

## Posthumous 9

### Poosition, Comparison, Finite Processions

Posthumous 8 took a humorous and, yes, an aggressive turn. There was my hope that I would get a somewhat parallel response: amusement at my silliness or audacity or whatever; offense at my insulting view of Lonergan studies. But the response has been the silence that I commented on in that previous essay.

I could say that I feel like Herman Weyl after 1918, a year in which he made his significant push towards what was to emerge as Gauge Theory.<sup>1</sup> He was not quite on the mark but still he received responses that were an offensive invitation to go learn some serious physics.<sup>2</sup> The unhappy difference with my efforts is that there is no outcry from colleagues telling me that I have been and am quite wrong, that I should go back and learn some philosophy or theology.

My Weyl – pronounced “vile” - parallel puts me in the context of those first pages of *Method in Theology*, where Lonergan nudges us to keep an eye on the more successful sciences, which yield “cumulative and progressive results.”<sup>3</sup> Which brings me back to my nudging us to suspect that Lonerganism is not moving that way: where are the cumulative and progressive results of the past forty years? But best leave that question to the painful puzzlings that should emerge from my final seventh section here.<sup>4</sup>

In a first section, however, I continue with some musing on the silence with which my bluntness has been treated. In sections 2, 4, and 6 I comment, respectively, on the three words of my title, [2] Poositioning; [4] Comparison; [6] Finite

---

<sup>1</sup> On Gauge Theory, see Richard Healey, *Gauging What's Real. The Conceptual Foundations of Contemporary Gauge Theories*, Oxford University Press, 2007. Interestingly, as a strengthening of my case for functional collaboration and divisions of labour, I would note that this full context lifts Gauge Theory, part of standard model heuristics, into cyclic collaboration. The full answer to the question, ‘What is Physics?’ demands that context.

<sup>2</sup>For Herman Weyl’s original paper and the various responses to it, see Lochlainn O’Raifeartaigh, *The Dawning of Gauge Theory*, Princeton University Press, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> *Method in Theology*, 4. On page 5 he puts the point in italics.

<sup>4</sup> At the beginning of the first section I point to a “brighter side.”

Processions. The other sections, odd-numbered as noted immediately, deal with [3] my larger positioning; [5] N.T. Wright's work as it is to find a place in the full context of theology's functional collaboration; [7] Lonergan's overture to me and you in lines 18-33 of *Method in Theology* page 250.

## 1 The Silence

There may be many reasons for the silence, but one in particular is worth pausing over in friendly and constructive fashion.<sup>5</sup> It is the silence of embarrassment. "Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company,"<sup>6</sup> and the central embarrassing doctrine of *Insight* is the "rule of extreme importance, for failure to observe it results in the substitution of pseudometaphysical mythmaking for scientific inquiry,"<sup>7</sup> the scientific inquiry that is at the heart of "a series of fundamental changes that have come about in the last four centuries

---

<sup>5</sup> As well as the silence I pause over in the text, there is the silencing I mention here briefly in this note and note 53. So, while I agree with Lonergan that "the significance of satire and humor is, I suggest, out of proportion to their efficacy," (*Insight*, 649), I feel it necessary to talk for the space of a note or two, not of silence, but of silencers. They obviously add to the mesh of kingdom and cross that I write of later (see notes 62 and 63 and the text there), but their statistical reduction is to be a feature of the spiraling of the Tower of Able. So my ramble here is not gratuitous bitching: implementation of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> functional specialties need to aim at "eliminating totalitarian ambitions" (Lonergan, *A Second Collection*, 213) of this kind. At all events, the abundance of unpublished books on my website bears witness to the silencing of publishers and publishers' readers. And there are of course – Do you too grin or growl at such memories? – rejected articles. I do not wish to enlarge on this but one instance needs mentioning since the article is important. It is the article entitled "What to do? The Heart of Lonergan's Ethics," which appeared in *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 7 (2012), available at: <http://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/jmda/article/view/361/233>. It had been commissioned for a volume on Lonergan studies, but was cut out by the University of Toronto Press readers, to the astonishment of later readers. Who are these pompous asses? On the University of Toronto Press my silence here is perhaps eloquent. In note 53 I take a satirical shot at *Theological Studies*. Then there is the matter of a reader rejecting my original Appendix A of *Phenomenology and Logic*: CWL 18. It is another valuable piece for this context: it appears in Chapter 5 of my *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2007). So perhaps I am talking too of the ventures associated with the 1<sup>st</sup> functional specialty? "What is worth recycling" is not to be dictated by an editor or "an Ogpu" (Lonergan, *For a New Political Economy*, CWL 21, 7).

<sup>6</sup> *Method in Theology*, 299.

<sup>7</sup> *Insight*, 528.

and a half.”<sup>8</sup> The Lonergan community as a whole, from the beginning, “had no real apprehension of the nature of these changes.”<sup>9</sup>

But can we not now twist, indeed with the humour of the previous essay, towards being cheerful? There are the serious descriptive efforts of the past half century of Lonergan studies. A lean into the basic stance I advocate in the first *Posthumous* essay can reveal effectively a bright side: “these are worth recycling.”<sup>10</sup> The leaning is not going to be easy: it requires a molecular bend in and of strenuous fantasy. The lean needs initially to involve amygdalic feedbacks in simple bodily and linguistic performances,<sup>11</sup> generating some of the group ethos mentioned in *Posthumous* 8.

But what of the cycling process? The ethos is to include the patience of the mind-and-body bending and the blossoming incarnate conviction that “cycling is worth recycling” in a really messy fashion. The messy cycling will self-identify the drop-ins and the drop-ons: there are to be no drop-outs. The drop-ins are to share the agony and the ecstasy of the Tower. What I call the drop-ons are people who, yes, qualify at some level as competent in Lonergan studies but who venture towards lighter forms of implementation, either in the seeding of FS8 or in what I call C<sub>9</sub>.<sup>12</sup> For all this the Tower diagram of collaboration,<sup>13</sup> or some form of it, will play the role of the periodic table: it names the X of functional collaboration just as the chemical table on the inner cover of grade 11 texts names a two-year road

---

<sup>8</sup> *Method in Theology*, 317.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> See the conclusion of *Posthumous* 1.

<sup>11</sup> See note 16 below for Lonergan’s mention of linguistic feed-back. It is a massively complex contemporary topic of neurochemical studies. There are important zones of it to be developed in institutionalizing – in the best sense of the display of *Method in Theology* page 48 regarding personal relating – conversations of adult growth. Age is to count more and more in coming centuries. There needs to be increasingly poised age- and pace-sensitivities.

<sup>12</sup> The basic diagram I shall refer to right through here is **W<sub>3</sub>**, one of an incomplete set **W<sub>i</sub>** introduced together in *Prehumous* 2, “Metaphysics and Metawords” (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/prehumous-02.pdf>). **W<sub>3</sub>** is reproduced on page 161 of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publications, 2010. Hereafter **Lonergan Biography**.

<sup>13</sup> A 3-dimensional version of **W<sub>3</sub>** is produced on page 163 of **Lonergan Biography** under the title, “The Tower of Able: Lonergan’s Dream.”

of schooling. All this will make more sense in the context to be generated by the following sections, but that Tower lift can be teasingly anticipated here by considering the Periodic Table to be a first answer to the question, “What is chemistry?” The full answer to that question identifies chemistry as an integral component in global cyclic care.<sup>14</sup>

## 2. Poositionings

*Poosition* is the middle word of the title of my essay of exactly ten years ago, *Cantower 9*, “Position, Poosition, Protopossession.”<sup>15</sup> Poosition, briefly, is the molecular and neuromolecular internalization of the corresponding position, and if one wishes to engage in such poositioning of positioning, one has to articulate self-referentially and aesthetically to self and others the corresponding position. This indeed is the deep message of linguistic feedback,<sup>16</sup> illustrated in an initial fashion by the reflections of Dick Liddy on noising abroad his struggle towards ‘the position’.<sup>17</sup>

I see no need to repeat the reflections of *Cantower 9* here: it is readily available, and it brings out the narrative character of talking out one’s possession of any position: this is a key requirement of the ‘1833’ process to which we return in the

---

<sup>14</sup> See note 1 above, on Physics.

<sup>15</sup> It would be an essay in itself to indicate my decade climbing since I wrote that long (35 page) essay that concludes with Patrick Kavanagh’s magnificent poem on God. Position and poosition were no trouble to me, but, under the word *Protopossession*. I was struggling towards a luminous meaning of community, both in its sense as Tower subjects and in its sense as Tower objects (as in the challenge of Canon 2 of Hermeneutics). It was only at the end of the decade that images of future Tower subjects “living human bodies linked together in charity” (Insight, 745), **characters** of Christ and temples of Grace, began to take concrete heuristic meaning. Some further pointers are contained in the text but more especially in the later notes (see especially note 58). The push on understanding and imaging Canon 2 continued through the *FuSe* essays, available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/fuse.html>.

<sup>16</sup> This is an enormously important topic, especially in the matter of the neurochemistry of self-address. It is introduced in a gentle fashion by Lonergan in note 34 of *Method in Theology* on page 88. Another reference to it was lost at line 12 of page 92, which should read (the lost piece is in italics): “linguistic *feed-back* is achieved, that is in the measure that explanations....”

<sup>17</sup> Richard M. Liddy, *Startling Strangeness. Reading Lonergan’s Insight*, University Press of America, 2007.

final section below. And indeed it is a positioning regarding that 1833 positioning that is my central interest here: the other central issue of section 6 will be sensed gradually. But initially it is a matter of a simple reluctant positioning oneself in reading those 1833 lines, perhaps privately musing over one's reluctance to join the enterprise. Of course, *per se*, in the cycle, the joining is the task only of the dialecticians. But being luminous about where one stands is of the essence of following Lonergan's advice about life, even if one is not at the musical height of the 1833 overture. And indeed, it might be as well, in this first reading of my variations on the theme, to turn immediately to section 7 in order to sniff the place of that venture in one's living and one's reading not just of Lonergan but of any of the four gospels.<sup>18</sup>

### 3. My Larger Positionings

I use the word *position* in the title here rather than the word *poisition*. You may take for granted that there is/was a lag between the two in any instance in my or your climb beyond position to poisition, and again that climb or its failure is to be part of the discomfoting sharing Lonergan asks for in the 1833 overture.

I am not here going to venture on my own 1833 self-exposition. That is a task best postponed till it is shared by others doing either the dialectic task or simply the necessary task of self-discovery, of becoming enlightened on just where one stands with regard e.g. to theory.<sup>19</sup> But of special interest, in the context of these *Posthumous* essays, is where you stand with regard to functional collaboration. Still, my own strategic bent here – beyond the 1833 overture, but in it – is to

---

<sup>18</sup> A context for such reflection is provided by Lonergan, CWL 11, *The Triune God: Doctrines*: 639-85. Obviously N.T. Wright's work on the four gospels, *How God Became King* (Harper, 2012), the focus of section 5 below, is another context. I make no attempt to sort out these various contexts here, or to locate them in the full collaboration mentioned in note 1. But I think there are enough clues to lead to a locating of the task of such geohistorical locating. Wright's book is to be referred to below simply as *How God Became King*.

<sup>19</sup> See the text at note 7 above. This, for me, is the major crisis of present Lonergan studies. It is presented strategically in **Lonergan Biography**, chapter 10. There is a communal challenge here that meshes with the integral perspective on kingdom and cross offered descriptively by Wright in *How God Became King*, Part 3. It is to be a daily repentant Godplod for all churches, all religions, all of us. Recall the texts at notes 6 - 9 above.

interest you in another positioning and positioning, one raised in previous essays,<sup>20</sup> and so I wish you to focus, from whatever level you are at present living at, on my present piece of climbing.

My struggle at present is with the positioning demanded by what I treat of briefly in section 6 below and more elaborately but in less developed fashion – after all, I am climbing! – in the articles mentioned just now in note 20 and those mentioned in section 6. How is one to molecularize as pilgrim<sup>21</sup> the inner word that is articulated in that section?

It is as well to note that such a molecularizing enterprise is a two-way street: the inner word, a psychic skin, is lifted in that struggle towards a fuller content of real assent.<sup>22</sup> And it is also necessary to note that the inner word is something one should expect to change daily. Every lift of context nudges and lifts the concepts in that context,<sup>23</sup> and to be luminous about the lifting and twisting gives one's lift not only a pattern of genetic surprises but an expectation of such surprises, that can poise one to see oneself as a strange divine galaxy with one's very own challenge of *Comparison* within the phyletic challenge.

#### 4. *Comparison*

I see no advantage in trying to compress the climb to the meaning of this word, a climb that took me from December 1971 till December 2011. From a late leap of

---

<sup>20</sup> The topic is scattered through the writings of these last ten years. Best just stick with a personal effort to mesh Posthumous 3 and 4 in a search for an explanatory lift into a personal strange psychic reality of "*magis ei est intimum*" (the end of paragraph 1 of *Contra Gentiles* IV, 11), the beginning of the life-climb through that chapter and beyond. Section 6 gives further leading references.

<sup>21</sup> The pilgrim molecularization is an anticipation and a seeding of the accelerated everlasting eschatological adventure.

<sup>22</sup> Another twist on this is to note that I am grappling here with features of foundational prayer, a topic I raised in the five essays with "Foundational Prayer" as title: *Prehumous* 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/prehumous.html>). Such foundational prayer is obviously character-forming, with a meaning of *character* to be reached from the first paragraph of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia* lifted into the context I pointed to in note 15.

<sup>23</sup> On concepts and contexts, see Lonergan, *CWL 2, Verbum. Word and Idea in Aquinas*, at page 238.

these past years there emerged the little book *Method in Theology 101 AD 9011. The Road to Religious Reality*.

Something short might help here, prior to you attempting to share, at your own climbing level, the view of *Comparison* that I suggest.

Think, then, of a young dove with an injured wing<sup>24</sup> in the presence of 10 caring vets.<sup>25</sup> What would be good would be these 10 being up-to-date on the present best theory of the genetic development of this variety of dove. Even better would be that the group were tuned into the story of the best views on the dove, that story genetically controlled in critical discernment of applications. So, some ancient remedy might well hit it off in this particular case.<sup>26</sup> The 10 vets are to know this, to know indeed that they should be at or beyond “the level of the times,”<sup>27</sup> and operating in “elitist”<sup>28</sup> fashion in the situation.

Our present dove place, Dovecoat,<sup>29</sup> is the particular variety of finitude in which we live. But let us fancy our dove, our *Windhover, God’s Grandeur*, as ill.<sup>30</sup> Is

---

<sup>24</sup> “Think then” or think now, and I appeal to you to pause – this belongs in the 1833 Overture – of how you are thinking of **dove**. It is very unlikely that you were, that are you, in the **comeabout** state (start eleven lines from the end of *Insight*, 537). As a help recall that the dove is of the pigeon family and then (when?!) tackle Terry Quinn’s Halifax Conference paper of July 2012, “Fledgling functional foundations for the biology of the adult pigeon,” which available by writing the author: [terrance.quinn@mtsu.edu](mailto:terrance.quinn@mtsu.edu)

<sup>25</sup> Ten years ago, 2002, in *Cantower 8*, “Slopes: An Encounter” available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/cantower8.pdf>), I invented a group of ten – including people like Seamus Heaney – who would face the pain of self-exposure and slope up, in a converging fashion, from their particular disciplines to the encounters described in the 1833 overture. In the decade since 2002 I have pushed to realistic fantasy so as to arrive at numbers of Tower participants that would be plausibly adequate for Global Care by 9011 A.D. See the essay “Arriving in Cosmopolis,” available in both English and Spanish at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/archives.html>.

<sup>26</sup> You may think here of present shifts in medical treatments to ancient practices.

<sup>27</sup> *Method in Theology*, 350.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 351.

<sup>29</sup> The misspelling of *dovecote* is, of course, deliberate, nudging the sideshow of the seamless robe of John 19:23, lifted to another twist on the Kingdom as aggregated temples that “fuse into a single Explanation” (*Insight*, 610). The “e” is not capitalized in the text: I am adding the meaning of the second Person in God, identified fully in the divine decision to establish the whirl of a seamless robe, a Symphony, a Dovecoat.

Grace ill? Certainly She is ill-templed. The molecular patterns of her Embrace are faulty, warped patterns of brains and bombs and business and busyness. Might not global carers strive to reach beyond today's best views, reach beyond the present towards what I call<sup>31</sup> (discernment)<sup>3</sup>, a self-luminous discernment that would ground "bright wings"<sup>32</sup> and so lift us all to wonder at, and wend our pilgrim way in, "the achieve, the mastery of the thing!"<sup>33</sup>

But the key point is that each and all of these experts would compare their suggested treatment to what fits with the best accumulation of bird care.

So you may arrive at a suspicion of the meaning of *Comparison* on page 250 of *Method in Theology* as that best glimpse that would be an effective open story of the stories of the flight of the Dove, an open story that is the inner word of the mystical body of Jesus, the seamless symphony of Christ.<sup>34</sup>

## 5. The Wright Stuff

It would be ludicrous to attempt to comment on Wright's massive output. In *Posthumous* 7 I suggested that we might focus on *Simply Jesus*,<sup>35</sup> but now what I intend is to make a few helpful pointers towards *Comparison* – and in section 7 towards the work of Overture 1833 - with the help of his latest book *How God Became King*. The focus of his book is on a fresh integral reading of the four gospels.

"Reading the gospels as the launching of God's renewed people is not merely a historical note: 'This was where and how our story began.' It

<sup>30</sup> I refer here to two well-known sonnets of G.M. Hopkins.

<sup>31</sup> I introduced the notion of "discernment of discernments of discernments," (discernment)<sup>3</sup>, in the conclusion to my website book, *The Redress of Poise*, chapter one, "The value of Lonergan's economics for Lonergan students," available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/redress.pdf>

<sup>32</sup> The conclusion of Hopkins' "God's Grandeur."

<sup>33</sup> Line 8 of *The Windhover*. Note that the poem is dedicated "To Christ our Lord."

<sup>34</sup> This is the central topic of my little book, *Method in Theology 101 AD 9011. The Road to Religious Reality*, Axial Publications, 2011.

<sup>35</sup> N.R. Wright, *Simply Jesus. A New Vision of Who He Was, What He Did, And Why He Matters*, Harper, 2011, is the Wright book I introduced in the previous essay.



declares too: 'this is the sort of people we are: suffering kingdom bringers, suffering kingdom-sharers.' ”<sup>36</sup>

The evangelists were existentially and historically poised “as they struggled to understand the enormous thing that had just happened in their midst.”<sup>37</sup> “God’s worldwide sovereignty on earth as in heaven. .... How can we even begin to understand this?”<sup>38</sup>

Return now to the pointers regarding *Comparison*, regarding the sequence of theses on the Symphony of Jesus, regarding the piccolo-person in the mirror that may tune into that symphony. Think further of the 100 billion piccolos and tubas genetico-dialectically tuned into the symphony way before symphonies were thought of, but not ‘before’ “God’s concept and choice”<sup>39</sup> of a finitude that, “so to speak, brings God too close to man.”<sup>40</sup> Further, think of the telling of that symphony over the ages, *Upanishads* and other Old Testaments, within which there lie, even fit, the telling and the tellers of these four gospels. How do we fit John’s telling in? Do we not need some strange grip on the symphony of symphonies and the existential music they spread in geohistorical musty mustarding, so that “the explanatory differentiation of the protean notion of being fuse into a single explanation”?<sup>41</sup> A discouraging task: tracking forward with creative practicality, way beyond 9011 A.D., Shaun’s tale.<sup>42</sup> “You can either sit on

---

<sup>36</sup> *How God Became King*, 201-202.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

<sup>39</sup> *Insight*, 748.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 747.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 610.

<sup>42</sup> An obvious reference to the spiral climb of Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*. It leads me to recall my 1989, much more elementary, expression of the cyclic structure of our human climb. I omit a host of footnotes to *The Wake*. “The third stage of global meaning, with its mutual mediation of an academic presence, is a distant probability, needing painfilled solitary reaching towards a hearing of hearing, a touching of touching, ‘in the far ear’, ‘sanscreeed’, making luminously present – in focal darkness – our bloodwashed bloodstream. It is a new audacity, a new hapticity, to which we must aspire, for which we must pray” (so ends the final chapter of *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*, written 23 years ago: unpublished of course (ho ho: see note 5 above) but available at:

<http://www.philipmcshane.ca/process.pdf>).

your hands, or you can put spade to earth and move the first sod.”<sup>43</sup> But Those Three weave on, mysteriously and successfully, to fuse all into a Single Explanation, Simply Jesus.

## 6. Finite Processions

How do they so weave? There is a geohistory of answers, and here I piccolo forward my little take on “the music of the spheres,”<sup>44</sup> my tuning forward of the genetics of symphonies within the history of symphonies planned and performed, the history of locally-roomed symphonies.

One might think of this venture as doctrinal venturing crying out for the cycling on of a gloriously genetic systematics. Or one might think of the venture more elementarily as functional research, noting things worth cycling.<sup>45</sup>

Lonergan notes something worth cycling in Thomas: the struggle with the meaning of *natural resultance*,<sup>46</sup> like the natural presence of mind in soul.<sup>47</sup> Is there a *causa* that steps beyond the usual five? Might I call it a “causality of presence”?

---

<sup>43</sup> F.E. Crowe S.J., *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study in History*, Paulist Press, New York, 1978, 149.

<sup>44</sup> I replace my usual reference to Shakespeare’s *Pericles* with a reference to the first verse of the hymn, “This is God’s Wondrous World,” words by Maltbie Davenport Babcock (1911). But there is the need to lift the reference into the full spectrum of human rhythms, beyond traditional piety or drama. Think, for example, of the hidden messages of Lonergan’s “Finality, Love, Marriage,” *CWL 4, Collection*.

<sup>45</sup> Again, I call attention to the parallels to reading the periodic table. So, there is and is to be phyletic and ontic growth in the reading and praying of **W<sub>3</sub>**, “Double You Three,” spiraling, ontically and phyletically, into eschatological circumincessions that are unendingly, gloriously, surprisingly, incomplete. But for now the important thing is to fantasize about the difference between the initial and the more mature stages of the tasking sketched on page 250 of *Method in Theology*.

<sup>46</sup> See Lonergan, *Verbum. Word and Idea in Aquinas*, *CWL 2*, 145-49.

<sup>47</sup> See *Verbum*, 147, at note 235.

Again, there is the struggle of Thomas and Augustine regarding vestiges or traces of the Trinity.<sup>48</sup> It is well worth brooding over at length, indeed there is worth in brooding over Thomas' effort here as it parallels Wright's efforts: the paralleling effort helps to glimpse the full scope of the dynamics of geohistorical genetic comparison, two weaving seeding contexts in geohistory that I overlap in this short essay. But that is a task for the developed theology of a later day. Meantime, lace in as best you can the sincere struggle of Augustine and Thomas to find traces of the Trinity in creatures beyond that given by intelligible processions. The results can be found to be strangely continuous with my reachings – again, one must think through this with the help of geohistorical diagrams of contiguous and overlapping contexts. Thomas respects Augustine's efforts, as I do, and I could well push the issue of continuity with Augustine's reach as he talks of the Three in terms of "*quod constat, quod discernitur, quod congruit*,"<sup>49</sup> or "*modus, species et ordo*."<sup>50</sup> But again, a task for a later developed theology.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> The relevant text is in the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa*, q. 45, a. 7, but obviously digesting the context given by the previous article is vital: it is not an easy matter to grapple with decisions about each other by three Persons with one consciousness in which only one Person speaks. And it is useful here to think of intimately conjoined triplets. Such empirical thinking about shared sensibilities and thinking also helps in reaching for a glimpse of the dynamic fullness of eschatological circumincessional consciousness.

<sup>49</sup> That a thing exists (*constat*), that it is discernible (*discernitur*), that it fits (congruity). It is worthwhile relating the second form-focused pointer back to the (discernment)<sup>3</sup> of note 31 above. And one may lift that into the dynamics of the reality of Jesus' Symphony and the genetic discernments required in sequentially caring for its Brahmanesque cosmic well-being (see note 59 below).

<sup>50</sup> Mode, species, and order.

<sup>51</sup> A single basic illustration adds to our overall context. Think of the geohistorical genetic trail that is to carry forward through Augustine's spirit-searching "congruity" and "order" and beyond Lonergan's "potency as limitation" and "potency and finality" (*Insight*, 467-76) - where Lonergan adds in a brilliant identification of the meaning of energy (see **Lonergan Biography**, 178-88) to a theological heuristics of infolding that would place Grace's lurking embrace luminously in the cosmic dynamics from the huge negativity of primitive energy through the infoldings of physics, chemistry, botany, zoology and mind. The famous heart-flooding of *Romans* 5:5 would mesh with an explanatory cherishing – "theoretical understanding's embrace" (*Insight*, 442) – of genital and psychic lonelineses and release human searchings from brutally oppressive myths to find their provident way into a pilgrim anticipation of the

So I hint at a lift forward of this struggle by adding to the context of the heuristic  $W_3$ .<sup>52</sup> I have been venturing into this steadily now for some years, with occasional published suggestions.<sup>53</sup> But I would emphasize that the suggestions have a

---

everlastingly incomplete neurodynamic circumincessional negentropy, a growing fullness of the Hosanna of "Double You Three."

<sup>52</sup>  $W_3$ , Double You Three, is to become a communal kataphatic contemplative ethos of those called into the Tower of Able. What I am struggling with here and in note 59 below is the final line at the bottom of the diagram of  $W_3$ . How do the four real relations in God weave into that flow of finitude?

<sup>53</sup> Two articles are immediately available: [a] "The Hypothesis of Non-accidental Human Participation in the Divine Active Spiration," *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* N.S. 2.2 (2011) 187-202; [b] Posthumous 4, "Conversing with Divine Friends."

In note 3 above I talked of silencers, and can't help grinning over the years of outreach to *Theological Studies*. A relevant piece of my contribution to the controversy on the aforementioned hypothesis between Bob Doran and Charles Hefling Jr. (see *Theological Studies* 68 [2007]) was rejected by the journal. It appears as the 20 page *Prehumous* 9, "Lack in the Systems Talk," available at <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/prehumous-09.pdf>. But my humor bubbles when I think of my rejected "The Reach for Jesus", which is included in *Prehumous* 10 (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/prehumous-10.pdf>), of that title: pages 11-31. One reader considered it unacceptable because it was above the heads of the readers. A curious criterion: one does not get into most journals of science unless the article is above the heads of the readers! My story with *Theological Studies* is a comedy. My first article there "The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God" (1962) was commissioned by John Courtney Murray. I was in first year theology at the time, but Murray, according to Fred Crowe's surmise, thought I was a professor. The next year Murray published my "Causality of the Sacraments." I have had nothing published in *Theological Studies* since. But I may move beyond humor and satire here by noting what I wrote in section 2, "Transformations" of chapter 4, "Intentional Process" of the unpublished (yes, another reject: ho ho) book of 1990, *Process. Introducing themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*, available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/process.pdf>. There I wrote of the transformation of chemical journals in Europe and America after the shift of 1869 in chemistry to the Periodic Table. Lonergan's shift in the *Gregorianum* of 1969 resulted in no such scientific shift. I went on in that section of the book to satirize such journals as *Theological Studies* in terms of chemical journals of the early nineteenth century. Let me recall my wit of 1989, caricaturing "one contemporary journal's content" (I won't mention the journal's name: it appears to be alive still!) in terms of a bogus volume of *The Journal of General Chemistry*. Some of the articles in this bogus volume are: "Neurochemical Factors in Strabismus"; "The Morality of Chemical Pollution of Fishing Rivers"; "Iodine Content of Cat Food"; "Automobile Rust-control in Montreal Winters"; "The Ozone Layer and the Economy of Australian Resorts." Again I recall note 5 above. This ramble is not gratuitous. First, there is the need for eliminating OGPUs or their Western or Oriental equivalents. Secondly, my satire is a wake-up call to the datedness of present theological journaling. And here I also recall, in that *Process* section, noting the locked

context, making this doctrinal for the advanced and making it research for the beginners.  $W_3$  perhaps points to that context well for all, but it seems good to add a simple effective symbolic context: I am speaking of God as  $G_{jk}^i$ , the Trinitarian God one can leap to from struggling, in a mastery reached - only by climbing thus far in the book - with *Insight* 19.7. Then one may be able to think, on one's psychic skin, of Grace's presence not now just as "hovering over the waters" in *Genesis* 1: 1, but as dancing with the new chemicals within that first second, 13.7 billion years ago, like a virus in being, in relatively autonomic reach.<sup>54</sup>

---

schemes of recurrence of a group of journals – they seemed to avoid reading each other - published in, well, a certain holy city, putting me in mind of inert gases. But thirdly, there is a point to be made about the controversy between Doran, Hefling and myself. In later private discussions I have sided with Doran despite strong points from that extremely sound thinker Hefling. I do so in the manner of a scientist. In science one does not simply toss back and forth some hypothesis: one ventures towards empirical work, even if it is the work of prayer. Hefling's view cuts back Lonergan's suggestion (*The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 470-3) regarding the four graces in a manner that gets us out of thinking through the suggestion of Active Spiritation as a strange Presence in finitude of two Divine Persons. So, for me, there seems a rich twist there towards finding subtleties of Divine Care that so far have not been dreamed out.

<sup>54</sup> I developed the notions of autonomic, synnomic, and relatively autonomic forms in "Image and Emergence: Towards an Adequate *Weltanschauung*," one of two papers for the Florida Conference of 1970. It is now available as chapter one, *The Shaping of the Foundations* (1976), available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/foundations.pdf>. Chapter two of the book is the second Florida paper, on functional collaboration in musicology. The reflections on autonomic forms etc. are now relevant to considering the Presence of Grace in history. A complexification of that presence occurs in the emergence of humans some seven million years ago. Then there is the wildly infinite surge of the participation in Paternity/Maternity that colours finitude when the second Person becomes incarnate (see chapter 7, "Grace: the Final Frontier," of *The Redress of Poise*, available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/redress.pdf>). That surge includes the initiation of the graces of Jesus discussed in Lonergan's *On the Incarnate Word*, CWL 8. Further complexifications of  $G_{jk}^i$  occur throughout the life of Jesus with magnificent human rooting as His pilgrimage weaves through death, resurrection and ascension. Amazing Grace is now a dominant personality in history, not well recognized - as the hymn "Amazing Grace" typifies in its neutering of Grace. I have, you will notice, introduced the terminology " $G_{jk}^i$ " without either lengthy comment or apology. It is magnificently disturbing use of a term borrowed, with that exact lettering and structure, from general relativity, a wake-up call for those who miss Lonergan's pointing to chapter 5 of *Insight* as a bridge. But the terminology powerfully points towards the problem of serious explanatory advances in understanding a God incarnate that the Hebrews knew as  $j$ aweh and that the Christians must grow to know as  $k$ in.

Venturing on here in any doctrinal detail would be a large heuristic projection of spiraling cyclings, an anticipation of a millennium of the science of human spirit,<sup>55</sup> enlarging minds and neurochemicals and heart strings in harmonies of self-taste in gown and town, Tower and plain.<sup>56</sup> It is to be a new spiraling of *Summas* meeting, in local coordinates, “the problem of history, which is the real catch.”<sup>57</sup>

So perhaps I should stop there, suggesting that the G of the 26<sup>th</sup> place of *Insight* lifts Grace’s story, a G that spacetimewise becomes earthy  $G_{jk}^i$ , from a New Creation of supermaternity to Grace’s discomfoting settling into new temples.<sup>58</sup> Brahman walks the streets, four personalities of atman.<sup>59</sup> And John’s group

<sup>55</sup> I placed the search for the meaning of human spirit in a fuller context in the second half of *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, Axial Publishing, 2010.

<sup>56</sup> The question of ex-plane-ing, of reaching from whatever is the current plane of spiraling in the Tower to the cultural planes, plains, of common sense is one I raised at the end of *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2007), chapter 3. It is a matter of redeeming, in modes of religious aesthetics, *haute vulgarization*.

<sup>57</sup> Lonergan, *CWL 10, Topics in Education*, 236.

<sup>58</sup> Recall note 52 above. One must first come to grips with the *esse secundarium* of the incarnation in the full rich context of relations while still holding with *Insight* 756, lines 25-29 on non-reduction to metaphysical elements. Then one has to struggle with the new cosmic creation of Jesus’ incarnation, with the dynamic tension (pull in *Insight*’s index-stuff on *tension*) between Active Spiration and Passive Spiration in its realization of the calling and speaking of the First Divine Person. The tension during Jesus life has the rich twists sketched in *How God Became King*. The tension brings forth - and more abundantly in the later whirl of the Tower - the seamless symphony of Jesus. The dynamic of the tension is both horizontal and vertical and torsional, reminding us of the need for adequate symbolizations to which we are nudged by  $G_{jk}^i$ , symbol and Reality. In that full context one arrives at the challenge of conceiving of the temples, humans, of the New Covenant in the third stage of meaning, a world of microautonomous globality, of **characters** of religion instead of **personae**. This is a complex problem, yet so simply posed both by increasingly empty church buildings and by John’s hinting (*John* 4:21-24) through Jesus talking at the well in Samaria about worship in spirit and truth.

<sup>59</sup> My strange remark was to be unpacked in the second and third series of 25 seminars that give rise to the FuSe essays but the series faltered in the fifth seminar on general categories. It seems useful to appeal here to mathematics to help our puzzling of “the dimensions” of Brahman. The continuum’s infinity is in quite another ballpark from the infinity e.g. of the fractions. Think then of - contemplate over a lifetime - Brahman as beyond the full series of the transfinite, of atman as just a single fraction, of finitude, added fractions in the chemistry of 14+

writes in glorious intensity of this with no suspicion of the later daring caring global cyclic climb of *Comparison*.

## 7. Lonergan's 1833 Overture Accepted

Lonergan very clearly accepted, in a limited sense, his own overture. He states his Position in *Insight* and elsewhere, and in *Method* itself the position of *Insight* is repeated in his catalogue of categories.<sup>60</sup> He follows through regarding failed positionings and their consequence: this is pretty evident even from the few quotations given in section 1. He leans into the future in various scattered ways that would require a substantial referencing throughout his work.<sup>61</sup>

But our problem here is to see how it can be accepted by us in the cheery humble mood hinted at in the first section, but more fully grounded in the Old and New Testament reachings identified by Wright. Does Lonergan's 1833 overture weave into the call of Jesus?

Certainly the call of the 1833 overture is a weave of kingdom and cross, of which Wright speaks, a weave into each of us storytellers, "... at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay all his cards on the table."<sup>62</sup> Indeed! "At the point where the world is in pain."<sup>63</sup> For each of us dialecticians a remembrance of times past that

---

billion years - as just "a little thing" (Julian of Norwich). Who, then, is doing this typing, this reading?

<sup>60</sup> I have dealt abundantly over the years with the nature of the book *Method in Theology* as tired and descriptive: so there is nothing remarkable in Lonergan leaving out of his list a number (10) that would mesh in the full heuristics of his functional Tower of Able. In the Rice Interviews (see **Lonergan Biography**, 110-12) he talked, with a smile, of leaving that task of implementation to his disciples. The next note here gives a hint of one large typing smile to his followers.

<sup>61</sup> I cannot help repeating my favorite, quite hilarious, Lonergan-pointing to the future: the paragraph at the center of *Method* 287, where Lonergan notes that, with *Insight's* categories, one can go on to do a serious rewrite of the first half of *Method*.

<sup>62</sup> *Method in Theology*, 193.

<sup>63</sup> *How God Became King*, 242. The tenth chapter of this book by Wright (211-49), titled "Kingdom and Cross" is subtitled (italics his), "*The Remaking of Meaning*," and obviously I am suggesting a linking of it with the tenth chapter of *Method*, but particularly that central piece, the 1833 overture. Then one can go on to parallel the final eleventh chapter in *How God Became King*, titled "How to celebrate God's Story," with Lonergan's eleventh chapter on

must needs show, story-wise, levels of some success but also zones where we have been “not old folks but young people of eighteen, very much faded,”<sup>64</sup> where we have been little Salieri’s in the presence of Lonergan’s Mozart.<sup>65</sup> So it seems to me oddly and suggestively fitting to end here by quoting Wright’s entire beginning-page of *How God Became King* chapter 8, titled “Where We Got Stuck.”

“We are now approaching the heart of the four gospels, the dense and complex center of their world of meaning. We should allow ourselves, on a regular basis, to be struck anew by the thick, rich, multilayered nature of these four documents, so full of vivid human scenes, but so evocative of meaning about the world, God, life and death, and pretty much everything else. As I read the gospels and think what the church has done (and hasn’t done) with them, I am reminded of a wonderful scene in Peter Shaffer’s play, *Amadeus*. There, the cynical old court composer Salieri contrasts his own operas, telling and retelling great tales of legendary heroes but through stale and tedious music, with Mozart’s astonishing ability to take characters off the street and create something truly magical. ‘He has taken ordinary people,’ says Salieri, ‘ordinary people – barbers and chambermaids – and he has made them

---

“Foundations.” Wright’s eleventh chapter starts with the dismantling of a car. “The car is the New Testament,” and he goes on to raise the issue of wholeness, particularly wholeness of reading. We are back at the issue of reading *The Dove*, and indeed, more deeply, the issue of reading *reading* that is at the heart of *Insight*’s 17th chapter. Here we may focus the painful challenge of reaching as a global community beyond what Wright calls “a kingdom-shaped gap” (257). His “Conclusion: How to Read the Gospels” (273-6) poses the question that drove my little book, *Road to Religious Reality*. “Have we formulated a concept of the kingdom that does in fact grasp God’s passion to put the world to rights?” (273) We have a painfilled century ahead to begin to glimpse the saving heuristic concept of the seamless symphony of Christ. The saving categories of Lonergan (*Method in Theology*, 286-91), placed in their proper context of the 1833 overture, name the way of the theological cross. That same positioning way, “at the point where the world is in pain,” is to bring us, but later, to a startlingly strange lift of eucharistic theology that will further bridge the kingdom-shaped gap, weaving us into a new eschatology.

<sup>64</sup> Marcel Proust, *Remembrance of Times Past*, Random House, New York, Vol.2, 1042.

<sup>65</sup> The recalling of Salieri echoes vividly with my memory of working through the manuscript of *Insight* in the early 1970s. There were almost no corrections: and this made present to me the scene in the film *Amadeus* where Salieri, in astonishment, drops some Mozart manuscripts shown to him and remarks, “There are no corrections!”



gods and heroes. I have taken gods and heroes .... *and made them ordinary.*”<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> *How God Became King*, 157. Italics in text.