

In response to Travis' paper, I'll begin with a quote, offer four sets of observations/suggestions about the paper/project itself, and work back from there to make some comments about how I'm thinking in light of what you've written.

The quote, from "The Dry Salvages," the third of Eliot's *Four Quartets*: "But to apprehend the point of intersection of the timeless with time/is an occupation for the saint-/No occupation either, but something given/And taken, in a lifetime's death in love, Ardour and selflessness and self-surrender."

First observation: I really think that what you are talking about here, is *sainthood, holiness, being sanctified*. It is a side-product of the poverty of the doctrines of the Spirit in modern theology that the doctrine of sanctification has been collapsed too often into that of justification, and that we've really not thought seriously about what it means to be *deified, to participate* in God. I want to note that what I found most interesting and promising about your paper is the taxonomy according to which it is beginning to think of the Spirit's distinctive work and agency. But here I'd issue a warning, too: You note in a footnote that you have not dealt here with Christology, and you somewhat bracket that question. But then you bring it back in with Bonaventure – as a matter of the question of the Eternal *Ars*. Let me say that I think perhaps what you need in all of this is not to think of the role of Christ in what you're wanting your pneumatology to do, but the role of *Jesus*. The Spirit as the one who relates *Jesus* to the Father as the Son.

Second Observation: I bring up the name of *Jesus* not because I like Jesus (I do; I love him). But because I think there is something *concrete* missing from your treatments of *contemplation* and *prayer* and *vision* in all of this. What I want to remind you of is the way in which in the

ancient Fathers, you don't have *theoria* without *praktike*, *ora* without *labora*, contemplation and prayer without *work*. To what extent is it the *praktike*, the *labora*, the *work* that is the sign of sanctification. Part of what I'm trying to say here is that creation is "sacramental" as you say, not so much as a matter of *vision*, but as a matter of *liturgy*.

Third Observation: In thinking the question of *memoria* in terms of *intentio* and *distentio*, let me suggest adding the consideration of a third category *repetitio*. What might it mean to think not only of the redemption *from* time lost, but redemption as the *re-taking* of time. *Anamnesis* is a eucharistic category, and there is something of a eucharistic logic to Kierkegaard's thinking of *repetition* as a kind of remembering-forwards. It is a re-taking of what is past – Jesus of Nazareth – and remembering it forward into what is to come – the *parousia*. Repetition is about *imitation of Christ* – and well, if art imitates life...(is that how it goes). "Do this in remembrance of me... for in doing so you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." Repetition is a way of remembering that seems to me not to be about the elevation of the mind, the suspension of time, ecstasy, so much as the offering up of broken and fragmented time to what God will make of it in Christ. In this respect, I think it might help to think your doctrine of the Spirit eucharistically in terms of the *epiclesis*.

Fourth Observation: You mentioned in a footnote that the next stage of the narrative beyond Bonaventure would lead you to the consideration of the work on mysticism done by Lubac and Certeau. Actually, I think your narrative could use a little dose of the likes of Luther, Thomas à Kempis, and Kierkegaard. Especially, I think Kierkegaard's Augustinianism with a twist of Luther might help keep a good Hegelian, or Schellingian, from liking your project so much. I'm not accusing you of idealist residues – I would just take such to be a bad thing.

So, let me say one last thing about *saints*. Saints are notoriously hard to live with. When you want to talk about their poetry, they make you go pick apples with them. When you mention holiness and purity, they offer you a cigarette. When you start talking about visions of glory, they ask you to assist them in changing their sick neighbor's bed-sheets. When you're supposed to meet them for coffee, they stand you up. When you ask them if it was because they were intensely praying, they'll tell you it was because they were at the hospital praying with the family of the 22 month old boy who was just diagnosed with stage four brain cancer. Saints are so hard to live with, because they indeed *have* seen the kingdom, that "new world" appearing that you talked about. And they're so hard to live with because that new world they've seen seemingly interrupts our own search to see it, even just to glimpse it. That new world is always messing things up, because to the saint, that new world is all-too-accessible: in the hungry, in the imprisoned, in the enemy. And the love to which they are called to give themselves to this new world can't be abated in them. That new world sends them out into the very *brokenness* of time, those events of shattering, in a mode of abandoned *agape*. It is not so clear in this that they *see* the new world at all: in fact, to bring Kierkegaard back, they only know this new world in Christ, whom they only now know "incognito" in the crowd, or in the *enemy* – before whom, as Kierkegaard reminds us, we may very well need to *shut our eyes*, if we are to love her, with the love of the Kingdom that has come in Jesus Christ.

The vision in your paper is brilliant and beautiful: and it leads me to ask how it is that we can maintain it. But, then, I begin to think, we'd all be too easy to live with. Sainthood may entail that vision, but sainthood is about what happens when one comes back down from that vision: the *work* from which contemplation arises and to which it returns. It makes me wonder why it is that so many of us living here below really *are* so easy to live with?