prehumus* 2, “Metawords and Metaphysics,” available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/prehumous-02.pdf>), so bringing forth a concrete heuristic of the

name-address of the Father - or Mother - especially if we are struggling in various feminist contexts.

Perhaps the tone of my present efforts is best given by talking of my problem with the naming of the third Person of the Trinity. *Donum*,¹² Gift, just doesn't do it for me. In the past year I have sifted through New Testament talk, e.g., of "comforter,"¹³ and found my odd way through "fort" and "fortune" to the Roman Goddess about whom Augustine has little good to say.¹⁴ Still, "Hello Fortune my old friend", to twist a bit of Paul Simon's lyric, doesn't sit well.¹⁵ There is the Spirit as Embrace, deeply suggestive for me of a special characteristic of processional love.¹⁶ That leads me to muse over the name *Grace Em. Fortune* as a possibility.¹⁷

experience called *religious*. I had best make the claim at this early stage that I am not talking about mysticism anywhere here. The issue is open incarnate thinking. It is perhaps necessary to add the simple claim that prayer – and the types of conversations that I deal with here – involves thinking in Faith. Again, further down that page I cited Lonergan's remark: "as yet the world religions do not share some common theology or style of religious thinking." I am pushing here for such a theology, and indeed for a theology that locates the third person of the Trinity in a special manner of presence, with a story of variation of molecular and psychic resonances from Big Bang to Big Clasp. See note 16 below.

¹² *Summa Theologica*, Q. 38. See further, note 16 below.

¹³ The Gospel of *John* 16: 7.

¹⁴ *The City of God*, chapter 18.

¹⁵ The song I am referring to here is "The Sounds of Silence," the words and music of which were an inspiration to me in the mid-1960's when I and my students were struggling with *Insight* chapter 19 and towards glimpsing the image of the trinity in our lonely selves.

¹⁶ **Embrace, Embracing: a Person** responding to a **Calling**. I must begin by noting that we are here in the refined zone of "Notional Acts" (Lonergan's heading, *CWL* 12, 385), and that "the complete conception of these acts involves almost all the elements of Trinitarian theology." *Ibid.* In the *Summa Theologica* we have jumped or climbed from Q. 27 to Q. 41. Here, indeed, we may pause over that funny slogan, "With this well understood" (*CWL* 12, top of 367), and yes, "when one has grasped all of this, one can only admire the terse and simple elegance of St. Thomas in expounding the principles and potencies from which there are the notional acts." *Ibid.*, top of page 361. "In expounding" is not in the Latin, but just *about*: try **(about)**³ to glimpse our horizon-field challenge. We are back with Thomas' puzzling (Q. 37, a.1) about naming the Holy Spirit: "*non sunt aliqua vocabula*" – we lack words: so, he advises, let's use *love* in two ways.

The challenge is for the cultivation of a new ethos through generations of cycling and of long conversations with and within Grace, or - using my nudging – in the Embrace of Grace. I can only suggest here, as researcher, that my suggestion is worth cycling and recycling. In cosmic terms, I think of *Embrace* as a variant of *Clasp* that I used to talk of when replacing *Big Crunch*

At all events, it gives leads beyond “Hello fortune,” which doesn’t quite make it as talk between friends, except perhaps in a popular form derived from the name *Lady Luck*: “Hello Lucky.”¹⁸

Now here you may already feel an irritation with what seems irreverence. I recall Rahner’s goodly essay of 1971, on Lonergan’s functional specialties.¹⁹ Yes, Rahner found that the structure fitted the human sciences, but where is the central

with *Big Clasp* and obviously we must start in the contextualized chapter 5 of CWL 12, “The Divine Persons in Relation to One Another.” Conversational research of the **W₃** type needs to soak up the “Excursus: The Psychological Analogy of the Trinity” (CWL 11, 639-685), which gives an initial self-taste through scripture. Then one senses that Thomas’ *Donum*, Gift (*Summa*, Q. 38) is centered on hearing (seeing, seizing, embracing, whatever). We are talking about “hearing in the heart” (see note 85, 661) paradigmmed by Mary (*Luke* 2: 51), who now, in a new sense, can be cherished as full of Grace. Follow Lonergan when he says, “we must now consider briefly how the Holy Spirit hears” (669), and discover **acceptance**. “The Holy Spirit hears and accepts truth from the Father and the Son (*John* 16: 13-15)” (679). And there is the finite story of the Graceful active acceptance of the practical Word of history that pivots on Lonergan’s identification of supernatural entities. See CWL 12, 471-2. “It is clear that the whole of what we are seeking is not expressly found in scripture” (CWL 11, 671): it is to be found in listening with Grace, in the Embrace that is Grace, to the “Seamless Symphony of Christ” (P. McShane, *The Road to Religious Reality*, Axial Publications, 2012, 19-21), thus generating the climb, in the humility of *Comparison* (*Method*, 250: See *Road to Religious Reality*, 17-18) through a genetic systematics of theses on the Mystical Body (*Ibid.*, 38) that carries forward, in glorious incompleteness, everlastingly. But more on that in notes 28 and 35.

¹⁷ Such musing on my part must be done existentially by different people within their own cultures and stories. My odd suggestion of middle initial M, written “Em.”, relates to my advising women in this zone of seeking the Christian equivalent of Jung’s animus. See note 55 below. How do you address the spirit as a woman in that context? There are the initials G.E.F., which led me to suggest to some that “Geffree” might suit for conversation with that intimate guest, or rather permanent Eschatological mate. Geffree is their dance-companion, sharing the molecular patterns of their aesthetic quest. See my essay, “Aesthetic Loneliness and the Heart of Science” *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*, (6), 2011 (available at: <http://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/jmda/article/view/261/156>). In the later footnote 29 we muse over the deeper crisis of culture and history of naming God with “level of the times” (*Method*, 350-351) meaning.

¹⁸ I recall now a conversation in the 1960s with Lonergan in which he replied to a question about his finding of a certain book: “luck” he said, with a lifted eyebrow and a twinkle. Lurking in his minding was his larger view of “natural resultance.” See *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, the index under *natural resultance*. The lilies in the fields and the books on the shelves are embraced in that single symphonic cosmos.

¹⁹ Published in *Gregorianum* (52) 1971.

mystery of theology? It is as well to quote at length this good response of Rahner, so soon after the appearance, in the same journal, of Lonergan's suggested restructuring of theology. That restructuring is the central concern of these Posthumous essays, and its initiation the discomfiting drive of Posthumous 5.

Lonergan's theological methodology seems to me to be so generic that it actually suits every science, and so is no methodology of theology as such, but only a most general methodology of all science, illustrated by examples from theology. The most that one could say, it seems to me, is that the methodology of Christian theology presented by Lonergan (for it is surely Christian theology that is meant!) is one which will enable any ideology whatever (in the neutral sense of the word ideology) to bring to its own community its own full self-understanding.

Lonergan's theological method abstracts: a) from the once-for-all, entirely proper-to-itself relationship to the concrete Person Jesus, which is proper not only to Christian faith and life, but also, arising from that, to Christian theology. Since the relationship is unique and once-for-all, there arises already from this a property of theology which is simply not given in other sciences; b) from the fundamental fact that all theological statements, as theological, are related not to God as some object or other within the field of categorial objects, but to God as the incomprehensible mystery, that can never be subsumed, in the same method, among the objects of the other sciences. For a theological method must surely make clear and legitimize the singularity of the language that goes with it, namely, that it is precisely about God as such, as distinct from the language used in all other sciences. Of that, however, I can detect nothing in this Lonergan sketch of theological method. In Lonergan's article the words 'God' and 'Jesus Christ', do indeed occur, but only as indications of material objects with which the science of theology, as distinct from other sciences, engages, and not as words from whose content what is proper to theological method as such must be established, and which therefore must indicate something like formal objects of theology (or taken together as the formal object).²⁰

Let me help us forward in both the Rahner problem and ours of naming "with irreverence" by appealing to the fifth of Lonergan's doctrinal theses on the

²⁰ Op. Cit. Quoting from a translation from the German by Dr. Conn O'Donovan.

Trinity.²¹ The key point, for our purposes, is the manner in which the mystery is focused by a fundamental inverse insight.²² But the point comes across more enlighteningly when we turn to and in²³ a precise meaning for analogy. For that precise meaning we move away from discussion of analogous concepts to talk about the operation of talking, judging, analogously: “It is such-and-such, but not-really; indeed much better.”²⁴ It is good, indeed necessary, to pause here over normal usages, e.g., talking about a new type of car, or entree, or friend, or good conversation.²⁵

²¹ CWL 11, *The Triune God: Doctrines*, 577-684. The thesis asserts that “the dogma of the trinity is a mystery in the proper sense” and goes on to discuss the place of analogical understanding.

²² CWL 11, 635 and 637.

²³ I recall the complex meaning of *in* that we hovered over in *Posthumous* 3, leading up finally to the shocking suggestion of reading the first word of *Insight* chapter one, *In*, in a new culture. In note 29 I add a reference to the central chapter of the Website book, *The Redress of Poise*, where I talk of the turning in towards which the new culture of theology must reach through slow repentant collaborative spiraling. Generally, I nudge towards that turning, that boldfaced about-face, that “comeabout” (*Insight*, 537 end), but adding such print-hints as (about)³, or (discernment)³, where what is meant is a curious triplicity of turning which, e.g., sublates St. Ignatius’ view of commonsense discernment into a discernment of discernments of discernments that is the *per se* work of those in the fourth specialty Dialectic. See lines 18-33 of *Method in Theology*, 250.

²⁴ I wish to emphasize here the presence of the challenge of the previous note in the apparently simple expression I concocted above. The such-and-such of focus in the present essay is the meaning and actuality of our conversing with the Three Persons of three divinity individually (the 6 *index*-pointers at the top of CWL 12, 804 are a helpful contextualization here, but much more musing on shared consciousness is needed) or as a group: “O Dad,” “Hello Jesus,” “Greetings Grace,” or, twisting the conclusion to Kavanagh’s great poem “The One” (quoted in full at the conclusion of *Cantower* 9, “Position, Poisition, Protopossession” [available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/cantower9.pdf>]), “Beautiful, beautiful, beautiful God / breathing love by a cut-away bog.”

Further, one refines the consequent “not, but much better” through serious kataphatic contemplation on the various levels of science, beginning with the layers of mathematical infinities. The friendship then can be, well, friendly, but always fringed by the utter remoteness of Brahman from atman. And there is the post-pilgrim dynamic touched on in footnotes 28 and 35 and intimated popularly in the last verse of *Amazing Grace*: “When we’ve been there ten thousand years, bright shining as the sun, we’ve no less days to sing God’s praise then when we’d first begun.” *Amazing Grace*, indeed.

²⁵ The questions about good conversation mentioned in note 6 obviously fall within the possibility of accelerating meaning pointed to in note 28 below. Horizon zooming closer to a gloriously disappearing Field. See CWL 18, 199.

In this essay we are talking about an Old Friend, or rather Three Old Friends. Let's try Paul Simon again, but now with almost the right words, "Hello Darkness, My Old Friends. I've come to speak with You again."²⁶ The darkness belongs with the second and third aspects - sub-judgments - of analogical judgment. When we conceive of it decently, then we have a luminous concept of our talk, but this in quite odd sense of the word *concept* in relation to analogy: it means we are talking about a concept of analogy.²⁷ And it is important to note that that concept can improve, indeed indefinitely.²⁸ Here it seems good to go beyond paddling and wade out a bit into the infinite ocean that is Our Old Friends.²⁹ Let me then jump

²⁶ The song, and the film in which it occurred in the late 1960s, *The Graduate*, was part of the ethos of the first edition of *Music That Is Soundless*, so its subtitle was "An Introduction to God for the Graduate." But the nudge to write the book came from reading the poetry of John of the Cross as I walked on Sandymount Strand, Dublin.

²⁷ It is useful to parallel the effort here with the drive of *Insight* chapter 13 towards a complex concept of "a patterned context of judgments." *Insight*, 398, at the end. That is already a difficult "in" task (recalling note 23 above). Talking of either the God of philosophy or the God of Faith is much more complex. The concept of analogy, moreover, complexifies with advances in human understanding: see, e.g., the index under *analogy* in *CWL 18, Phenomenology and Logic*. See also, note 29 below. Important, too, is to take note of the genesis of series of incompleteness theorems, lifting analogies up from mathematics to theology. A simple immediate help here however, is the comparison of infinities such as that of the fractions and that of the decimals (see the website book, *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, 25-26, available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/wealth.pdf>). More on that in the next footnote.

²⁸ Here we face a giant cultural challenge. Perhaps I can instill the molecular vibes of that challenge by recalling the last sad speech of Rahner at 80, when he spoke of the lack of Eschatology, of a reach in theology for where he was heading. And I shall return to that issue explicitly in note 35 below. But here I wish to repeat an old pleading of mine, about where we are heading, especially as global Tower People, in the decades of our pilgrim lives. The point is made briefly in the concluding pages of my *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2007).

Normatively, we accelerate in our improvement of concept, being always strangers to ourselves of last week. This, when roled, tasked and institutionalized (the reference is to the display on *Method 48*) in later centuries, will transpose human communication very radically: there is to be a new ethos of **HOW**-language, rescuing each of our journeys as **Homes-Of-Wonder**. That ethos is to include in its heuristic explanatory conception, axioms of such genetic incompleteness and of the paradoxical bridges of its intergenerational communication. All this, of course, is way too much for a footnote. Yet I dare to pick up on the topic in note 48, the topic of the bridges heading through disembodiment.

²⁹ There is a sense in which this central footnote is the most important of my long and strange life. It is, indeed, the central note of the 57 here, and I use the strategy to recall a previous

to the end of Lonergan's invitation to understand those Old Friends, and read freshly the final lines of his book.³⁰

middle note 23, of 45, to the middle chapter "Turners: Strategists of Survival" of the Website book of the 1990s, *The Redress of Poise* (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/redress.pdf>). The talk of that note is about biography reaching to biography in history, as I am doing here with you. There is to be more about such reaching at the beginning of Posthumous 5, on starting strategies of functional collaboration. But here I need to stick to my key point.

How am I to be brief, when I am chastising a long history? These days I have reached startling clarity about a remark Lonergan made in 1961 – we were in the presence of that then-unknown Caravaggio after dinner in the Jesuit House proximate to University College Dublin – about theologians being big frogs in little ponds. The God of the theologians is not God cherished "on the level of one's time" (*Method in Theology*, 350), nor are they adequately "elitist." *Ibid.*, 351. The God of *Insight* chapter 19, reached through our version of "the Secondary Component in the Idea of Being" (*Insight* 672-4), is not its core. So we must ask, beginning in this decade, freshly, discomfortingly, and perhaps even haunted by the shadow of the end part of *Method* 250, "What, then, is critical method?" (*Ibid.*, 708), thus questioning our entrapment in "the flight from understanding..." (*Ibid.*, 707) that is present commonsense theology. Nor do I find acceptable the excuse that the God of theology is the God of prayer. Prayer is conversation with Friends that is to be continually rescued from "the murkiness of mythic consciousness." *Ibid.*, 707. Nor is mysticism an acceptable theological core. The mystic may well claim that "you may find yourself quite suddenly elevated into an altered state of consciousness, lifted into a vast domain on the cosmos in which the entire universe seems to fit inside you while you see it all around you simultaneously." Caroline Myss, *Defy Gravity. Healing Beyond the Bounds of Reason*, Hay House, 2009, 139. But the mystic reaches are either inarticulate – like St. Ignatius' talk of the Trinity – or expressed in traditional terms, as in St. Catherine of Siena. The Tower People need to embrace gravity and struggle to heal humanity within the bounds of reason's cherishing of Friends. "Love of God above all and in all so embraces the order of the universe as to love all men with a self-sacrificing love" (*Insight*, 722); it "is repentant" (*Ibid.*); "it wills the order of the universe and so it wills it with that order's dynamic joy and zeal." *Ibid.* It may 'Defy Gravity' but also embrace it by embracing chapter 5 of *Insight* – without which embrace of its "natural bridge" (*Insight* 163) one misreads the rest of the book. Even the little particles of physics are zealous to waft us to love the invisible, (an old Preface of Christmas Mass: "*ut ad amorem invisibilium rapiamur*") and that zeal and wafting are meshed together, flexible spirals in the Embrace of Grace.

³⁰ The previous note, of course, provides a shocking context for viewing these Latin efforts of Lonergan, or the limited descriptive efforts of Thomas. Thomas was writing before the rise of serious understanding. Lonergan was writing in impossible circumstances for a light-weight audience.

For the glory of the Father is this, that just as he eternally speaks the Word in truth and through the Word breathes forth Love in holiness, so also in the fullness of time he sent his incarnate Son in truth so that by believing the Word we might speak and understand true inner words, and through the Word he sent the Spirit of the Word in holiness so that joined to the Spirit in love and made living members of the body of Christ we might cry out, “Abba Father!”³¹

Now let me quibble fruitfully. “We might speak and understand true inner words” slides away from the Latin of Lonergan. The Latin here is “*verba vera intus dicamus atque intelligamus*”: “we might speak true words within and understand.”³² I am not happy with any phrase that says “understand inner words” or “understand concepts.”³³ I recall a closed option of systematics: “the key issue is whether concepts result from understanding or understanding results from concepts.”³⁴ But the key issue here is very personal for us in pilgrimage and in the Eschaton.³⁵ Bear with me here in my odd strategy of presentation. Have

³¹ Lonergan, *CWL 12, The Triune God: Systematics*, 518-21.

³² This is a very tricky and suggestive phrase. Does it relate to the mediation of concrete understanding in the strangeness of the incomplete knowing of the particular? Might we find its fuller thematization relevant to the dynamics of the glorylight mentioned in notes 35 and 56 below?

³³ A present venture of mine is helping a friend’s daughter through Grade 12 mathematics. The text – which I discretely do not name – is a brutal insult to intelligence, dominated by the phrase – and the mentality – of bringing the student to “understand concepts.” The fundamental theorems are glossed over and memory is the name of the game. This is the stuff of all first year university texts that I have mused over in the past fifty years, especially in economics. That culture screams for implementation, an essential of metaphysics, transposed to the eighth functional specialty. The screaming is the topic of *Posthumous* 5.

³⁴ *Method in Theology*, 336, at note 1.

³⁵ So I pick upon the dense ramble of footnote 28. I could venture, very eccentrically, on musings about the titles of these essays, *Posthumous* essays, and the odd psychology that carries them forward, so shaking normal thinking of the discontinuity of the usual adventure of death. But perhaps I can be more persuasive by taking a classic thesis of Thomas and inviting its fuller ingestion: the thesis that the human mind of Jesus cannot comprehend the divinity. This thesis is at the heart of an Eschatology way beyond the youthful stumblings of Thomas. The Eschatological rides of Jesus and us are deeply different, yet sharing in the oddness of “infinite surprise.” The concluding words of the Epilogue to *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*. Thinking this out in terms of layered incompletenesses and layered infinities is a massive task of future theology that is to carry us beyond a simple-minded view of an impossible infinite jump –

we lost track of naming Lucky? Not at all. But I wish to follow up a more elementary point regarding the intimate word within from which further understanding blossoms. I am, indeed, led in my strategy by my concern to get functional collaboration going: that is the topic of the next *Posthumous* Essay. I am thinking of the true inner words that we need to share, as Tower People, if we are to begin to lift forward redemptive understanding.³⁶ I am thinking of what I call **The Standard Model**³⁷ for functional collaboration, with its three intertwined inner words named by the three symbols in FS + GS + UV: *FS*, *GS*, *UV*.³⁸ The three symbols name the result of a mighty climb to the conceptualization that needs to

recall *I Corinthians* 13: – to “seeing as we are seen.” That massive task is in continuity with the task of detecting the dynamics of the four-personality reality of every Finneganwaking, HCE and ALP. (See, as context, P. McShane, “The Hypothesis of Non-Accidental Human Participation in the Divine Active Spiration,” *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* N.S. 2.2 (2011), 187-202.) How does the Presence of Embracing lift each and all in the Call of the Wild Bunch, the feeble participation in the Active Spiration of the first and second Persons of God? There is the pilgrim climb in the light of faith, already a deeply mysterious uninvestigated presence of the past 7 million years. “Theologians, let alone parents, rarely think of / the historical process,” the Seamless Symphony of Jesus, in which Embracing ferments a molecular melody of understanding in the cosmic trip now only 14 billion years on the ride. The inner quotation is from “Finality, Love, Marriage” (CWL 4, 47), an article that symbolizes warps in molecular understanding with roots in early Hebrew and Hindu disoriented gropings. We desperately need a beginning of an explanatory theology that would locate the shift to divine adoption (*filiatio* is the technical word located in signpost fashion in CWL 12, 471-2, and the context is the reach for a full genetics of the strange road signposted there) in the molecular whirling of an everlasting circumincessional spiraling. The understanding of light of glory, like the simpler understanding of the Higgs particle to emerge in physics, will give mass and momentum to our pilgrim and Eschatological quest.

³⁶ I have made a beginning of the symbolization of such inner words in *Prehumous* 2, “Metawords and Metaphysics” (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/prehumous-02.pdf>). The word that is the focus of attention in this essay is **W₃**. It is reproduced in many places, e.g., page 161 of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas* (Axial Publishing, 2010), with title “**W₃**: A Heuristic of Lonergan’s Perspective.” The following page contains Lonergan’s classic statement for the need for such diagramming, and page 163, with title, “The Tower of Able: Lonergan’s Dream,” lifts **W₃** into a tower diagram.

³⁷ I introduced this key parallel with physics (see *Method in Theology*, 3-4) in the 2007 website book *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry* (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/lonergansmodel.html>)

³⁸ In *FuSe* 10, “Contexts of Functional Interpretation,” there is a compact presentation in section 3, “FS + UV + GS.” This essay is available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/fuse-10.pdf>

be shared by the future community of collaborators. Think of that conceptualization as Lonergan invites us to do:

Conceptualization of understanding is, when fully developed, a system and one must advert to the implications of systematic knowledge in the Aristotelian and Thomist *quod quid est* if one would grasp the precise nature of the concept; the concept emerges from understanding, not an isolated atom detached from all contexts, but precisely as part of a context, loaded with the relations that belong to it in virtue of a source which is equally the source of other concepts.³⁹

Now think of the undergraduate climb to conceptualization that ends with the quotation above from *CWL* 12. It is a climb through *CWL* 11 and 12, not to speak of the climb and its result being “loaded with the relations that belong to it, etc.” And I invite you to think with me of the Gregorian University in Rome in Lonergan’s days of teaching there, and so realistically of the doubtful climbing of classes of hundreds sent there to prepare for ordination. Not, then, a parallel with a climb to graduation in an honours physics that would leave one with a decent glimpse of The Standard Model.

Chatting with Lonergan in the 1970s about his days of teaching in Rome revealed that he had a trickle-down principle. “If you talked to the general low-level group, the bright fellows wouldn’t listen, so I aimed at the top and something was bound to trickle down.” But that context placed a writing burden on him: he talked to me at that time of aiming at organizing a thesis a year, although it is pretty evident that he did better than that. Still, it drew him away from following on in his own search and certainly in his expression of it. He could talk bluntly of his burden and even write about it: “It was because of teaching obligations that I was led to write the book and not because I had nothing else to do.”⁴⁰

What, you may well ask, has all this to do with our problem of conversing with divine persons, and naming our conversation partners? I give a pithy answer, lost perhaps on, to, many, trapped in a culture that needs to be shaken off. The

³⁹ Lonergan, *CWL* 2, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, 238.

⁴⁰ *CWL* 7, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 3.

culture and conventions of talking and writing in the mid-twentieth century in the Gregorian University, Rome, and perhaps even where you are now, do or did not, it seems to me, move on lines of a contemplative climbing that would place professor and budding priests, or even now those in our broader educational world, in the world described in that final quotation from *CWL* 12, subjects-as-subjects in the real world of the Eternal Concern of Subjects-As-Subjects to make us living members of the Symphonic reality of Jesus, who calls us, not servants but friends.

But let me slip back to two simple analogies to help sniff out the problem. First, my own experience of teaching an honours level course in mathematical physics.⁴¹ I was approached by the chair early on in the course and he asked me how the class was going. I replied that I had a decent group and that it was going well so far. His reaction was, “well, talk over their heads for a few weeks: that will cut down the class and you’ll have a great year.” My second parallel is from a program I watch regularly with title “So you think you can dance?” Last night I watched a final in the program that was filled with astoundingly talented performances. One of the judges remarked on how the reach for excellence of these people was an inspiration to all involved in dancing.⁴²

My concern is with the absence of such seriousness and excellence in contemporary Christian theology. No doubt things have changed since the early

⁴¹ That same year I lecture graduate courses on relativity and on advanced differential equations. Obviously, none of the first year students attended: they had a few years of climbing to do. The next year I was a student of theology, where it was taken as obvious that 2nd-4th year students did the same courses together, e.g., on Trinitarian theology. What was “going on”? We are back with the horrors touched on in note 29 above.

⁴² I recall Nadia Boulanger’s comments on excellence quoted at note 41 of Posthumous 3. But perhaps my own blunt view of earlier this year is worth recalling. “**IF** you aspire to Tower presence, then you must face the challenge not only of Lonergan but of the “zeal” of the Cosmos. There is no doubt but that Lonergan invites you, if you wish to be thus present, to scratch and crawl your way out of defective parallel universes of discourse. Nor is there any doubt but that he invites you to crawl through the simplest stages of the simplest science in doing so. If you opt out of that infant crawlspace then you opt out of the tower of collaboration. That opting out can lead both to personal enrichment and to tower seeding. But the continued pretense of opting in, crawfishly, is to emerge in culture as a gross immorality.” *The Road to Religious Reality*, Axial Publishing, 2012, 46-7, notes omitted.

20th century. But an altogether deeper change is needed, one indeed beyond present fantasy, if we are to rise quite beyond the level of our times to a new How-language⁴³ regarding, guarding, Ulti-mates. “So you think you can dance with the Ultimates?”⁴⁴ My own messy efforts help to see the difficulty of the situation.⁴⁵ In 1961, at the invitation of Fr. John Courtney Murray to present the core theological message of *Verbum* in a single article, I produced an old-style, “The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God.”⁴⁶ Six years later I at least arrived at an effort to converse with the Three Friends, but it was scarcely a seed for what is needed.⁴⁷ Fifty years of brooding over Lonergan’s Latin Treatises only brings me to the edge of the quest, and Lonergan does not now help forward in his holding with, and by, his old-style remoteness. I illustrated that remoteness in the previous essay by quoting his marvelous “the answer is easily reached” at the end of *Insight*, chapter 5. In the Latin works there is the regular occurrence of the Latin-style phrase “these things having been well understood” and the things

⁴³ This is a massive complex topic that I have touched on here and there in these past years. It has a long history of personal searching beginning with the title of the second chapter of *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, Axial Publishing, 1998: “How-Language: Works?” I had little idea there what I was getting into.

⁴⁴ See the reference above, note 17, to the article in volume 6 (2011) of the *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*. The article was in fact a compendium of two lectures given on the importance of aesthetic meaning, where the emphasis was on the meaning of dance. The lectures are part of the website series *Bridgepoise: Bridgepoise 3* and *Bridgepoise 10: “Liberal Arts as the Core of future Sciences”*, Part One and Part Two. The series is available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/bridgepoise.html>.

⁴⁵ It seems appropriate to comment broadly on those messy efforts of fifty years. What functional specialty were they in? They were messy efforts of mine in random dialectic and struggling foundations, but they can be considered now as belonging to the output of functional communications which therefore swing into recycling through functional research. Is all this stuff worth re-cycling? – I am recalling the slogan at the end of *Posthumous 1* (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/posthumous-01.pdf>), which points to the badly-needed poise of “eliminating totalitarian ambitions.” “An Interview with Bernard Lonergan, edited by Philip McShane, *A Second Collection*, edited by William Ryan and Bernard Tyrrell, Darton Longman and Todd, 1974, at page 213. But it is important to note that the place now of the core of that climb is in the communal work described with wonderful brutality in lines 18 – 33 of *Method in Theology*, 250.

⁴⁶ *Theological Studies*, 1962.

⁴⁷ The Prayer to the Three forms chapter 7 of *Music That Is Soundless*, written in 1968: Axial Publishing, 2007.

before and after are presented there in the usual remoteness.⁴⁸ So, for example, the quotation with which I started concludes a four-page reflection on the assertion, “Although the indwelling of the divine persons exists more in acts and is better known in acts, still it is constituted through the state of grace.”⁴⁹ In the four pages there are odd hints and nudges in the direction of which I speak, but written in that old style that is conducive to missing the pointing. So, the second sentence points out: “We are not speaking here about the presence of a stone to stones but of a person to persons.”⁵⁰ But what does it point out, or in, or (about)³, to the normal reader of our culture?⁵¹ How does that normal reader travel on towards such a statement as “we are not our own, for we are temples of the Holy Ghost”?⁵² Does the normal reader think here of self and Grace in subject-as-subject resonance, indeed in the molecular fashion that shakes the old-styled virtue of charity into a growing personal self-possession mediated by the

⁴⁸ There are problems here that come under the general problematic of HOW-language development and of the emergence in the third stage of meaning of a mediated compactness that, e.g., lifts talk of prime matter from the remoteness of Lonergan’s talk towards a later way of meaning the Upanishads’ expression. Read the two in sequence and muse over the communication’s problem. “‘Potency’ denotes the component of proportionate being to be known in fully explanatory knowledge by an intellectually patterned experience of the empirical residue.” (*Insight*, 457); “Primal matter is perishable; Hara is the immortal imperishable. One god has power over both perishable and self. Through mediation on him, through practice, through his being entity and more, in the end the whole *maya* ceases.” *Svetasvatara Upanishad*, book 1. So, we might ask Grace, and do indeed ask with Grace, “What then is prime matter? What then is fully explanatory knowledge?”

⁴⁹ *The Triune God: Systematics*, 513.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 515.

⁵¹ The normal, reader, sadly, includes the present community of religious studies. Perhaps it is of benefit to end here as I ended my little book that is a younger but parallel appeal of mine regarding accepted normality in the studies of both economies and religions, *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, (Axial Publishing, 2011): “The sadness reaches destructively into the next generations, for, the legitimate unexpressed desire in so many for a viewpoint on the level of the times is frustrated. I can only appeal to each of us to ask, ‘Is it I?’, in relation to my dialectic and foundational accusation of our settling for rich description, and comparison in rich descriptions, in place of the desperate global need of the exercise of either of Lonergan’s canons of explanation.” (93)

⁵² *Ibid.*, 519. Pp. 501 and 503 give collections of equivalent statements on the earthly dwellings of divine persons.

inner word of flexible circles of ranges of schemes of recurrence?⁵³ Are Grace and I in conversations that twine luminously around heart and hypothalamus,⁵⁴ so that Jung's gropings regarding the animus and anima become a wonder of adult growth in personal relations that weave on thus through everlasting life?⁵⁵

And now, obviously, I am leading both of us to think here not of the normal reader, or even of readers who have worked their way through this book of Lonergan. My lead is to us thinking in strenuous fantasy of the Tower People of the future in the normative fashion that would invite them to spiral endlessly

⁵³ My broad reference is to *Insight*, Chapter 15, within the reach described in note 29 above. A more particular context is that of Quodlibet 3, "Being Breathless and Late in Talking about Virtue," (available at: <http://www.philipmcschane.ca/quod-03.pdf>) which adds here the challenge of conceiving Grace's "natural resultances" not only as a vaguely-described indwelling, but in a massively fresh take on Augustine's and Thomas's struggles with the notion of vestiges of the trinity. See *Summa Theologica*, Ia, Q. 45, a.7. So one finds The Three intelligently operative within a plan that includes Grace's dynamic viral Radiance in the pre-human cosmos, moving towards fuller molecular Poise these past seven million, adding layers to the human touch – and indeed to the radiance of living things like sacred trees and elephants – in the yearnings of world religions, rising both to new galactic brooding and to new intimate residence in the 4-Presence of the Incarnation (CWL 12, second last paragraph of Q.22, to be built forward through to Q. 32 in a theology intimated in what follows here), and blossoming into a Pentecostal Presence that makes factual the oddity of worship without walls (*John* 4:20, 23) and the glorious uniqueness of indwellings and namings (*Revelations* 2:17), a cosmic climbing of billions of years that is a Listening to the Symphonic Vine of Christ, vinedressed in the lonely call Om. (*John* 14-17). There is much more to contemplate about the molecularity of the four-presence in the weaving towards the glory of an everlastingly expanding Eschaton, the genetic reality of which is even a Graced presence in the neurodynamics of the human minding of Jesus. Alas, this strange molecular vision poses huge problems to a heuristic that is not praying within the third Metaword, **W₃**, "Double You Three."

⁵⁴ There is the sexual overtone to the hypothalamus reference that relates to a needed reconsideration of the concluding pages of "Finality, Love, Marriage" that I have referred to previously in *The Road to Religious Reality* (Axial Publishing, 2012) in note 101 of page 46. See also note 35 above.

⁵⁵ See note 57 below regarding the post-mortem dynamic. Regarding Jung, I would note the later reference in chapter 15 of *Insight*, (482), which puts the topic in the context of Posthumous 4, and the reference in chapter 17 (557), which adds the context of "comeabout" (*Insight*, 537) and that of the second canon of hermeneutics (*Insight*, 609-10). These contexts, within that of note 29 above, shift the ballpark of the neurodynamics of personality into a rich remote world of explanation, a world where "fuse into a single explanation" (*Insight*, 610, line 9) takes on new meaning, calling indeed for a capital letter in Explanation.

onwards into a community that would be luminously “*eo magis unum*,”⁵⁶ sharing borderlessly⁵⁷ the intimate word, a standard model, that would ground a cyclic outreach of concrete fantasy and understanding. That concrete creativity would reach bedrooms and banks, ghettos and governments, farming and filmmaking, in a manner that whispers to our molecules melodies of the Eschaton.

⁵⁶ See CWL 2, *Verbum. Word and Idea in Aquinas*, chapter 5. And there is now a set of interesting theological questions that ferment around the statement of *Insight 442*: “Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view.” Grace embraces the Tower, and the Word, the theoretic understanding of God, leads the weaving of humanity towards the neurodynamics of glorylight in the Black Whole of Dad. Recall notes 32 and 35 above.

⁵⁷ This is a complex pointer to both pilgrim and Eschatological stages of humanity’s circumincessional spiral. There is the spiral climb up-round the Tower of People solving “the problem of history which is the real catch.” CWL 10, *Topics in Education*, 236. It is to have its own strange topology, a multidimensional global Klein bottle containing new wine to flow into plain plane meaning, and, in later millennia, into a daily Cana. Then there is to be a strange neurodynamic borderlessness of Eschatological life, Persons and persons – in their hundred billions – in an everlastingly growing intimacy of molecules and minds, of words and Word that is everlastingly incomplete.