

In works like *The Crucified Jesus Is No Stranger* and *Jesus the Liberator of Desire*, Dom Sebastian Moore, O.S.B., has emerged as a premier spiritual theologian. He draws on psychology, literature, the philosophy of Bernard Lonergan, and his own contemplative experience to articulate the dynamics of transformation effected by prayerful encounter with Jesus crucified and risen. In the present volume fourteen of Moore's friends, among them David Burrell, Robert Doran, Elisabeth Koenig, Matthew Lamb, Nicholas Lash, and David Tracy, explore the themes of Moore's work.

William P. Loewe, Ph.D., is associate dean of the School of Religious Studies at The Catholic University of America. With The Liturgical Press he has published *The College Student's Introduction to Christology* (1996).

Vernon J. Gregson, Ph.D., J.D., is professor and former chair of religious studies at Loyola University in New Orleans. He chairs the section on psychoanalysis and religion of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and teaches psychiatry and religion at LSU Medical School. He has a private practice in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy.

U.S. \$24.95




Jesus Crucified and Risen

Essays in Spirituality and Theology

IN HONOR OF
DOM SEBASTIAN MOORE

— Edited by —
William P. Loewe
Vernon J. Gregson

1998

A Michael Glazier Book
 THE LITURGICAL PRESS
Collegeville, Minnesota

Contents

By Way of Introduction: Sebastian Moore, Anselm, and Friends <i>William P. Loewe</i>	v
1 Sebastiano in Pallara: A Pilgrim's Tale <i>Nicholas Lash</i>	1
2 Torment as Method <i>David B. Burrell, C.S.C.</i>	13
3 A Contemporary Personalist <i>Dom Illtyd Trethowan, O.S.B.</i>	19
4 Ego Transcendence and Transformation: The Soteriology of Sebastian Moore <i>Stephen J. Duffy</i>	31
5 Human Desire and Easter Faith <i>Louis Roy, O.P.</i>	53
6 Transcultural Knowers and Lovers <i>Joseph Flanagan, S.J.</i>	67
7 Reflections on the Terror of History <i>Glenn Hughes</i>	95
8 Nature, History, and Redemption <i>Matthew L. Lamb</i>	117
9 The Church and Our Desires: An Inquiry into Ecumenical Criteria <i>Vernon Gregson</i>	133

10 Stirred Up by Desire: The Search for an Incarnational Spirituality <i>[Redacted]</i>	147
11 Surviving Slander with Richard Rolle <i>Elisabeth Koenig</i>	161
12 AIDS Ministry as a Praxis of Hope <i>Robert Doran, S.J.</i>	177
13 The Gospels as Revelation and Transformation: A Tribute to Sebastian Moore <i>David Tracy</i>	195
14 The Bedded Axle-Tree <i>Dom Sebastian Moore, O.S.B.</i>	211
Select Bibliography of Dom Sebastian Moore, O.S.B.	227
Index of Names	231

Stirred Up by Desire: The Search for an Incarnational Spirituality

Carla Mae Streeter, O.P.

It has been the ongoing search of Sebastian Moore to free the human heart in its relentless search for the holy. To pursue this search Sebastian has not only shared his work in process through the printed word, he has provided us with an interiority analysis which grounds soteriology in human experience. In so doing, he builds a bridge for the theologian to be able to discuss matters of healing and the integration of the human person with the psychiatrist and the psychologist. He opens the way for an academic ecumenism.

But even more important, Moore invites his theological colleagues to reexamine their own categories, to reshape them as carriers of fuller truth, and so to influence the interconnected web of their own teaching.

The adults who are our students are assuming more and more self-direction in their learning and living. This contemporary phenomenon manifests itself from bouncing aerobic classes, Overeaters Anonymous groups, and crowded New Age weekends, to weekend college, Scripture study, and what some will declare is at the heart of it all: the search for the whole and holy. Theologians ignore this growing phenomenon at their own peril. Students, both traditional and non-traditional come to the theological task with multiple agendas. It is not the role of the theologian to be an academic reed swaying in the cross-currents of these agendas, but unless he or she is very aware of these contextual currents the task of returning from

the realm of theory to that of common sense through effective communications in the theological task is short-circuited. Carefully done theoretical work is a ministry: its goal is to challenge what has always gone on in the realm of common sense.

I suggest it is in a three-fold way that Sebastian Moore contributes to ~~this theological task~~. First, his work is grounded in interiority analysis, which by its very nature—as Lonergan explains—encompasses the realms of theory and common sense and enables us to distinguish and relate them (Lonergan, 1971, 85). This analysis provides the deeper foundation that many of our students are seeking: the link between careful theoretical distinction in theology and their lived lives. Second, because Sebastian's focus is soteriology, it is that area of systematics which has a clearest relation with foundations. Conversion might be described as the vulnerable inner palm of the soteriological hand. By his work, Sebastian has placed that hand on the doorknob of what remains yet to be done: exploring the import of what he has uncovered about the human ego for religious conversion (in addition to its Christian form) and for psychic, moral, and intellectual conversion. Third, because Sebastian's work is grounded in interiority, it has implications for human anthropology. While coming from a distinctly Christian horizon, the work provides grounds for discussion in comparative theology. Its potential here has yet to be explored.

It is with the above context in mind that I state the intent of this essay. There is, I believe, in the writings of Sebastian Moore, a significant contribution to the human search for an incarnational spirituality. Operating from within my own Christian categories, I will suggest that such a spirituality manifests at least three basic principles: incarnateness, sacramentality, and expressed communalness. These three principles effect a healing integration that releases creative operation in the human person. I will examine these three principles, relate them briefly to Sebastian's writings, and project what implications such a distinctly Christian spirituality might have for others in the human family "stirred up by desire."

Incarnational Spirituality

Our first question may be what such a spirituality might be, and then whether we need it. To answer these questions still other questions are uncovered: What is the meaning of spirituality as it is used here? Are there spiritualities that are not properly speaking incarnational? What are the distinguishing characteristics of a spirituality that is incarnational?

To begin, the meaning of the word "spirituality" as used here is quite focused rather than broad.¹ In a recently published work,² Daniel Helminiak has focused the term in a workable way for our purposes here. Recognizing that the word spirituality can be an umbrella term for several different meanings, he specifies three that are closely related. The first refers to the human spirit itself as the basis for talk about the spiritual. The second refers to a lived reality, a way of living expressing that source. The third refers to a subject matter, an academic study that treats of the lived reality and its source. It is the second meaning that will be our focus here: spirituality is human living insofar as it is geared toward integration of the intrinsic human dynamism toward authentic self-transcendence, as created by God and reaching fulfillment through the Holy Spirit in Christ. This form as distinctively Christian is not Helminiak's only formulation, but I choose it here because it relates to Sebastian's distinctly Christian focus.

It is not by chance that I begin with these specific categories. In all honesty, it is the only place I can begin. This is not to say my Christian categories are to be imposed on anyone. It is simply to declare that with Panikkar³ I do not believe *epoche* or the "neutralizing" of one's own categories is possible in entering upon religious dialogue. It puts the theologian in the position that Lonergan points to in the very structure of *Method*, namely, of translating from one's own theological categories back into the world of someone else's common sense understandings. This puts the burden, I believe, where it rightfully belongs. The burden is on ourselves to communicate the message in such a way that the categories of another are respected rather than disdained, and the task is to find a home for the good news in the indigenous categories of a people very different from ourselves.

¹The effort to arrive at a satisfactory definition of what spirituality means is reflected in the writings of both men and women. See Walter Principe, "Toward Defining Spirituality," *Sciences Religieuses/Studies in Religion* 12:2 (1983) 127–41, and Sandra Schneiders, "The Effects of Women's Experience on Their Spirituality," *Spirituality Today* 35:2 (Summer 1983) 100–16; "Scripture and Spirituality," in *Christian Spirituality*, McGinn and Meyendorff, eds. (New York: Crossroad, 1985) 1–20; "Theology and Spirituality: Strangers, Rivals, or Partners?" *Horizons* 13:2 (1986) 253–74; and "Spirituality in the Academy," *Theological Studies* 50 (1989) 676–97. Because neither of these writers is asking the question from the realm of interiority, the operations of the spiritual subject in asking the question do not come under consideration. One is left with choosing a meaning without reference to the authentic operation of the evaluator.

²Daniel A. Helminiak, *The Human Core of Spirituality: Mind as Psyche and Spirit* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996).

³Raimundo Panikkar, in *The Intra-religious Dialogue* (New York: Paulist, 1978) develops the notion of *epoche* more thoroughly.

In this way the term “incarnational” begins to take on meaning beyond the usual Christian connotation of the word. It is with this understanding of the potential broadening of the word, that I press for a spirituality that is incarnational.

But we are getting ahead of the purpose of this essay. Our first task is to press for an authentic incarnational spirituality as understood within our own Christian categories.

The Meaning of “Incarnateness”

For Christians this term has to do with the enfleshment of the divine. Incarnation refers to the fusion of the divine with the human, with matter, in the person of the Word of God. This mystery, known theologically as the hypostatic union, is a distinctive feature of Christian revelation. The incarnation reveals simultaneously something about divine mystery and something about the human. Keeping in mind that it is the human that receives whatever is revealed, the very act of such a union has profound implications. There is obvious desire on the part of the divine to immerse itself in what it has made, or better still, to impress us with the fact that perhaps it has been quite at home there from the beginning. In the Christian tradition there is the clear conviction that neither the divine nor the human is violated in this union. There is neither mixture nor dissolving involved.⁴

What I would like to suggest here is that “incarnateness” might be a philosophical/psychological/physiological category. By this I mean that it can be a term with human meaning in its own right, without directly referring to its basis in Christian religious language. Incarnateness in this sense would mean being at home in one’s body, in the flesh. It would mean physiological, psychological integration. It would challenge philosophy to build on the insights of Merleau-Ponty and Karl Stern among others.⁵

To move in this direction requires more than theory. It requires empirical analysis. It is in the interiority analysis of Lonergan that we find the data of consciousness taken seriously and made explicit in the charting of human operations. Here philosophy is in its element, for it is concerned with all that pertains to human processing. Psychology is concerned, for it

⁴See J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958) especially 338–40, for a full treatment of the development of the doctrinal settlement in christology.

⁵See the classic *The Flight from Woman* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1965).

is through human consciousness that psychic strength and illness is discovered and treatment attempted. It pertains to the physiological for the organism is the locus for both psychic and reflective activity, and resonates with this activity for good or ill.

In practical terms this would mean that the integrated human being shows evidence of balanced operation in each of these spheres. The philosopher, psychologist, psychiatrist, and physiologist would bring to the discussion what they would consider human “balance” in their area. It is not hard to see that eventually the sociologist, the political scientist, the ecologist, and the economist would have to be invited into the discussion, for we can no longer afford the mistaken luxury of considering authentic humanness out of context.

This wholistic integrated approach to the human will never begin seriously without the anthropological base that Lonergan maintains interiority analysis provides. If what Lonergan has charted regarding the recurrent pattern of human operation is not adequate, another scheme would have to be invented based on closer scrutiny of the data of consciousness. The importance of this realization is discussed by Sebastian in the final chapter of *Jesus the Liberator of Desire* (Moore, 1989, 119–20).

I would like to push this need further and suggest that the incarnateness I am calling for will require the psychic conversion of which Robert M. Doran writes.⁶ Dramatic bias (Lonergan, 1957, 191–203) can so cripple the psyche that the basic images needed for new insights will not even be allowed to arise. I suggest that this psychic censorship can prevent a person from being at home in his or her own flesh. This disincarnateness cripples the intellectual process, for the intelligence cannot operate in a liberated way when under psychic restriction.

⁶In consultation with Lonergan before his death, Doran was assured the he “was onto something” in dealing with the censorship that arises from different forms of dramatic bias. Doran is convinced that this censorship aborts the intelligent process at the point of the *image*, thus setting up a selection of only those images that are not painful. This selectivity can result in a denial of much that has to be faced for full integrative growth.

See Robert M. Doran, “Psychic Conversion,” *The Thomist* (1977) 200–36; “Subject, Psyche, and Theology’s Foundations,” *The Journal of Religion* 57:3 (July 1977) 267–87; *Subject and Psyche: Ricoeur, Jung, and the Search for Foundations* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1977); *Psychic Conversion and Theological Foundations: Toward a Reorientation of the Human Sciences*. American Academy of Religion, Studies in Religion 25, Thomas J. J. Altizer and James O. Duke, eds. (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981); “Dramatic Artistry in the Third Stage of Meaning,” *Lonergan Workshop II*, Fred Lawrence, ed. (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981) 147–200.

Accuracy in the charting of conscious processes is the basis for what Lonergan calls general (theological) categories, those that apply across disciplines because they chart a human process that is common to them all. (*Method*, 285) Neglect of the operations of consciousness in the human subject keeps us adrift in the ambiguous sea of a plurality of theories about the human. The beginning is noting what goes on. Then one is in a position to question how well it is going on in whatever area.

Once we have begun at the beginning, the base in the background of all Sebastian thinks and writes, the Christian is in a position to play a trump card. In the horizon of one who has experienced Christian religious conversion is a figure who captures this authentic integration. There is a concrete person, a lived life that is the paradigm for the authenticity we humanly long for. There is for the Christian familiar with Sebastian's works, a continuity between *The Crucified Is No Stranger* and *Jesus the Liberator of Desire*.

The presence of this figure can be a hazard or a help. If the knowledge one has of Christ Jesus is docetic, this Jesus is no help toward an incarnateness. If one's knowledge is grounded in sound Christian tradition, this Jesus is the key to human authenticity.

How is this so? The traditional doctrine posits that there are two natures or modes of operation in Jesus, the human and the divine. Further, it posits that there is only one person, the eternal Word of God. There is no violation of either of the modes of operation. They do not get "mixed," nor are they "separate." They operate freely, one in deference to the other. What belongs to the realm of one is not imposed on the other. What is human is human, not divine, and what is divine is divine, not human.⁷ I am proposing that this concrete mystery is revealing something profound to us about ourselves. Careful consideration brings us to the insight that we might have something here that breaks through the nature-grace impasse, not in a 50-50 resolution, but a 100-100 reality, each working in its own mode of operation.

This, of course, brings up the work currently being attempted on the consciousness of Christ.⁸ Of core importance in these efforts is the need to distinguish what *is* from what is *known* or understood. The fact that there

⁷See Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, especially the Chalcedon statement on 339.

⁸There are two early attempts at a translation of Lonergan's *De Constitutione Christi Ontologica et Psychologica*, namely that of Brezovec and O'Fallon. Of more interest, however, would be the translation jointly prepared by John Hochban, S.J., and Michael Shields, S.J., and awaiting publication in the *Collected Works* gradually coming out of the University of Toronto Press. This translation is available from the Lonergan Research Institute in Toronto. Of interest also might be Michael Shield's translation of *Pars V, De Redemptione*

is no such thing as "pure nature" is one thing. That that fact is known or understood is another.

In the case of the Incarnate Word this opens up the notion that the human consciousness of Jesus had to come to know what was completely clear to the divine consciousness, yet that divine consciousness never pushed the human process aside, but instead revered its unfolding. If this relationship of the divine nature with the human nature in Jesus is a paradigm, then its implications for how divine grace reverences the unfolding of human authenticity from a sin-infested state is startling.

Yet here some major distinctions must be pointed out. Jesus began with a basic human authenticity; we do not. We need to be healed from a degenerate humanness in order that the authentically human can creatively emerge. In us, grace not only effects a relational union, it heals human brokenness so that the human can function properly as it was emotionally, intelligently, and volitionally intended. The implications of this view of the human and its relation to the holy are important when brought to inter-religious dialogue. These implications will be considered later.

In summary, I have called for a broadening of a category typically Christian, that of "incarnateness," to call attention to its philosophical, psychological, and physiological implications.

The Meaning of "Sacramentality"

Once again, at first glance we are referring to a typically Christian category. In Christian terms a sacrament is most properly an external religious ritual that celebrates a hidden sacred reality. The sacrament is said to "effect" what it celebrates, that is, to make the celebrators *become* what they are celebrating. The most familiar context for sacramental meaning is that of the seven sacraments celebrated in the Catholic community. But what if again we plumb the inner core of this reality? Then by sacramentality we might mean the function of something open to the senses pointing to

of *De Verbo Incarnato*, also available from the Institute. Both are dated in 1987. Other references dealing with christology that are based on Lonergan's work are: John Ashton, "The Consciousness of Christ," *The Way* 10 (1970) 382-8; Daniel Helminiak's *The Same Jesus: A Contemporary Christology* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1986); "Human Solidarity and Collective Union in Christ," *Anglican Theological Review* 70 (1988) 34-59; "Jesus' Humanity and Human Salvation," *Worship* 63 (1989) 429-46; and Roch Kereszty's "Psychological Subject and Consciousness in Christ," *Communio* 11:3 (Fall 1984) 258-77.

something beyond what is accessible to the senses and which cannot be confined to sensible limitation. We would also be speaking of a form of praxis that makes us more and more into what we intend and choose.

In calling for an incarnational spirituality I believe this category, too, must be expanded. Just as incarnateness can be spoken of philosophically, psychologically, and physiologically as an “at homeness” in flesh, so sacramentality must be understood as the celebration of the transforming impact self-transcending humanness can have on another. Certain human activity signs to us an authenticity that is deeply moving. Even in the most dehumanized situation such activity causes a leap of the heart in those not blinded by the situation. The recognition of this sensible experience as a cause of exhilaration has a transformative power to bring about further authentic humanness. What I am calling the sacramental principle here is the activation of what might be a form of moral conversion in another, even one who is considered “irreligious.”

In the Flannery O'Connor short story, “A Good Man Is Hard to Find,” the escaped convict Misfit experiences a sacramental moment when the old lady he is about to shoot reaches out, touches his face gently, and exclaims, “Why, you look just like my own son!” He recoils and kills her, but as his buddies, who have killed the rest of the southern family, make a remark about the good “fun” they have had that day, Misfit can only mumble that all the “fun” has gone out of it for him. Raw evil has suddenly gone sour in him as a result of the old woman’s touch and words. He might try to do business as usual, but he has been changed by her.

To shift slightly to the inner core of what I am designating as the sacramental principle here, it may be helpful to return once again to the religious context that is the source of its meaning. As we have found in the Incarnate Word the paradigm for the principle of incarnateness, so I believe we can find there the key to how sacramentality works.

Sacraments are “givens” in the Catholic community. The word always connotes the ritual. What I am suggesting is that the ritual be regarded as the tip of the sacramental iceberg, the larger portion hidden beneath the direct sensible surface. It is not inaccurate, I think, to begin with the very person of Jesus as a sacramental reality in himself.⁹ By this I mean he was an inclusive welcoming person. He was a strengthening person. He was a nurturer of others. He forgave. He healed. He manifested leadership. He was a lover par excellence. All of these are ways of being who he was. He

⁹This is the approach taken by Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P., in *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1963).

acted out of the way he was. What he did prompted change in others. They began to regard themselves differently. The little community of disciples he left behind wanted intently to be “Jesus’ People.” They wanted to do what he did. Eventually they externally ritualized what he had done. His inclusive welcoming became the “sacrament” of baptism. His strengthening continued in what came to be called confirmation. His nurturing continued in the Eucharist. His forgiving becomes visible in reconciliation. His healing compassion is signed in anointing. The fact that he led and shepherded others was externalized in orders. His unbelievable love is signed to us by faithful married couples.

What is of importance here is to note that a good part of the sacramental reality is not ritualized but is still very real and transformative. It is this grounding in existential living that many of our people have lost. As a result, sacramental ritual is often empty, disconnected from life.

It is my conviction that the expanding of the notion of sacramentality to its core meaning beneath the ritual meaning can be very fruitful to integrate life for those who are not theologically educated. In addition, the impact this notion might have in interreligious dialogue has yet to be explored. It brings with it the challenge to name what is really going on in other traditions as transformative.

The Meaning of “Expressed Communalness”

This third principle of an incarnational spirituality unites two notions: that of visibility, and that of a “we” consciousness in contrast to a “me” consciousness. I am referring to a quality of life that is visibly relational.

It is not difficult to note how expressed communalness flows from being at home in one’s own flesh and signing this to others. Being visibly relational follows upon the principles of genuine incarnateness and sacramentality. Without this third principle, both incarnateness and sacramentality might be construed as personal pietism. This third principle leaves no doubt that true human longing is communal and relational. It manifests a two-fold desire: the desire for intimacy with the divine, and the desire for intimacy with other human beings. These are not two distinct directions or communions. The incarnate principle reveals the holy housed in matter. The sacramental principle identifies matter as the locus for transformation. This third principle reveals that the liberation of this longing goes on among *us*. It is something in common, a *common* transformation either entered into or refused.

Nowhere is this unfolded with more delicacy than in the final chapter of Sebastian's *Jesus the Liberator of Desire*. Hidden under the title "A Paradigm Shift in Contemporary Psychology," Sebastian captures what I intend by positing this third principle of an authentic incarnational spirituality, an expressive communalness.

Noting that the baby will cease feeding when its attention is grasped by something colorful, Sebastian turns human self-perception inside out.

I am not a monad, seeking to keep comfortable and to survive. *I am a relatedness all around, seeking to actualize more and more, to go out more and more, . . .* (118) (Emphasis added.)

Giving credit for this reversal to Lonergan's insights, Sebastian goes on:

to say that desire is for my relatedness to the world to become actual is to say something new about desire and to say something new about knowing. It is to connect desire with coming-to-know, and it is to connect knowing with desire. (119) . . . the opposition we take for granted between desiring and knowing . . . is false. With this, a flood of dammed-up energy is released. The deep split in our culture between head and heart begins to mend. Knowing is different—it is desire coming to fulfillment. Desire is different—it stretches out to know. (120)

In these few lines the theme that has woven its way through Sebastian's writings swells into a coda.

I am a total relatedness waiting and wanting to be realized. . . . I am totally connected up without my appreciating all this connectedness. . . . *desire* is for the actualizing of our relatedness. (120)

The book ends with a sonnet which Sebastian suggests is the "etymology of *desiderium*:"

Desire to know even as I am known:
That *is* desire, creation coming conscious,
Amoeba growing out to all, its own,
The maggot Israel illustrious.

The infant interrupts the flow of warm
Milk to observe a change in the world scene:
Eyes opening, lips parted to the charm,
Islands of ecstasy where we have been.

Desire is to relax into what is,
The unknown knowing one, the dance in three,
Heart of the universe and open kiss
Opens our private worlds so we are we.

Desire indeed is the desire to know,
For we are known, and into this we grow. (121–2)

Sebastian is very clear to note that in this, healing pleasure and desire are not opposed. I suggest he is opening for us a way to begin to understand what really happens in moral conversion. It is the movement from what merely satisfies to what is the long-term good. At first glance this can be understood as opposition. But a closer attentiveness shows this not to be necessarily so.

The healing of bias in us opens us to new value. Liberation brings a new sense of what is worthwhile. We no longer have a "taste" for what satisfied us before. The good now becomes satisfying, the flow of desire now released toward its goal. The long-term good now involves us, not just me. The connections, the relatedness that was hidden now comes into awareness. This is a new positioning, a new and fuller "at homeness." No longer is it just the enfleshment that is my bodiliness, it is a communalness with all that is within my awareness. It is expressive first simply by my way of being. I am "present" in a new way wherever I am. Eventually my speech will happily betray it, and my silence, and my choices.

In these three incarnational principles of incarnateness, sacramentality, and expressive communalness, I suggest we have a glimpse of the fruit of three forms of healing: in psychic conversion the healing of an image-censorship that prevents incarnateness, the effect of personal healing on another in what I have called sacramentality, and a third healing, again personal, that reveals the reality of relatedness and the illusion of isolation.

Admitting this to be so, of what value is it? Is it merely to comfort us in our own Christian camp? Is Sebastian's Jesus, liberator of desire, just our Jesus? Do we clutch him to our breasts and grieve for the rest of the world, or do we have in these three principles of an incarnate spirituality the core of the liberation of desire for *all* peoples?

Stirred Up by Desire: Global Implications

In this final section I would like to bring this reflection on the search for an incarnational spirituality, and Sebastian's contribution to this search,

to the threshold of where I think it has to go. We can only stand in the doorway, as it were, but even that, I believe, is filled with promise.

In chapter eleven of *Method*, Bernard Lonergan writes of theological categories that are general and specific. He maintains that the core of both of these types of categories is transcultural (284). I suggest that the work that Sebastian has been about, and the type of depth probing of certain familiar categories from the Christian tradition which we have named “incarnateness,” “sacramentality,” and “expressive communalness,” have something to do with making that core systematically explicit.

We enter the company of those who walk in other faith traditions clothed in our own specific Christian theological categories. We can do no other. These categories are the images, symbols, and thought constructs that come from our religious experience of the holy in Christ Jesus. For Christians, God has come to meet us in Christ Jesus. Rather than maintaining that basic fact as an exclusive enclosure, we have need to go to the depths of its core, and ask how the experience of the holy-in-the-human, our distinct experience in Christ Jesus, is common. Thus our push from the more familiar theological terms *incarnate*, *sacrament*, and *community*, to a more philosophical understanding of these terms anthropologically.

Once we have entered the anthropological realm, we are in company with Sebastian, and we are entering the realm of Lonergan’s general theological categories. These are categories that theology shares in common with other disciplines. For Sebastian, this means such realities as intimacy, loneliness, loss, relatedness, ego-centeredness, and insight. These, too, are entered into by the Christian with the concreteness of Christian presuppositions on what the human is. Again, these presuppositions, usually undeclared, cannot be left behind. But core to them are the human operations, revealed through interiority analysis.

We now have two elements of the core: the *special* theological category of the experience of the holy, and the *general* theological category of the human operations. It is this two-dimensional core that Lonergan maintains is transcultural.

What this implies is that what is true in distinctly Catholic Christian terms just may have meaning transculturally in its core, and this transcultural meaning needs to be teased out. This is just what this brief paper has attempted to begin with the Christian categories of incarnateness, sacramentality, and expressive communalness. Yet it is but a beginning. Perhaps the time has come for a systematic explanation of the Church’s constant prayer: “I am the savior of all . . . says the Lord.” We can no longer avoid the burning question, “How is this so?”

Conclusion

This essay has attempted to flesh out systematically what Sebastian Moore, the man “stirred up by desire,” has been about for some time. It has asserted that Sebastian is onto elements vital to an integrated incarnational spirituality, and has specified three hallmarks of such a spirituality: incarnateness, sacramentality, and expressive communalness. I have suggested that what was attempted here is but an attempt to work with the general and special theological categories that Bernard Lonergan maintains are transcultural at their core, and only at their core, thus protecting the specific cultural differences that form the distinct religious contexts of the peoples of the world. Finally, I have suggested that this approach, which I believe Sebastian exemplifies, opens the way to the inter-religious dialogue which faces the Church in the new millennium. We are fortunate to have his good company.