

Q. 45 (continuing Q 44). Please give further leads regarding the meaning you are giving the first five words of *Method*, chapter 1, “Thought on method is apt”, and relate that meaning to the spirituality that you wrote of in the final six *Posthumous* essays, and the difficulty of reaching for it personally.

A. 45 We are reaching here for the unrealized meaning of a new culture and a new spirituality, and again brevity is the soul of wit.¹ For me, and I hope slowly for contemplative you, the full meaning of those first words, bred from gropingly² following the doctrines of those late *Posthumous* essays, is to lift *Method* into a new world of contemplative authenticity, a serious homing in on, home in,³ the little things of the first paragraph of *Insight*. What I have done in the previous question now can come into play, a play of the divine comedy of history’s tadpole messing. “What do you want?”⁴ : We can reach, life-longingly, to envisage effectively the drive of the speaker of the last supper towards expressing His want: us “being one.”⁵ So there is a new possible – I would say probable⁶ – support for concrete global moves to unified yet

¹ I refer fairly often below to my book of 2006 (Axial Publishing), *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway*. It provides a context for the struggle for meaning, the meaning of “skin-within molecules of cosmic all, cauled, calling. The rill of her mouth can become the thrill, the trill, of a life-time, the word made fresh” (*op.cit.* 66). The mention of wit above leads me to point to the film *Wit*, (see *op.cit.*, 157, and 220, note 2) with the John Donne character played by Emma Thompson – who wrote the screen play. One of her soliloquies is relevant to your reading and our struggle: “We are discussing life and death and not in the abstract, either. We are discussing my life and my death. And I cannot conceive of any other tone. Now is not the time for verbal thought-play. Nothing would be worse than a detailed scholarly analysis of erudition, interpretation, complication. Now is the time for simplicity. Now is the time for, dare I say, kindness”.

² See the text from Lonergan quoted in the text below at note 33, in which the word “grope” occurs, and see also the Lonergan text quoted below in note 30. **Groping** can be thought of in the context of the notional acts associated with C₁ and C₄ (see notes 10 and 12 below). Both groping and craving have, of course, sexual undertones: see “Finality, Love, Marriage”, CWL 4, 49, line 17, “an infinite craving”. The next two pages in that article crave for re-visioning.

³ See *Method in Theology*, 14, on the sense of home that is difficultly cherished and cauled: the difficult homing talked of on pages 350, 351, 356.

⁴ *The Gospel of John* 1:38.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 17: 21.

⁶ A tricky meaning within a grasp of “the significance of large numbers” (*Insight*, 146; *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, chapters 8-11) and of ranges of troubled disciplines. Perhaps the seeding will come from “adversaries claiming that they themselves discovered it” (the concluding words of Lonergan’s “Healing and Creating in History”). But friendly searchers - e.g. in ecological studies - may find the cyclic way, or there could even be a creative renewal, in literary studies, of the Vorticism of a century ago. The issue of 2014 in Lonergan studies is going to be single events, single seekings, coming together on Bastille Day in Vancouver: “the concrete possibility of a scheme beginning to function shifts the probability of the combination from the product . . . to the sum $p + q + r . . .$ ” *Insight*, 144. If the shift occurs to even messy cycling then the doctrine of annoyance and embarrassment comes into play, “Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company.” *Method in Theology*, 299. As the latter part of this Answer intimates, I would consider the time for politeness to be long past.

aggregatedly-fragmented communities of kindness and promise.⁷ And – putting it hopefully hopelessly so so briefly - that possibility pivots on those interested in Lonergan admitting effectively into consciousness the challenge of the enlarged **W₃**,⁸ the diagrammed orientation of the global community towards the village pragmatics and prayer, “Double You Three in me, in all, Claspings Cherishing Calling Craving Christing”. What is the meaning of the five Cs? That is a door opening on the lines of the five points of special foundational categories.⁹ It is the door opened by Lonergan’s strange brilliant paragraph in *The Triune God: Systematics*.¹⁰ But it can be effectively opened only through conversions that seem almost impossible for present orientations of Lonergan studies, conversions to explanatory thinking within the context of functional collaboration.

My questioner, and you reading, undoubtedly want me to say more. But the pointings are to the beginnings of a huge communal effort of these coming centuries.¹¹ Yes, I could add a paragraph each, or a book, on the five Cs, gathered from the *Posthumous* essays¹² and indeed

⁷ The Appendix to my *The Road to Religious Reality* raises the issue of the blossoming of Jeremiah’s covenant (31:31-34) in an economics dominated by luminous promising.

⁸ As I have noted before, the original **W₃** is to be supplemented in its final Trinitarian line by the open reaching of the five Cs to which we turn shortly.

⁹ I am recalling here the complex discussion in the *Posthumous* essays of the shift of the five leads of *Method in Theology* 291 back to being a structuring for a revised version of *Method*’s chapter on “Religion”. But here the relevant point is that the five Cs become a foundational address, a move from subject to subjects regarding and guarding seedling reaches towards the meaning of God, of G_{jk}^i , of the intimate notional acts.

¹⁰ It seems as well, to aid in the contemplation seeded by the five Cs, to quote from that key paragraph (beginning at the end of *CWL* 12, 471) here, adding in the five Cs: “There are four real divine relations, really identical with the divine substance, and therefore there are four very special modes that ground the external imitation of the divine substance. Next, there are four absolutely supernatural realities the secondary act of existence of the incarnation, sanctifying grace, the habit of charity, and the light of glory. It would not be inappropriate, therefore, to say that the secondary act of existence of the incarnation is a created participation of paternity [C_2], and so has a special relation to the Son, that sanctifying grace is a participation of active spiration [C_3], and so has a special relation to the Holy Spirit, that the habit of charity is a participation of passive spiration [C_1 and C_4] and so has a special relation to the Father and the Son, and that the light of glory is a participation of sonship [C_5].”

¹¹ The global maturing is a distant business – and business is to walk then on streets of mystery – talked of both in “Arriving in Cosmopolis” (available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/archive8.pdf>) and in *The Road to Religious Reality* as to be thought of creatively in terms of 9011 A.D.

¹² Back then to note 10. These five Cs express an effort of decades – my first shot of appreciation the Triune Subjects was expressed in *Theological Studies* of 1962, “The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God”. The climb to a radiant meaning of C_2 began seriously, nearly twenty years ago, in the seventh chapter of *The Redress of Poise*, “Grace: The Final Frontier”, but the five Cs are a result of a very focused contemplative drive of the past four years. Note 10’s correlations present you with strange puzzles. C_2 places each of us in the cherishing radiance of the human conception of the second Person. C_5 names that leap beyond the muffled pilgrim symphony of our molecular Christ-identity to the luminosity of everlastingly growing circumincession. C_3 is that subtle absent-presence of the whisper that is the caul

enlarged in meanings reached in the months since I concluded writing.¹³ But the core issue now is the paragraph that tops page 291 of *Method*, starting “secondly, from the subject one moves to subjects, their togetherness in community, service and witness.”¹⁴ This subject is talking about Those Subjects in a new Way, putting the demands of that talk, freshly and startlingly, in the first five words of *Method*, and surrounding them with the lead up to, an embrace of, a clasp in, those five words from the very last sentence of that book, “the possible expression is collaboration.”¹⁵ Am I entirely wrong in suggesting this and in suggesting that the heart of theology is the explanatorily-heuristic embrace of the Symphony of Jesus that is history, and that present history, a nest for Lonerganism, is an agony,¹⁶ a “monster that has stood forth in our day”?¹⁷ If I am wrong then the move to subjects should be a move of subjects to correcting me, not the gross silence of Lonergan scholars that prevails from “their togetherness in community,”¹⁸ a togetherness that seems to me to make them “a class closed in upon themselves become effete.”¹⁹ My questioner does not belong there existentially but the tragedy is that the dominant pressure would have him settle for the low life of the same old same mold that dodges listening to the heartfelt cry of Lonergan and the invitation of Jesus to be like the Father, an explanatorily-thinking speaker.²⁰ It seems best, then, that I move discretely with this questioner and others like him – such as the lady in foreign parts that phoned me this morning - so that, privately, in little steps, we can lead each other to lonely accelerating adult growth.

of Father-Son. With C₄ it grounds a molecular living-in-tension that breaths and breeds the patterned ontic and phyletic story-polyphoning (see *Third Collection*, 132) of history and His Story. C₄ is the emergent human psychosomatic achievement (see my *Quodlibet* 3 [available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/quod-03.pdf>] on the need to reconceive the habit of charity, and add to it the need, noted in *Verbum* 145, to re-conceive, in relation to a causality of presences, Thomas’s “natural resultance”) of a big-bang haunting, C₁, of the first cosmic second’s chemicals. One has, of course, to lift into the new context the struggle of Thomas and Augustine with vestiges of the Trinity (see *Summa Theologica*, q. 45, a. 7).

¹³ There is the deep issue of accelerating growth raised coherently and suggestively on pages 161-63 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. It has huge existential consequences for authentic conversations between climbers of different ages. Obviously, in one’s lone climb, one leaves behind the self of last month, to whom the present self is a stranger. But think of the conversation with those a decade or four younger in the climb towards self-luminous adult pilgrimage.

¹⁴ *Method in Theology*, 291.

¹⁵ *Method in Theology*, 368.

¹⁶ “The whole of creation groans.” *Romans* 8:19. See below, notes 32 and 33 and the text there.

¹⁷ *Method in Theology*, 40.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 291.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ I leave you to think out this twisted suggestion. A help is the discussion “The Secondary Component in the Idea of Being,” the seventh section of *Insight*, chapter 19. But the issue twists around all forms of speaking, especially functional talk in the direct mode in the cycle, and of course there is the issue of redeeming *haute vulgarization* in modes of a gentle aesthetic discourse.

Why, some may gasp, did I suddenly go into what might be called attack mode in the middle of the previous paragraph? I would excuse myself on the grounds that I did have a serious hour's conversation this morning with a lady reaching towards fresh contemplative meaning but finding all around a subtle conventional discouragement: books to be read, information to be sifted. I muse now that I really did need that providential nudge. Yes it is a nudge within the present questioner's appeal. Other questioners express the same problem to me. The discouragement within Lonergan studies of the new explanatory contemplative reach, yes, is murkily there, pressuring my questioners and claiming the minds of later generations, an ethos that is subtle and busy and blatant and black. The pressure of present convention is to keep going, not quite like it was in Thomas day's searching for certitude and "going away empty."²¹ Nowadays the pseudo-self-appropriation includes wading into the mole-asses of subtle truncated talk so that the questioner goes away not empty but worn-out with opinions.

So, rather than pushing on in public I push on in private with each who craves for understanding and admits increasingly the slow open decades of the climb to paradoxically grasping the "Mystery"²² of "all that is lacking."²³

But I need, obviously, to be more public and louder on the basic broad issue so that I might bring friends and colleagues of the couple of generations after me to condemn publically my decades of suggestions about *Method* and its abandoned demands, my suggestions about the Mystical Body,²⁴ my suggestions about "substituting pseudometaphysical mythmaking for scientific inquiry."²⁵

Perhaps I should conclude with more vigour, more annoyance?²⁶ Perhaps with satire and humour?²⁷ Might I get some Lonergan scholars to laugh at themselves, as they talk of self-appropriation of their own procedures yet go on stolidly within methods that are so patently and truncatedly ineffective? They are simply adding to the data that pushed Lonergan to envisage his new collaborative way, but they add to that data their unsubtle and silly and dark rejection of his cure for their dark silliness. So it is *apt* – that fifth ghostly word of *Method*! – to

²¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones quolibetales* 4. Q. 9, a. 3. Quoted fully in CWL 12, 9.

²² *Insight*, 569, in the title of section 1.6.

²³ *Ibid.*, 559: see, seize, that I lift you back ten pages!

²⁴ The suggestions, of course, are the dense central point of *The Road to Religious Reality*.

²⁵ *Insight*, 528.

²⁶ The problem of annoyance was there right through my writing reachings of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. "A Dublin tradesman printed his name and his trade in ancient Erse on his cart. He knew hardly anybody could read it: he did it to annoy. In his position I think he was quite right" G.K. Chesterton, *George Bernard Shaw*, Bodley Head, London, 1961, 16: quoted in note 2 of chapter 2 on page 178 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

²⁷ In *Insight*, "Possible Functions of Satire and Humor" (647-49) is the central of five sections on **The Problem of Liberation** (645-56).

conclude by pausing with you over that strange displaced well-placed paragraph, a heart of darkness in the twinkle, the “apparent purposelessness”²⁸ of “purposeless laughter,”²⁹ of Lonergan’s bow to wit:

The concrete being of man, then, is being in process. His existing lies in developing. His unrestricted desire to know heads him ever towards a known unknown. His sensitivity matches the operator of his intellectual advance with a capacity and a need to respond to a further reality than meets the eye and to grope³⁰ his way towards it. Still, this basic, indeterminately directed dynamism has its ground in potency;³¹ it is without the settled assurance and efficacy of form;³² it tends to be shouldered out of the busy day, to make its force felt in the tranquility of darkness, in the solitude of loneliness, in the shattering upheavals of personal and social disaster.³³

Should one laugh with paranoid purposelessness at finding the shattering in the darkness of the busy face of theological friendships?

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 649.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ See note 2, above, on “gropingly”. Think, too, of “the orientation of the flow of consciousness not determined either by the environment, external objects, or by the neurobiological demands of the subject.” *Topics in Education*, 232.

³¹ There is the massive aesthetic tonality, for the self-luminous adult reader, of potency’s 13.7 billion years’ finality, that steams off the pages of *Insight*, climbing to the appeal to Clasp’s rescue of good will that hauntingly ends page 722. That “order’s dynamic joy and zeal” (the five last words of the page) is in the clutched amygdalic hearts mentioned in *Romans* 5:5.

³² I think here especially of the absence of that assurance in the case of the cyclic collaboration that as yet lacks effective seeding. See chapter ten of my Website book, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*, “Metaphysical Equivalence and Functional Specialization”.

³³ *Insight*, 648.