

QQ.21, 22, 23. Q.21 “The Chemistry of the Searcher”; Q.22 “Searching with a nine-year old”; Q.23 “Craving Effective Transpositions”; Q. 24, “Who are You Three?”

Q.21. (February 14, James Duffy). I wonder how theology externally relates to natural sciences, in this case chemistry. It is kind of strange to think that a natural and conscious “notional love” is chemical and even has a taste, and that in and by tasting and seeing and understanding and loving a gift (*donum creatum*), albeit imperfectly and analogically, humans are capable of “Doubling You Three” in theochemistry.

A.21 James will notice, and other readers should know, that this is the end of a bundle of great questions from him. I decided to tackle this last question first. But there is a point I feel I should make, or rather repeat, for I have been on this topic for a decade, the topic of adult growth, and of not frustrating your own reach for it by yielding – how could you not alas! – to pressures of convention. The pressures invite you to settle down in your present view rather than hoping and stretching so that you become a stranger to your self of last month. James is familiar with this challenge but the answer goes out to a growing community with growing doubts about conventions. So I begin with something which I know James already cherishes, a statement from the end of *Posthumous* 17, “Jesus: Flower in the Crannied Caul”: “You may well, in this next decade, reconfigure book and face, trial and fact, Jill finding Jack through risky solo-leaps of inner assertions. But that communal climb to the concrete good suggests that we hold hands, being one in the Flower: it suggests that the neglected garden-plot of entwined collaborators calls and cauls to bring us to the edge of the Field.”

You get the whiff here of an emergence in the distant future? What is to replace the simple axiomatics, locked in descriptiveness, of Thomas’ *Summa*? A cyclic dynamic functional system of generating the missing sequence of theses on the mystical body – a pilgrim and eschatological chemical reality – so that we may move from its tadpole reality of these early millennia, muddled by overconfident and sometimes brutal piety, to a global statistically-effective tension of embrace in later times and beyond. There is no doubt that this was Lonergan’s reach after his 61st year. In his 49th year he wrote of “living human bodies linked together in charity” (*Insight*, 745). He was then about to start his climb to finding the auxiliary to that effectiveness, to charity’s cousin hope. How make a start here? Alas, you must go back to *Quodlibet* 3, “Being Breathless and Late in Talking about Virtue”. Charity is not some ghostly presence in the faculty called will: it has all the recurrence-scheme complexity that Lonergan begins to talk about on *Insight* page 489, “Study of an organism begins...”. And the organism here is the Symphony of Jesus. Then you could leap forward to *Quodlibet* 19, “The Solution to the Problem

of Feelings in Lonergan Studies”, written at the end of 2004. But both these essays need to be read slowly, walkabout fashion, walk with me as I paced round Dublin thinking out the shambles of the 2004 Lonergan Centennial Conference in Toronto a week before, and fermenting it into the invitation of Quodlibet 8, “The Dialectic of My Town, Ma Vlast“. Then you may make a beginning by asking whether the phantasm, in which insight bubbles, is chemical.

Now James is in this world, but I am appealing to my readers to take seriously him and me, and those few others reaching for this world. The magic of the future cyclic dynamic is that it has a spin-in towards this seriousness: I have written about that in various places and pass over it here. But how do I perhaps help further the few front-runners? They already have taken note of *Posthumous* 3, “A Commentary on Inside“. They are not unfamiliar with their personal dynamic as described by Rita Carter in *Mapping the Mind*. James’ question raises the bar, bares the quest for light on notional love, the Embracing that is the Third Person of the Divine Three. He is pointing to where the reaching is leading in the entire 21 *Posthumous* Essays. Might I add further nudges?

This is a deeply unfamiliar world of kataphatic contemplation. The context of the challenge is given in those five essays on “Foundational Prayer”, *Prehumus* 4-8, but you need not go back to them: the issue is moving out of a numb childishness of prayer to being subjects-as-subjects growing slowly luminous in the Embracing that we are, Embracing our Cauling. I’ll get back to that in Q/A 22.

Think now more simply of the charitable tennis player or violin player teaching a child to play. [we are on the edge here of you other puzzlings, James, as I said, so: the next question, number 22.] Think of the gentleness of the flexed arm that, with moist charity, invites the lob or the quiet bowing. So, we flex our molecular minding to find, ingest, that the Presence of Embracing flexes in our eyes and elbows, an obedient flight, hovering, “mastery of the thing”, to and in the absolute supernatural. The flexing is a natural resultance (see *Verbum*, index, on the problem), a new strange causality related to the vestigial (see *Summa*, q. 45, a.7) radiance of Divine Personalities.

How do we think, Jack or Jill, of Jane the tennis player, or lover: does our inner word reach to the subjectivity of those bright eyes and other body parts flexed and moist in the encounter? How do we think, Jack or Jill, of Embracing as he or she (the gender-naming of the Spirit: a tricky business related to Jung’s problem of *anima* and *animus*) is coming with us in our daily reach? The notional act as subject in me subject-as-subject, lifting me and us beyond metaphors such as “temple of the Holy Spirit”, our hearts and amygdalas and elbows flooded, or at least damp, moist, wet. Wet? We are talking of molecular patterns, of specific heats and latent heats of fusion, of a strange enthalpy. “The process of changing water into wet, saturated steam, can be shown by a temperature enthalpy chart”. (I

quote a text on Power Engineering). Can we chart the character-mesh of our dominant subject-Partner in the play of life's politics? Incarnate meaning (*Method*, 73, 356) wound into the reach of the first paragraph of the *Magna Moralia* and lifted into a mirror-fermented self-portrait (*The Road to Religious Reality*, 52-55) a self-ontology spinning in cosmic symphony.

But this is a long climb in thinking in and of our molecules. So I should conclude this Question, but perhaps with an opening conclusion regarding that first word of *Insight*'s first chapter: "In". An ever-fresh ever-ready later culture will read that "In" within, with Inn, $W_3 + W_{3T}$ (the enlargement of the bottom line of W_3 achievable by following **in** the 18 Assertions of CWL 12). And the context of **in**gesting those Assertions is reached by striving freshly (I am putting the task into a new set of nudges) to put the **in** into TH**in**K, [Trinity, History, and K-bent : here recalling my old trick of re-spelling such words as "systemati**K**s" to point to the subject] thus reaching for a fresh inkling. It seems to me now that we might be nudged beyond mythic reading of *Insight* if we thought about, (about)³, the slogan "understand what it is to understand" as **in**scaped into the slogan, "think what it is to think". (Recall the frontispiece of *Insight*, in the usual translation: "the faculty of thinking then thinks the forms in the images"). That nudging may help us towards a life **luminous** in the shock of the forms, mine, yours, being with-**in** (position, position, protopossession) the Embracing of Being, the subtly me-Grace Embracing of Active Spirating, Cosmos emerging, and me-portraying luminously. And we may begin to decade-seize a little better the meaning of "being **in** Love with God", G_{jk}^i , and the seeding seething chemical challenge slipped into *Method*'s chapter on Religion: "To speak of the dynamic state of being in love with God pertains to the stage of meaning when the world of interiority has been made the explicit ground of the worlds of theory and of common sense." (*Method*, 107)

Q.22 (James Duffy) "Why are you crying?" That was the question that my nine year-old niece asked me at a Christmas Eve vigil. Was she asking about material, formal, efficient, exemplary and/or final cause? Probably about efficient cause, but I honestly don't know... it is possible that she was asking about all five in her own little-flower way."

A.22 I return from the end of Jame's long question of Q/A 21 to the beginning. A 23 will tackle the middle part of his puzzling. Of course, the question is a massive question that leans against "the monster that has stood forth in our day" (*Method*, 40) and the answer is to be a change of culture in this next millennium. But let us ramble a little here, in terms of a 9-year-old Jill and a 49-year-old uncle Jack – recalling the Jack and Jill of the final article in CWL 1, and the positional context to

which it point. The context I wish us to think of adding is that of biography meeting biography in history, and this recalls the development of that perspective in the middle note of the middle essay of *The Redress of Poise*.

Two difficulty contexts then: it is up to you to figure where you stand in regard to them, in guarding them. We are back with the challenge of **THinK**. But let me invite you to think lightly here of Jack thinking forward: the little flower is orientated by her five-quest to become a blossom in ten years. The five-quest: probably compact but, James, perhaps dominantly not efficient but final?

Will the monster devour her? The lift that saves is the sixth sense of cause, that can ferment a “natural resultance” (see *Verbum*, index) by its presence, the causality of presence, incarnate meaning and the strange meaning of The Embrace that James talks about. Uncle Jack is likely not to be enough to hold back the monster of truncated education and environment and to lift Jill into the radiant character of the longer cycle of incline so desperately needed by her and history.

James writes of his problem as one of communication, and we meet it here on the many levels of the matrix C_{ij} . My challenge is to boost the lift into a decent statistics of that meeting, an effective meeting; and the monster stands in our way. Concretely, most of us (retirement helps!) just do not have to time or energy to pause and contemplate creatively the self in the mirror. Indeed, we may not even like the morning mirror companion!! Yet, such contemplation is what lifts us to read properly Jill at 9 or Jack at 49, even in this page. James is struggling towards niece and he meeting, subjects-as-subjects. If you pause and think it out you will find that it is massively difficult to push towards, move towards meeting, bio-to-bio, Jill’s quest, seeing in the nine-year-old eyes the reach towards 19 and 49 and being. The difficulty is alleviated in so far as you, or James, or uncle Jack, is pushing to be a character (*Method*, 356, line 12) that can claim and pray “I am a craving Embrace of being in its fullness”. A simple statement that, but dense with a fresh precision regarding, guarding, obediencial finitude in the absolute “joy and zeal” (*Insight*, 722, end lines) of its cauling.

As I look at my jottings of these past days round this question it is obvious that there are accumulated the seeds of a treatise on the needed change of culture. But the Q. and A. would lose their present value in further additions. Best halt with those few hints to your bright eyes. Yet you might also weave your effort round a strained patient imagination of a later culture in which the Childout Principle flashes in each school eye, the building bright in a dream-theme architecture that showed forth its Kabod.

Q. 23 (James again, summarized by me). The Why of tears, of any tears, “Christmas Eve tears, intelligible but not intelligent, not *emanatio intelligibilis*. They were no more my doing than the onion tears. My *sensus fidelium* is that the tears are some kind of gift given by way of love. They were my tears, but in some way they were not “my own.” Is there a giver? Is the giver a person? If so, how gives the giver?

Why gives She thusly? Here I have in mind the Q. 27 “Is the Holy Spirit sent as notional love?” (CWL 12, 473-479) And, as you have noted, there is quite a string of Assertions leading up to Question 27, including the assertion that “the missions enter into other theological treatises” (437). Where am I going with my questions and conjectures? Strangely, perhaps, I would like to have something to say to my niece if she asks again. For weeks now I have been bathing in *CWL 12* in the mood of: “Who are You Three?” with my niece’s darn good question in mind. Also I wonder how my question about tears, and more generally the *sensus fidelium*, evokes – is “demands” too strong? – serious reflection upon how to efficiently communicate, how to effectively develop transpositions “if religion is to retain its identity and yet at the same time find access into the minds and hearts of men [and women] of all cultures and classes” (MiT, 132-133).

A. 23. So I come to the middle of Jame’s bundled questions. His references to *CWL 12* repeat, in another way, my point at the end of the previous question. The context is one of heavy climbing in contemplation with the result registered in words of a later culture with new specializations. “the fact is that the specializations have to be invented, and the use of the inventions presupposes a corresponding development or education of prospective audiences or readers.” (*Insight*, 594, end). That is what these Q/A are about, and the discomfiting symbols of that (about)³ are such symbols as W_3 and C_{ij} . There is the discomfort of finding oneself more than “a little breathless” (*Insight*, 755), but, with luck, not tearless. That Luck of tears can be resonant of years wasted – theses, articles, presentations – on and in *haute vulgarization* and of the possible threat, “that they are to collaborate in terms of common but abstruse principles” (*Insight*, 581). That collaboration’s peaks can bring tears of joy, even when it reaches plains of vision where talk is “without tears” (CWL 7, 151). The whole business of this Q/A final campaign is to give rise to such tears of frustration and joy. Humanity is in its infancy of cyclic decline: 9-year-old Jill can rise at 39 or 79 to signal effectively the longer cycle of incline, lengthening into the sunlight of the Eschaton.

The tears are a gift, and of course there is a giver that “is personal” (*Insight*, 691: Lonergan’s 26th place) but Faith-found to be tri-personal (*Summa Theol*: Thomas’ 27th question). The given is personal in the fullest sense of Lonergan’s shocking and intimate 21st place (*Insight*, 686-7): but are you resonantly shocked, even brought to tears, finding Brahman sweeping tiny atman gently along in daily doings? And might you try, with James, to bathe in *CWL 12*, so as to find you way to the seeds of that new culture of talk and functional talk. And even talk with the Three, who work together making your talk, so that you and They can distinguish luminously the Personal, Personnel, difference in you saying “I crave being” and “I am a craving for being”? So, you tune to the climb towards Christianity’s version of “being in love with God” and make way for the specializations for “religion is to retain its identity and yet at the same time find access into the minds and hearts of men [and women]

of all cultures and classes" (*MiT*, 132-133). But – James' central question and quest, "how to effectively develop transpositions" - there are no half measures: try bathing, THinKinglinkly INN *Insight* in a fresh patient way, find a Jill or a Jack in this *Lack in the Beingstalk* so that you find yourself "strong enough to refuse half measures and insist on complete solutions even through you have to wait" (*CWL* 1, concluding word). More bluntly and briefly, how do we get both you and Lonergan to pay serious attention to the third section of chapter 17 of *Insight*? "Go, tell it to the Mounties Tra la la tra la la".

James' middle question needs more attention from all of us, but I prefer to wait for further questions from others, especially regarding our spirituality of Trinitarian life. I pause then hoping for further focusing on the other reaches of James questioning, a questioning centred on his key quest. "Who are You Three?" Perhaps that is a fitting heading for Q.24.

Q. 24 (James again): "Who Are You Three?"

A.24. I am back with the middle and the centre of James set of questions: "For weeks now I have been bathing in *CWL* 12 in the mood of: "Who are You Three?" with my niece's darn good question in mind." At this stage in our exchange most of us are perhaps tutored towards the self-appreciation of the metadoctrinal character of these Questions and Answers. But here it can become altogether obvious in that James is reaching in his solitude for the seeds of a massive cultural shift in theology. This document, *CWL* 12, "cannot be interpreted scientifically by a single interpreter or even by a single generation of interpreters" (*Insight*, 610). Lonergan in fact is talking there about "a totality of documents" and I can get *CWL* 12 into that context easily by referring us back to the obvious context, *CWL* 11. But we will get into that larger question through climbing beyond the next pieced of puzzling, stimulated by Q. 24. What I want us to notice in conclusion here is the larger, astonishing, aim of James.

It reaches creatively beyond the 1964 text to the reachings of the last chapters of *CWL* 18, a transposition of all types of existentialism. James is talking, with his own degree of luminousness, to Three Subjects. His inner word of Faith-assertion has to be of four bright-I'd subjects relating. That is a climb, in a new mode - perhaps I could talk of it as a fourth stage of meaning mode? (On this see *Posthumous* 19) - beyond the expression of Lonergan in *Insight* chapter 19 and *CWL* 12. (And whatever the subtle subjectivity of Augustine, it is beyond Augustine: now there you have a claim reaching into the totality of documents!)

Let me spell out a bit this inner word, this judgment of value. We return to Jack and Jill: then Jack's problem can be viewed – a high achievement in present culture – as conceiving five subjects-as-subjects in the complexity of their biohistorial relating. The task brings to mind the remark of Lonergan in "Finality, Love, Marriage": "theologians, let alone parents, rarely think of the historical process" (*CWL* 1, 47).

Moreover that article can be viewed freshly now as focused on the lovers Jack and Jill rhapsodizing sexually in the dominion of inner words of five subjects. Of course, the full heuristic is the possession, and the being possessed by, the inner word of history's subjects-as-subjects in the symphonic dynamic of Christ: now there's a fantasy!

The fantasy can become a reality of a Christian Globe only through the massive climb of functional collaboration that splits the task of interpreting Jack to Jill and Jesus to Jack and Jill into a tower community that saves plane plain meaning.

Meantime Jack has to struggle to keep the nine-year-old Jill from being devoured by "the monster that has stood forth in our day." (*Method*, 40)

There are here vast regions of inner searches way beyond present doctrinal answers, so let us move on to Questions 24 and to the larger problem that lurks in James' lonely question: the problem of a towering hermeneutics of rescue. The effort at answering Question 24 will give us a fresh context for considering practical possibilities of collaboratively answering James' set of questions. But now I would like to make one closing point central to them, and indeed to all our efforts, related to the phrase "interpreted scientifically" that occurs in the quotation from Lonergan above.

We need a massive effort to rescue the word "scientific". The effort is partly symbolize by the *Cantower 2* title "Sunflowers Speak to us of Growing" but it does not explicitly add care. That explicit addition, in its fullness, adds the forward specialties to all disciplines. Think out, if you have time and energy, the lift the move would to such sciences as physics and chemistry and botany and, consequently, the effective benefit it would bring to ecological concerns. But I must end on my main point.

To interpret scientifically is what we need to do with friends. The phrase, normatively, simply means effective caring understanding. "Who are you three?" can be asked thus of God or a gathering of three friends. And you may notice a neat twist here: think about the problem of your friendship with two others: the question of friendship poises you in the subject-as-subject question "who are you three?" It is the life-time personal challenge lurking in the destabilizing third-line placement of **personal relations** in the spread of *Method* 48.