

Essays in Systematic Theology 1: Consciousness and Grace¹

1 Introduction

This paper represents my first published attempt to move beyond the foundational concerns of *Theology and the Dialectics of History*² and into systematics. It is in keeping with the thrust of my earlier work, as well as with what Bernard Lonergan says in *Method in Theology* about special theological categories, that a contemporary systematics begin with a theology of grace;³ and I have made a general decision that, wherever possible, I

1 This paper appeared originally in *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 11:1 (1993) 51-75. Almost all of the attention that it received focused on the issue of a fifth level of consciousness, so that other matters at least as important to the essay were overlooked. Nonetheless, the essay managed to start a discussion that continues to this day, and should be kept readily available for reference. I have added footnotes that indicate developments in my thinking or corrections of what appears in the text.

2 Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990, 2001).

3 2009: The further development of this position aligns grace with Trinitarian theology. Systematic theology begins, I now suggest, with an exposition and understanding of the four-point hypothesis of *The Triune God: Systematics* (vol. 12 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007]) 470-73, a hypothesis that correlates the divine relations with created participations. This is still to 'begin with a theology of grace,' of course, but in a manner only barely contemplated when I wrote the present essay. Moreover, I have to take more seriously than I have to date

will begin my own treatment of systematic issues by attempting to transpose Lonergan's systematic achievements into categories derived from religiously and interiorly differentiated consciousness. Thus I begin my own work in systematics here by suggesting such a transposition of some of the principal elements in the first thesis of Lonergan's 'De ente supernaturali.'⁴

This work, Lonergan's most thorough treatment of the systematics of grace and, it seems, his first major effort at writing a systematic treatise,⁵ elaborates five theses: (1) There exists a created communication of the divine nature, that is, a created, proportionate, and remote principle by which there are elicited in the creature operations by which God is attained as God is in God's own self. (2) This created communication of the divine nature exceeds the proportion not only of human nature but also of any finite substance, and so it is simply supernatural. (3) The acts not only of the theological virtues but also of other virtues, insofar as they are elicited in the rational dimension and in a manner befitting a Christian, are simply supernatural as to their substance, and this indeed by reason of their formal object. (4) The potency to the simply supernatural is

Lonergan's statement in one of his responses to questions that where one begins a systematics is less important than is sometimes assumed.

4 Bernard Lonergan, 'De ente supernaturali: Supplementum schematicum,' ed.

Frederick E. Crowe, Conn O'Donovan, and Giovanni Sala (Toronto: Regis College edition, 1973). 2009 note: The work will appear as part of volume 19 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed.

Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010 or 2011).

5 2009 note: Lonergan confirmed this in a personal conversation with me during the last year of his life.

obediential. (5) Internal actual grace consists essentially in second acts of intellect and will that are vital, principal, and supernatural.⁶

In his elaboration of these theses Lonergan manages, with a remarkable economy of words, to synthesize in a Scholastic mode most of the major questions that have been faced in the history of the doctrine and of the Scholastic theology of grace, and to take a position on these issues. But obviously his formulations have now to be transposed into the categories of a theology constructed in accord with the dynamics uncovered in *Method in Theology*, and here we begin that work by treating the first thesis. What precisely is a ‘created communication of the divine nature’ in a theology whose basic terms and relations are found in interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness, and not in the metaphysical categories of substance, nature, potencies, etc., employed by Lonergan in ‘De ente supernaturali?’ ‘For every term and relation there will exist a corresponding element in intentional consciousness.’⁷ What are the elements in

⁶ Lonergan’s Latin formulation of these theses is as follows: (1) Exsistit creata communicatio divinae naturae, seu principium creatum, proportionatum, et remotum quo creaturae insunt operationes quibus attingitur Deus uti in se est. (2) Haec creata divinae naturae communicatio non solum naturae humanae sed etiam cuiuslibet finitae substantiae proportionem excedit ideoque est supernaturalis simpliciter. (3) Actus non solum virtutum theologiarum sed etiam aliarum virtutum, in quantum in parte rationali et sicut oportet a Christiano eliciuntur, simpliciter supernaturales sunt quoad substantiam et quidem ratione obiecti formalis. (4) Potentia ad supernaturalia simpliciter est obedientialis. (5) Gratia actualis interna essentialiter consistit in actibus secundis intellectus et voluntatis vitalibus, principalibus, et supernaturalibus.

⁷ Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, latest printing 2003) 343. Subsequent references will be given in the text and in the notes in the form (*Method* page number). 2009: It is important, I believe, to distinguish the

intentional consciousness that correspond to the metaphysical categories in which Lonergan elaborated the notion of a ‘created communication of the divine nature’? As we will see, later developments in Lonergan’s work give us many of the clues required to effect a transposition of his Latin theology of grace. But they are no more than clues.

As I have already said, to begin a contemporary systematic theology with the systematics of grace is one implication of the listing of the sets of special theological categories in *Method in Theology*. For the first of these sets is derived from religious experience, and the term ‘religious experience’ is used by Lonergan to refer to the reality of grace.⁸ Such a priority is part of Lonergan’s strategy of constructing a theology that

senses in which this statement is relevant. The ‘corresponding element’ in consciousness will be different depending on whether we are speaking of basic terms and relations or derived terms and relations. With basic terms and relations, the corresponding element will, indeed must, be identifiable in consciousness. But with derived terms and relations, naming that element may be a matter of naming the operation in which the element is known. The category of special basic relations is not mentioned by Lonergan in this context, but it is needed to fill out his methodological prescriptions. In other papers on this site, I will suggest how the four-point hypothesis of *The Triune God: Systematics* contributes to identifying special basic relations. On transposition, I now believe that it cannot be a one-way street, that is, from the second to the third stage of meaning, or from theory to interiority, or from metaphysics to cognitional theory. Rather, metaphysical equivalences must also be found for the terms and relations of interiorly differentiated consciousness.

⁸ On the first set of categories, see *Method* 290. On religious experience and its connection with the categories of grace, see *ibid.* 105-107. 2009: The source of the sets of special categories presented in *Method* remains a question for further research. In his 1968 lectures at Boston College, when the manuscript of *Method* was still being

has a transcultural base. On the understanding presented in at least Lonergan's later writings, while 'grace' is a Jewish and Christian category, it refers to a gift that is offered to all men and women at every time and place. Thus, while the language is Christian, the reality to which it refers is not; it is universal. Our purpose in this paper, then, is to give an initial indication of what this universally accessible reality is, and to do so in terms of a transcultural core that is not restricted either to a particular set of cultural matrices or to a specific religious tradition.⁹

written, the sets of special categories are differently articulated, but more clues are offered for how the categories, both special and general, are to be derived. This will be clear in chapter 1968-3 of volume 22 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, Early Works on Theological Method 1*, ed. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, in process).

⁹ 2009: Through all of my writings on the issue, this has been the goal: What is this universally accessible reality, and how does it affect consciousness? How can we express this in categories that evoke a transcultural core? The particular answer to that question expressed in the present essay did not quite hit the bull's eye, but it is also not as far off as I once thought it might be. In answering the question in terms of a fifth level of consciousness, I was concerned to emphasize that the answer does *not* lie in the four levels of intentional consciousness that Lonergan articulates in most of his writings. Those levels are, in themselves, 'nature.' To reduce sanctifying grace to the four levels of intentional consciousness is Pelagian at best, secularist at worst. I now see, however, something that I did not see then, namely, that sanctifying grace, as an entitative habit radicated in the essence of the soul, cannot be articulated in terms of conjugate or 'accidental' potencies, forms, and acts. Thus, if 'fifth-level' language is to be maintained, as I believe Lonergan intended, it must avoid any overtones of conjugate form when speaking of sanctifying grace. The latter is an elevation of

2 The ‘Created Communication of the Divine Nature’ as a Fifth Level of Consciousness

central form to participation in divine life. To speak of it in terms of a particular level of consciousness can easily be misunderstood as placing it in the category of a conjugate form. One breakthrough on this point within the Lonergan discussion was made by Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer, ‘Sanctifying Grace in a Methodical Theology,’ *Theological Studies* 68 (2007) 52-76. Further questions still need to be answered, but Jacobs-Vandegeer’s essay provides an essential part of the context in which they will be both raised and responded to. Most recently, Jeremy Blackwood has validated the discussion of the fifth level, taking Jacobs-Vandegeer’s contributions with utmost seriousness. This occurred in a paper delivered at the 2009 West Coast Methods Institute, ‘Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level.’ On the other hand, the habit of charity *is* a conjugate form. The language of levels may eventually prove to be counterproductive in this context, but the fact remains that Lonergan did speak of a fifth level, and further exegesis of his references needs to be done before the notion is discarded completely. The point on which I will insist is that what is referred to in the categories used to speak of grace is simply *not* to be explained in terms of the ‘four levels’ of intentional consciousness spoken of by Lonergan as these unfold from below upwards in human development. To do so would be to reduce grace to nature.

In the present paper, I made the point of identifying the dynamic state of being in love with the habit of charity. Lonergan identifies it with sanctifying grace, and so with a supernatural elevation of central form. But that identification perhaps is itself a bit undifferentiated. The distinction of sanctifying grace and charity has to have some manifestation in consciousness. I am trying to specify that distinction here. The items are treated in detail in many of the papers that will follow on this site.

2.1 A Transposition

Thesis 1 of ‘De ente supernaturali’ reads: ‘There exists a created communication of the divine nature, that is, a created, proportionate, and remote principle by which there are elicited in the creature operations by which God is attained as God is in God’s own self.’

I will propose that we transpose this thesis into the following terms: The gift of God’s love for us poured forth into our hearts is an uncreated grace that effects in us, as a relational disposition to receive it, and so as the consequent condition of its being given, the created grace of a fifth level of consciousness, at which we experience ourselves as loved unconditionally by God and invited to love God in return. This experience of being loved unconditionally and of being invited to love in return is the conscious basis of (1) our share in the inner life of God,¹⁰ (2) our consequent falling in love with God, and (3) the dynamic state of our being in love with God. The dynamic state of being in love with God, in turn, as equivalent to what the Scholastic tradition called the infused virtue of charity, is the proximate principle of the operations of charity whereby God is attained as God is in God’s own self. But the created, remote, and proportionate principle of these operations – what Scholastic theology called the entitative habit or sanctifying grace of a created communication of the divine nature – is the fifth level of consciousness, the experience of resting in God’s unconditional love for us and of being invited to love in return, the real relation to, and constituted by, the indwelling God as term of the relation.

¹⁰ I will not attempt in the present article a transposition of Lonergan’s later (1957) suggestions on the systematics of this share in *Trinitarian* life as such. We are proceeding step by step, and we have enough to occupy us here. 2010: For this more complete transposition, see, for example, ‘Being in Love with God: A Source of Analogies for Theological Understanding,’ *Irish Theological Quarterly* 73 (2008) 227-42.

This will be our own ‘first thesis,’ if you want, in the systematics of grace. It is proposed as a transposition of Lonergan’s first thesis in *De ente supernaturali* – a transposition into categories derived from interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness.

In the present article I will attempt to work out the details of this transposition of the thesis. The related question of the transformation undergone by other levels of consciousness and even by the unconscious, by ‘nature’ as a principle of movement and of rest,¹¹ will not be treated here but, under the rubric of the inner constitution of our life in God, in subsequent essays that I hope to write transposing the second and third theses of *De ente supernaturali*.¹²

Two steps entered into the process of arriving at the transposition that I have just suggested. The first treats almost solely the first thesis itself of *De ente supernaturali*, and attempts to work out as much as possible what would be the elements in intentional consciousness corresponding to the metaphysical categories there employed. The second considers several problems in the Scholastic theology of grace raised most explicitly by Karl Rahner, watches Lonergan wrestle with the same problems shortly after the writing of ‘*De ente supernaturali*,’ considers both the similarities and the differences between Lonergan’s treatment of these issues and that of Rahner, and attempts to work Lonergan’s position into a transposed version consonant with the directives of *Method in Theology*. These are the two steps that led to the proposed transposition that I have just suggested. Finally, at the end of this paper I offer a suggestion as to where we might turn for further

11 On nature as a principle of movement and of rest, see Bernard Lonergan, ‘Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,’ in *A Third Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985) 172-75.

12 2009 note: These essays have not been completed. Preliminary drafts exist. The drafts themselves will eventually be made accessible on this website, in order to invite comment and collaboration.

systematic (and so analogous) understanding of the transposed first thesis of ‘De ente supernaturali.’

2.2 *Gratia Elevans as Starting Point of the Theology of Grace*

Thesis 1 of Lonergan’s ‘De ente supernaturali’ identifies what the Scholastic tradition called sanctifying or habitual grace with a created communication of the divine nature, a communication that, as remote principle, makes it possible for there to be elicited in us certain operations in which the living God is attained as God is in God’s own self. Thus, Lonergan’s systematic ordering of the understanding of grace begins with what the theological tradition calls *gratia elevans*, grace as elevating, rather than with *gratia sanans*, grace as healing. It begins with the line of thinking about grace traditionally more identified with the Greek Fathers than with the mode of thought identified with the Latin and, principally, the Augustinian tradition. It takes as its starting point a line of thinking that emphasizes the divinization of human beings through God’s gift of grace.¹³ Lonergan

13 I must add here the qualification of Henri Rondet: ‘Augustinian theology is sometimes contrasted with that of the Greek Fathers. The Greeks talk about divinizing grace, while Augustine presents grace as the remedy for sin. There is some truth in this contrast, but we must be on guard against all systematization. There is no doubt that Athanasius and especially Gregory of Nyssa stressed the “physical” character of the redemption, and that the Greeks preferred this “physical” theory to all others. However, aside from the fact that some Latins like Saint Hilary were quite close to the Greeks, the physical theory of the redemption actually implies the juridical or moral theory. Or rather, both are found together in a higher synthesis based on the idea of solidarity. Thus, whether Greek or Latin, all the Fathers take as the starting point for their theological reflection the doctrine of divinization and of our unity in Christ. This

states as well that the thesis both verbally and really affirms the same reality as is proclaimed in the second letter of Peter 1.4: ‘so that through these things ... you may become participants of the divine nature.’¹⁴ This is confirmed, he says, ‘by interpretation of the Fathers, who often speak of a certain divinization of ourselves.’¹⁵ The tradition of *gratia sanans* appears in the presentation of the heuristic structure of the divinely originated solution to the problem of evil presented in chapter 20 of *Insight*. But the systematic theological ordering of ideas would not begin here, but rather with the principle that would order these and other ideas in a synthetic manner. That principle is for Lonergan the notion of a created participation in God’s own life, and the related notion of the absolutely supernatural, which he discusses in the second thesis of ‘De ente supernaturali.’¹⁶

is perfectly clear in the case of Augustine’ (Henri Rondet, *The Grace of Christ*, trans. Tad W. Guzie [Westminster, MD: Newman, 1967] 90-91). Someone familiar with *Insight* but not with Lonergan’s Latin theology of grace might identify Lonergan’s thinking about grace, too, as almost solely ‘moral’ or ‘juridical,’ though there are clues in chapter 20 pointing to the higher synthesis that is quite obvious in ‘De ente supernaturali.’

14 Rondet points to some difficulties connected with this text. See *The Grace of Christ* 70. But see also the commentary of Thomas W. Leahy in the *Jerome Biblical Commenary* and the remarks of Edward Schillebeeckx in *Christ: The Experience of Jesus as Lord*, trans. John Bowden (New ork: Crossroad, 1981) 303-304, 472.

15 Lonergan, *De ente supernaturali* 8. Thus Rondet studies the Greek Fathers’ theology of grace under the rubric of the divinization of the Christian. See *The Grace of Christ*, chapter 3.

16 Needless to say, we will have to study also the material in Lonergan’s work relevant to a transposition to a contemporary idiom of the notion of *gratia sanans*. But I have

2.3 *Sanctifying Grace and Charity*

The operations by which in this life we reach God as God is in God's own self are, for the tradition that Lonergan is here synthesizing, the operations that flow from the infused virtue of charity.¹⁷ Nonetheless, the thesis draws a distinction between the habit of charity and the state of sanctifying grace. The proximate principle of acts of charity is the habit of charity. But thesis 1 of 'De ente supernaturali' speaks also and primarily of a remote principle, a change in our very being by which we are elevated to participation in the

indicated this in speaking of the transformation of other levels of consciousness and of the unconscious, and so this transposition will not be attempted in the present essay.

17 The qualification 'in this life' is important. Lonergan's first thesis in 'De ente supernaturali' is more than the beginning of a theology of grace in the limited sense of the religious or spiritual life of persons in this life. The 'created communication of the divine nature' of which he speaks is an analogous term that refers as well to elements of the hypostatic union and the beatific vision. These further considerations will not be treated here, since we are abiding as strictly as possible by the strategy of constructing our systematic theology step by step from an experienced and therefore verifiable transcultural core. When we turn to Karl Rahner's presentation of the relationship between created and uncreated grace and to Lonergan's treatment of the same issue, we will have to mention Rahner's understanding of the beatific vision, since it is the basis of his presentation of the issue that most concerns us. But we are not here taking an explicit position on this issue, only on the reality of grace in this life. 2009: Lonergan's later four-point hypothesis, of course, mentions not only sanctifying grace and the habit of charity but also the incarnation and the light of glory. It is a differentiation of his notion of a created communication of the divine nature.

inner life of God, and it identifies this remote principle ‘materially’ with sanctifying grace.

A problem arises here in the exegesis of Lonergan’s various texts. It has at least partly determined the course of my reflection and transposition. It is the problem of the distinction and relation between sanctifying grace and the habit of charity. I am assuming that it is the habit of charity that Lonergan is speaking of in *Method in Theology* when he writes of ‘the dynamic state of being in love with God.’¹⁸ But since he there identifies this dynamic state of being in love with God with what a ‘theoretical theology’ called sanctifying grace, might not his later terminology lead us to posit an identity between what Scholastic language calls sanctifying grace and the habit of charity? What would have to be added to his later terminology in order to preserve the distinction made in the Scholastic terminology of ‘De ente supernaturali’? It was facing this question that led me to the some of the suggestions I am making here.

The solution to these questions, and especially to the question of what might be added to Lonergan’s later terminology, or at least what further clarifications might be suggested regarding this terminology, can, I believe, be found by relying on the agreement of many scriptural exegetes that ‘the love of God’ in Romans 5.5, the text of which Lonergan makes so much, means, not our love for God, but God’s love for us.¹⁹ The context speaks of our reconciliation with God, which is ‘but the restoration of estranged and sinful man to union and companionship with God.’²⁰ The initiative for that

18 2009 note: It would have been more accurate to say that the language of *Method* seems to be identifying sanctifying grace and charity.

19 See, for example, Joseph Fitzmyer’s commentary on Romans in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* 306.

20 Ibid.

restoration lies with God, who floods our hearts with God's own love for us.²¹ In that case the uncreated gift of God's love for us could be considered as effecting a created and remote ground of our operations of love for God. That remote ground would be sanctifying grace, the 'created communication of the divine nature' of which the thesis speaks; and the proximate ground would be the habit of charity, or what in Lonergan's later writings is called the dynamic state of being in love with God. But then it is really the *created experience* of God's love for us that is notionally to be identified with what a theoretical theology called sanctifying grace, and that is also really distinct from the habit of charity, the dynamic state of our being in love with God. This is the key to the present transposition of elements of Lonergan's Latin theology of grace, not only into English, but also into the language of a systematic theology whose categories are to be derived from interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness.

The gift of grace is explicitly distinguished from the habit of charity again in Lonergan's *De Deo trino*, where four absolutely supernatural realities are affirmed: the *esse secundarium* of the Incarnation, sanctifying grace, the habit of charity, and the light of glory.²² The arguments there, however, presuppose and complement the systematics of the Trinity, and into this we are not yet prepared to move. We must be content at this point with the affirmations (1) that there is a created state by which God's love for us is

21 2010 note: Strictly speaking, this should read: '... who floods our hearts with God's own love,' *period*. But, I will continue to say, the base of this experience involves being ourselves on the receiving end of unconditional love.

22 '... quattuor sunt entia absolute supernaturalia ... nempe, esse secundarium incarnationis, gratia sanctificans, habitus caritatis, et lumen gloriae.' Bernard Lonergan, *De Deo trino II. Pars systematica* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964) 234-35. 2009 note: Now available as *The Triune God: Systematics* (see above, note 3; see pp. 470-73).

experienced in us, (2) that this state renders possible our falling in love with God and our being in love with God and thus that it grounds the habit of charity by which regularly, habitually, and consistently we love God above all things and all things in God, and (3) that this habit of charity is the proximate principle of the operations of charity by which we reach God as God is in God's own self, the remote principle being the created experience of the gift of God's love for us. What we must do is identify in our experience, and in the terms of interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness, what this created experience is. Again, 'for every term and relation there will exist a corresponding element in intentional consciousness.' If we are going to preserve the affirmation made in the first thesis of 'De ente supernaturali' we must identify what element in intentional consciousness corresponds to the 'created communication of the divine nature.'

2.4 The Analogy of Nature

Lonergan indicates that not all Scholastic theologians taught the distinction between the created communication of the divine nature and the habit of charity; though all affirmed the existence of a created communication of the divine nature, some (for example, Scotus) identified this created communication with the habit of charity. The question, Lonergan says in 'De ente supernaturali,' affects not the substance of the matter but the intelligible ordering of materials. The difference lies in diverging understandings of nature and of the analogy or proportion of nature.²³

23 Lonergan, 'De ente supernaturali' 7, 10. 2009: That is, the doctrinal affirmation of a created communication of the divine nature is not substantially altered by the position one takes. On the other hand, one's systematic understanding of this doctrine might be radically different depending on one's stance regarding this distinction.

Lonergan's understanding of the analogy or proportion of nature, which he says is also that of Aquinas,²⁴ affirms the direct linking of three realities: operations, accidental potencies as proximate principles of operations, and substance or nature as remote principle of the same operations. In the order of our knowing, we move from the operations which we directly experience to a knowledge of the proximate principles of these operations and then to a knowledge of the substance or nature in which these proximate principles reside. In the order of being, substance or nature is the remote principle; from it flow the accidental potencies or proximate principles, and in these the operations are received. According to this analogy, we must first *be* different, be changed or transformed, if there is to exist the proximate principle (in this case the habit of charity) responsible for the performance of the acts of love through which we attain to God as God is in God's own self. In Quentin Quesnell's terms, 'Thesis I does argue that God's giving us a love directed to himself implies so changing us as persons that his love can be in us. Thus [Lonergan] does conclude logically to a "principium remotum quo" – a basic principle in us by which such loving is possible: "just as if a cow actually understood something and made choices based on the understanding, you would not conclude simply 'This cow understands and wills'; you would conclude, 'This cow has a mind,' and even 'Here is a cow's body informed with a rational soul'" ... Technically, sanctifying grace would be the change in us as persons (principium quo creatum, proportionatum et remotum); charity would be the habitual love.'²⁵

24 He refers to *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 54, aa. 1-3, that is, to Aquinas's treatise on angels.

25 Quentin Quesnell, 'Grace,' in *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Vernon Gregson (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1988) 181.

2.5 Sanctifying Grace and God's Love for Us

What we must identify, then, in terms of interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness is precisely in what consists the change in us, in our very being, that would correspond to what the Scholastic tradition would call a created, remote, and proportionate principle of operations. What so changes us as persons that God's love can be in us?²⁶ Our clue to a solution of this problem is the exegetes' interpretation of Romans 5.5, the passage on which Lonergan relies but which he does not analyze in detail: God's love in us is radically God's love for us, and it is experienced as such. And this experience, the enlargement of consciousness that can be called 'being loved unconditionally from the ground of being that is God' is what radically changes us as persons, establishing an entitative habit (remote principle) and the consequent conjugate form of the habit of charity (proximate principle) by which we may perform the operations to which Lonergan is referring in the first thesis of 'De ente supernaturali.'

Thus it must be asked whether the language of *Method in Theology* is precise enough on this issue. There 'the dynamic state of being in love with God' is identified with sanctifying grace, and so, if Lonergan is consistent with what he wrote twenty-five years earlier, with the created communication of the divine nature of which the first thesis in 'De ente supernaturali' speaks. But then the remote and proximate principles of the first thesis of 'De ente supernaturali' would seem to be collapsed into one another in

26 2009 note: A far better way of putting the question is, What change is effected in us as conscious persons as a result of the gift of God's love? As the question is formulated in this text, it seems to make the change in us as persons a cause of God's love being in us. I did not intend this, but also did not avoid it as clearly as I might have. Also, the change extends beyond consciousness and so cannot be limited to whatever is identified in an answer to this question.

Method in Theology, which in effect would negate the systematic ordering of ideas in this earlier thesis. The only distinction discussed in *Method in Theology* is that between the language appropriate to a theoretical stage of meaning and that fitting to a later stage that takes its stand on the self-appropriation of interiority.

This gift we have been describing really is sanctifying grace but notionally differs from it. The notional difference arises from different stages of meaning. To speak of sanctifying grace pertains to the stage of meaning when the world of theory and the world of common sense are distinct but, as yet, have not been explicitly distinguished from and grounded in the world of interiority. 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 world of theory and of common sense. It follows that in this stage of meaning the gift of God's love first is described as an experience and only consequently is objectified in theoretical categories (*Method* 107).

But this should not render the theology appropriate to the stage of meaning grounded in interiority less differentiated than the theology appropriate to the stage of theory. Lonergan should perhaps have emphasized explicitly in *Method in Theology* – or at least I am suggesting here – that 'the dynamic state of being in love with God' is itself a consequence of a prior gift of God's love for us poured forth into our hearts and of an entitative change in us effected and constituted by this gift. This means, however, that the dynamic state of being in love with God is more than notionally distinct from sanctifying grace. It is identical with what the theological tradition in which Lonergan stands calls the habit of charity. The dynamic state of being in love with God is radically a function of God's love for us residing within us; as the habit of charity it is a habitual orientation within us by which we are directed to acts of love for God above everything else and of love for everything else because we love God.

Thus ‘the love of God’ of which Romans 5.5 speaks is God’s love for us poured forth in our hearts ‘from above,’ rendering possible acts of love ‘from below’ in us by which we reach God as God is in God’s own self. It may be, as Frederick Crowe wrote in some notes that he gave me in response to an earlier version of this essay, that ‘unless the context suggests otherwise, any unqualified use of “God’s gift of love” refers [in Lonergan] to our being in love, to the created love flooding our hearts.’²⁷ But I am drawing a distinction between the gift of God’s own love for us and our love for God rendered possible by the gift. The experience of God’s love for us, of course, is not the gift itself, but a created reality; but it is a different experience from the experience of our being in love with God. On this distinction rests the central argument of this essay.

What, then, is this experience? What is the remote ground of which this thesis speaks, the created, habitual, entitative change effected by the gift of God’s love for us? What is ‘sanctifying grace,’ in categories derived from religiously and interiorly differentiated consciousness?

The answer to this question requires, I believe, that we advance and promote Lonergan’s very few and somewhat hesitant references to a fifth level of consciousness. Unless I am mistaken, the only explicit published reference by Lonergan to the possibility of a fifth level of consciousness occurs in *Philosophy of God, and Theology*.²⁸ But this

27 2009: Today I would call Crowe’s point radically into question.

28 Bernard Lonergan, *Philosophy of God, and Theology* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1973) 38. 2009: Other occasions can be found in question and answer sessions at various workshops and conferences; these will probably be accessible on line by the time this essay appears on my website; see www.bernardlonergan.com, and among others, files 28860DTE080 (typewritten notes) and 28860ATE080 (audio), files 28880DTE070 (typewritten notes) and 28880ATE070 (audio), and files 30400DTE080 (typewritten notes) and 30400ATE080 (audio).

reference is not particularly helpful, since it occurs in a discussion period following a lecture, it is made in a somewhat offhand manner, and it refers again, not to the experience of our being loved by God, but to the dynamic state of our being in love, and so to what I am claiming is the third-stage-of-meaning equivalent to what Scholastic theology called the habit of charity. I propose, then, that we speak of a distinct level or enlargement of consciousness that is created in us by the gift of God's love for us as a relational disposition to receive that love (and ultimately as a participation in the relations of the divine persons) and that we identify this level of consciousness with the created communication of the divine nature of which the first thesis in 'De ente supernaturali' speaks, that is, with sanctifying grace.

This level of consciousness is distinct from the four levels disengaged with such precision by Lonergan; it is distinct, that is, from 'nature' as a principle of movement and of rest. To Lonergan's unfolding of the empirical, intelligent, reflective, and deliberative levels or enlargements of consciousness I want to add the affirmation of a level or enlargement where all intentional striving ceases, where we rest in the lived experience of being loved without qualification or reservation, where we are invited to love in return. This additional, and so at least fifth,²⁹ level or enlargement of consciousness is, I propose, the 'created communication of the divine nature' of which thesis 1 of 'De ente supernaturali' speaks.³⁰

Speaking of it in this way, as a fifth level or enlargement of consciousness created in us by the gift of God's love for us, allows us to think of it as a gift offered to all men and women at every time and place. And, as Lonergan emphasizes in 'De ente

29 2009: The words 'at least' have been added.

30 2009: For some reason this paragraph was omitted from the publication of this essay in *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies*. The omission may have led to some misunderstanding on the part of some respondents to the paper.

supernaturali,' by this created communication of the divine nature something becomes common to us and God, something that without this communication would be proper only to God.³¹ In the language of the Christian tradition, we become children of God, partakers of the divine nature, justified, friends of God.³² This change in our very being – in the terms of the Greek Fathers, this divinization – and our assent to it, an assent empowered by the gift of love, are what make it possible for there to exist in us the habit of charity, the dynamic state of being in love, which in turn is the proximate principle of acts of love of God by which we reach God as God is in God's own self.

This is the essential matter in the transposition that I would suggest of the first thesis of 'De ente supernaturali.' But these and further elements in the transposition that I am trying to make can become more clear if we turn to the related question of the relationship between created and uncreated grace, and draw out some of the implications of the difference between Lonergan and Karl Rahner on this question.

3 Created and Uncreated Grace

The first thesis of 'De ente supernaturali' speaks of created grace – a created, proportionate, and remote principle of certain operations. We have here identified this created, proportionate, and remote principle with a fifth level or enlargement of consciousness, where we rest in the experience of God's unconditional love for us. But through this created grace, God's own love for us is present in the depths of our being; and God's own love for us is an uncreated love; hence the expression 'uncreated grace.' What is the relation between created and uncreated grace? In order to explore this

31 'Communicatio: id quo commune fit quod secus esset proprium (non commune).'

Lonergan, 'De ente supernaturali,' thesis 1.

32 Ibid.

question we will turn first to the reflections of Karl Rahner and then to some of the evidence on Lonergan's position in the years immediately subsequent to the writing of 'De ente supernaturali.'

3.1 Rahner on Created and Uncreated Grace

Rahner's reflections are presented in the paper 'Some Implications of the Scholastic Concept of Uncreated Grace.'³³ Is it the case, Rahner asks, that we possess our pneumatic being (that is, our 'created sanctifying grace') because we have the personal Pneuma of God, or rather that God's Pneuma is present in us in a special way because we have created grace? Rahner finds that, for the most part, the Scholastic theology of grace does not do sufficient justice to the first of these formulations, which, however, he finds to be closer than the second formulation to the scriptural and patristic data.³⁴ Are we different because God dwells in us, or does God dwell in us because we have been made different?

33 Karl Rahner, 'Some Implications of the Scholastic Concept of Uncreated Grace,' in *Theological Investigations*, vol. 1, trans. Cornelius Ernst (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961) 319-46. I have followed this translation, except for changing exclusive to inclusive language and for translating most of Rahner's Latin terms into English. Essentially the same theology of uncreated grace appears in Rahner's much later book *Foundations of Christian Faith*, trans. William V. Dych (New York: Seabury, 1978) 120-22.

34 It may be asked, too, whether Lonergan's formulation of the issue in 'De ente supernaturali' does not merit the same criticism. While the question is not treated as such in this 1946 work, the evidence that we will present in the next subsection would seem to confirm that Lonergan changed his mind on this issue after he wrote 'De ente supernaturali.'

Or, in the terms we have just used, where created grace corresponds to, indeed in the first instance is, a fifth level of consciousness, is there a fifth level of consciousness because God dwells in us, or does God dwell in us because there is a fifth level of consciousness?

Here is how Rahner formulates his difficulty:

However diverse they may be among themselves, it is true of all the Scholastic theories that they see God's indwelling and God's conjunction with the justified person as based exclusively upon created grace. In virtue of the fact that created grace is imparted to the soul God imparts God's own self to it and dwells in it. Thus what we call uncreated grace (i.e., God as bestowing God's self upon men and women) is a function of created grace. It is not difficult to see the basis of this conception: 'uncreated grace' (God's communication of God's self to men and women, the indwelling of the Spirit) implies a new relation of God to us. But this can only be conceived of as founded upon an absolute entitative modification of ourselves, which modification is the real basis of the new real relation of men and women to God upon which rests the relation of God to us. This absolute entitative modification and determination of men and women is created grace, which has in consequence a twofold aspect: it is ontologically the formal basis of the analogical supernatural participation in God's nature through entitative assimilation of men and women to God's spirituality and holiness ... and it is the basis of a special relation (union, indwelling) between us and God ... For our purpose it makes no difference how the various theories go on to explain the way in which created grace provides a basis for a new relation between us and the God of grace: whether for instance it is said that God's new efficient causality in respect of grace makes God present in a new way in the object of God's activity (in virtue of the identity of being and operation in God and God's immensity); or whether the view is put forward that the entitative elevation of ourselves as regards our spiritual powers, which are thus

orientated to the beatific vision as last end, gives us a new capacity (of an actual or potential kind) to take possession by knowledge and love of the God who is present in us by immensity; or whether one sees a perfect friendship with God established by grace, a friendship which provides a new and in itself sufficient basis for the presence of God in us (already there in fact). For in each case the indwelling of the Spirit in the justified man or woman by grace is seen merely as a consequence of the bestowal of created grace, as the end-term of a (categorical) relationship of a man or woman to God given with created grace.³⁵

That such is not the viewpoint of scripture and of the patristic tradition is emphasized by Rahner in the first section of this paper. In these sources what Scholastic theology came to call created grace is ‘a consequence of God’s self-communication to the man or woman whose sins have been forgiven,’ whereas in the Scholastics ‘created grace [is] the basis of this communication.’ Rahner wants to complete the Scholastic theory ‘by elaborating in more explicit terms a pattern of thought (already in principle to be found in Scholastic theology) and applying it to our problem in such a way that the admissibility of the patristic formula should become clear too, and hence make available a more adequate appreciation of the nature of uncreated grace.’³⁶

Rahner finds the presupposition of a solution to the problem in the relation of the state of grace as a whole – not distinguishing created and uncreated grace – and the Scholastic understanding of the beatific vision. Grace is a commencement of the blessed life, and so, says Rahner, its ontology must be homogeneous with that of the beatific vision. The relation of the life of grace and the life of glory is not purely moral and juridical. Rather, the life of glory is the definitive flowering of the life of grace already

35 Rahner, ‘Some Implications’ 324-25.

36 Ibid. 325.

possessed. This makes of grace an inner entitative principle, at least partially, of the vision of God. And so ‘the inner nature of grace as a whole in this life must allow of being more closely determined in terms of the nature of the ontological presuppositions of the immediate vision of God.’³⁷

What, then, is the Scholastic ontology of the beatific vision? St Thomas Aquinas says that in the immediate vision of God God’s essence itself takes the place of the impressed species in the created mind. The impressed species for Rahner is not the intentional image of an object, a copy of the object due to the object’s impression upon the mind, so much as it is an ontological determination of the knower, sharing in the knower’s determinate grade of being and participating in the consciousness of this knower in act. ‘... knowledge rests for St Thomas on an assimilation to the object entitatively determining the knower by means of the species as a reality of the knower’s own being, through which the knower and the known are really “the same thing.”’³⁸

Given this concept of the species, an immediate, non-analogical vision of God cannot be based on a created species, for this could reveal God’s infinite Being only in the measure of its own entitative capacity as a finite determination of the knowing subject. Thus St Thomas says that God’s own being appears in the place of a created species of the finite mind. The real relation between creature and God in this case is not founded upon an accidental, real, non-relative modification of God or of the creature: not of God, on account of God’s utter transcendence and immutability; not of the creature, because an accidental modification could not be the basis of a fundamentally and essentially new relationship of God to the creature. Thus for Rahner the new relationship cannot be thought of in terms of efficient causality, but only in terms of formal causality.

37 Ibid. 326.

38 Ibid. 328.

... all the strictly supernatural realities with which we are acquainted (the hypostatic union, the beatific vision and – as we shall go on to show here – the supernatural bestowal of grace) have this in common, that in them there is expressed a relationship of God to a creature which is not one of efficient causality (a production *out* of the cause ...), and which must consequently fall under the head of formal causality (a taking up *into* the ground ...): the ontological principle of the subsistence of a finite nature in the one case [the hypostatic union], the ontological principle of a finite knowledge in the other [grace and the beatific vision].³⁹

Because of the difficulties attendant upon such a conception – that it does not imply that God’s active formal causality reactively impresses a new determination on God’s Being in itself that would do away with God’s absolute transcendence and immutability – Rahner prefers to speak of a quasi-formal causality. ‘All this “quasi” implies is that this “form”, in spite of its formal causality, which must be taken really seriously, abides in its absolute transcendence (inviolateness, “freedom”) ... it provides an emphatic reminder of the analogical nature of our concepts in the matter of a relationship to the world known only through Revelation.’⁴⁰ The formal causality under consideration here determines the finite spirit to know and to love. ‘... the reality of the mind in the beatific vision, so far as

39 Ibid. 329-30. The notion of a finite knowledge holds in the case of the beatific vision; in sanctifying grace, however, the question is not that of immediate knowledge of God, but of the presence of God’s love that renders possible our being in love. To what extent this position agrees with that of Rahner remains an open question. It may be that Rahner does not posit a sufficient distinction between consciousness and knowledge, and, if this is the case, this lack of distinction may be responsible for what seems to be his at times imprecise language on this point.

40 Ibid. 330-31.

such a reality in itself is due to a species as the means of knowledge, is the very Being of God.⁴¹

What, then, is the relationship of the light of glory to God's Being as the quasi-species of the spirit? The light of glory is 'a [created] disposition of the spirit for the reception of the formal causality of God's intelligible Being upon it.'⁴² Thus in Scholastic terms it is a material cause in respect of God's immediate formal conjunction with the spirit, even though, as an entitative determination of the cognitive power, it is a formal cause in regard to the human spirit. It is also an ultimate disposition, and so as material cause it logically precedes the form and yet 'depends for its subsistence upon the formal causality of the form, so that to affirm its presence is simultaneously to affirm with inner necessity the presence of the formal causality of the form and conversely.'⁴³

Rahner then goes on to transfer to uncreated grace in this life the concepts of formal ontology which appear in his account of the beatific vision: 'God communicates God's own self to the person to whom grace has been shown in the mode of *formal causality*, so that this communication is not then merely the consequence of an efficient causation of created grace.'⁴⁴ Thus 'the communication of uncreated grace can be conceived of under a certain respect as logically and really prior to created grace: in that mode namely in which a formal cause is prior to the ultimate material disposition.'⁴⁵ Uncreated grace, then, is to be determined only in terms of the beatific vision: 'it is the homogeneous commencement, already given though still concealed and still to unfold, of

41 Ibid. 332.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid. 333.

44 Ibid. 334.

45 Ibid.

that communication of the divine Being taking place by way of formal causality to the created spirit which is the ontological presupposition of the [beatific vision].⁴⁶

There follow for Rahner three consequences.

First, the union of God and human beings in grace is not simply a consequence of created grace, but rather 'precedes' the created grace since the latter, as ultimate disposition to the union, can exist only when God's formal causality is actually being exercised.

Second, as the ontological presupposition of the beatific vision, this union is already posited independently of an actually exercised apprehension of the threefold God by us in knowledge and love, whether through the theological virtues or through the beatifying vision and love of fulfilment.

And third, this union is posited as a presupposition of the beatific vision. It is the ontological aspect of the unity of the created spirit with God in the act of immediate loving contemplation. It implies the highest degree of unity in the fullest distinction.

Rahner's position is summarized as follows:

Just as [in Scholastic theology] the light of glory is seen as the ultimate disposition which is the necessity for the form, so here an analogous relationship may be assumed to hold between created and uncreated grace. In this regard created grace is seen as material cause (ultimate disposition) for the formal causality which God exercises by graciously communicating God's own Being to the creature. In this way the material and formal causes possess a reciprocal priority: as ultimate disposition created grace is in such a way the presupposition of the formal cause that it can itself only exist by way of the actual realization of this formal causality. From this objective reciprocal priority there follows further the logical justification for

46 Ibid. 335.

inferring the presence of one reality from that of the other. Because created grace as ultimate disposition can only exist along with the actual formal causality of the form for which it is the disposition, it is correct to say: If created grace is given, so too necessarily by that very fact uncreated grace, and hence the whole grace of justification, is communicated to us ... In order that [created grace] can be a disposition for uncreated grace at all, it does indeed have first of all the character of a formal entitative, supernatural determination of the human spirit; as such, however, on our view too all those formal effects can be assigned to it ascribed to it by Scholastic theology. Just in so far as and in virtue of the fact that it constitutes a man or a woman as a subject fit to receive the substantial gift of the divine essence for a future vision, it assimilates a man or a woman to God's nature considered as the principle of God's self-possession in Trinity; and thus it at once becomes the formal cause of all the properties of our supernatural elevation.⁴⁷

*4.2 Hints from Lonergan on Created and Uncreated Grace: A Clarification by Contrast*⁴⁸

Student notes in the Lonergan archives give quite detailed information on Lonergan's 1947-1948 course in Toronto, *De Gratia*.⁴⁹ In this course Lonergan proposed three propositions relevant to our present question, and the third of these went through at least

⁴⁷ Ibid. 341-42.

⁴⁸ Frederick Crowe directed my attention to the research materials on Lonergan's 1947-1948 and 1951-1952 courses on grace at the Jesuit Seminary in Toronto.

⁴⁹ There are two sets of these notes in the archives, those of Frederick E. Crowe and those of William A. Stewart. Together they provide fascinating evidence of Lonergan's efforts to arrive at a formulation of this issue that satisfied him.

two versions. The first version comes close to what Rahner criticized in the Scholastics, but the second not only corrects this articulation but also proposes another way than formal causality for understanding how the God of grace is a constitutive principle of the person to whom God's love is offered and by whom the gift is accepted.

The first two propositions are numbered in the notes 20 and 21. The first version of the third proposition is not assigned a number, but the second version is numbered 22. The text of Lonergan's own notes does not enumerate the propositions, but this text is preceded by a two-page list in which the propositions are numbered. Neither this list nor the text of notes contains the first version of what became proposition 22.

Proposition 20 may be translated as reading, 'The Holy Spirit is not given without there being produced a finite effect in the justified.'⁵⁰ Proposition 21 may be translated to read, 'This finite effect is not the very uncreated gift in itself, nor is it the uncreated gift in us, but it is that by which the uncreated gift is in us.'⁵¹ The first version of the next proposition, which seems to reflect the Scholastic position criticized by Rahner, may be translated to read, 'Through this same finite effect there is constituted not only the indwelling of the Holy Spirit but also the vivification of the just through the same Spirit.'⁵² But the student notes have this proposition crossed out⁵³ and replaced by a

50 'Quod not datur Spiritus Sanctus nisi effectus finitus in iustis producitur.'

51 'Quod hic effectus finitus non est id quod est ipsum donum increatum, neque est id quod est donum increatum in nobis, sed est id quo est donum increatum in nobis.'

52 'Quod per eundem effectum finitum non sola inhabitatio Spiritus Sancti constituitur sed etiam vivificatio iustorum per eundem Spiritum.'

53 Crowe informs me that Lonergan, who was in some labor at this point to get his doctrine worked out, instructed his students to delete the first version of this proposition. In Crowe's notes there is a large X next to this proposition, and in

proposition that, translated, reads, ‘The uncreated gift, as uncreated, is constituted by God alone, and by it God stands to the state of the justified person not only as an efficient principle but also as a constitutive principle; but this constitutive principle is present in the just not as an inherent form but as the term of a relation.’⁵⁴

It seems clear, then, that Lonergan wrestled with the same question that occupied Rahner in the article we discussed above, and that during this 1947-1948 course (and so a year or so after he wrote ‘De ente supernaturali’) he changed his position on the understanding of the relation between created and uncreated grace. In the first attempt, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (the uncreated gift) is constituted through the finite effect or created grace without whose production the gift of the Holy Spirit is not given (proposition 20) and by which the uncreated gift is in us (proposition 21). But in proposition 22 as Lonergan got it worked out to his satisfaction at this time, the uncreated gift is constituted by God alone. And God’s position as regards the ‘state’ of grace is not only that of an efficient cause but also that of a constitutive principle, and this precisely because the uncreated gift is constituted by God alone.

On the latter point, then, though not on the priority of uncreated grace, Lonergan’s position as he worked it out in this course differs from that of Rahner, and this on two counts. First, for Rahner the new relationship constituted by God’s gift of God’s own self is not to be thought of at all, it seems, in terms of efficient causality, whereas for Lonergan it cannot be thought of *only* in these terms. Second, for Rahner the new

Stewart’s notes there are written in the margin, ‘omittitur’ (‘it is omitted’) and ‘propositio omitti potest’ (‘the proposition can be omitted’).

54 ‘Quod ipsum donum increatum qua increatum per solum Deum constituitur, quare Deus se habet ad statum iusti non solum tamquam principium effectivum, sed etiam tamquam principium constitutivum, quod tamen principium constitutivum non iusto adest per modum formae inhaerentis sed iusto adest per modum termini relationis.’

relationship has to be a form of formal causality, whereas for Lonergan God is a constitutive principle of the person receiving grace, not as a formal cause, but as the term of a relation. Nor does Rahner's use of the expression 'quasi-formal causality' minimize the difference, since for Rahner, while the form abides in its absolute transcendence and so is not what Lonergan would call an inherent form (what is explicitly negated by Lonergan in the second version of thesis 22),⁵⁵ its formal causality 'must be taken really seriously.'⁵⁶

Lonergan's notes for his course on grace in 1951-1952⁵⁷ are even clearer on this question, and interestingly enough they also would call into question Rahner's 'strict homogeneity' between the ontology of the beatific vision and that of sanctifying grace in the 'just.' The question is raised, 'Whether God stands to the just as a form or a higher act or a supporting⁵⁸ act.'⁵⁹ Lonergan's answer is,

55 The notes of Crowe and Stewart show Lonergan defining 'forma inhaerens' as 'forma recepta in potentia et per potentiam limitata' (form received in potency and limited by potency).

56 Rahner, 'Some Implications' 330.

57 These notes are contained in file 30 of batch II in the archives of the Lonergan Research Institute. No date is given for the notes in this file, but a copy of part of the notes typed from Lonergan's own notes by Thomas Hoey, a student of Lonergan's at the time, indicate that they are the notes for the 1951-1952 course. The course on grace in 1951-1952 was divided between Lonergan and Fr Elmer O'Brien. 2009: These notes are now available on www.bernardlonergan.com at 20500DTL040.

58 The primary meaning of *assistō* is not 'to help,' though this meaning is given in Latin dictionaries as a secondary meaning. Rather, its primary meaning is something like 'to stand by,' 'to be present' but in a supportive role. I wish to thank Michael Shields of the Lonergan Research Institute for his assistance (!) on this matter.

We hold that such a doctrine is fitting in the case of the grace of [hypostatic] union (the humanity of Christ exists through the personal act of existence of the Word) and of the beatific vision (the divine essence is intelligible species). In these cases God fulfils in some way the function of act or form. We deny that this doctrine is fitting in the case of the justified, for everything can be preserved through the transcendental formal effects.⁶⁰ De facto nothing is said of the just that requires God as form or God as act. Trent teaches that the only formal cause of our justification is the justice of God by which God makes us just, that is, sanctifying grace and its consequences.⁶¹

‘Transcendental formal effects’ is the expression that Lonergan used at this time (1951-1952) to name the created effect in relation to the uncreated gift. Later, when in his Gregorian University courses he had worked out his own original analogy for the divine

59 ‘Utrum ipse Deus se habet ad iustum per modum formae vel actus eminentioris vel assistentis.’

60 To paraphrase a bit, ‘It is not needed, for the transcendental formal effects are quite sufficient to account for all the data we have on the just.’

61 ‘Dicimus eiusmodi doctrinam esse convenientem ubi agitur de gratia unionis (humanitas Christi existit per esse personale Verbi) vel de visione beatifica (divina essentia se habet ut species intelligibilis). His in casibus Deus ipse implet quodammodo vices actus vel formae. Negamus eiusmodi doctrinam esse convenientem ubi agitur de iustis. Nam omnia salvari possunt per effectus formales transcendentales. De facto, nihil dicitur de iusto quod requirit Deum ut formam vel Deum ut actum. Tridentinum docet unicam causam formalem nostrae iustificationis esse iustitiam Dei qua nos iustos facit, scilicet, gratiam sanctificantem et sua consecratia.’

self-communication, he would make a corresponding change from ‘transcendental formal effects’ to ‘consequent condition.’ Thus, what Lonergan came to account for through a consequent condition, Rahner accounts for through a created disposition, but with at least the difference that the latter is a material disposition for the reception of a formal (or quasi-formal) cause, whereas the former has to do with the truth of a relation established in the person, one term of which is the uncreated gift of God; the relation is established consequent upon the gift, and so by reason of the divine initiative alone, but it is also the condition of the possibility of the truth that God dwells in us.⁶²

Further study of the development of Lonergan’s theology of grace may show that there are further and even more substantive differences between him and Rahner. But these differences have not been the principal point of this section of the present essay. Rahner is well known for raising the question of the relation of created and uncreated grace, and on the issue of the relative priority of uncreated grace he has arrived at a position that corresponds to the transposition of thesis 1 of ‘De ente supernaturali’ that I am suggesting here. But Lonergan came to the same position, it seems, on this limited issue only a year or so after he wrote ‘De ente supernaturali,’ and he expressed his understanding in a manner that I find more satisfactory. He understands the divine self-communication in such a way that God is present to us and constitutively dwells in us as the term of a relationship that God has constituted. This seems to me preferable to Rahner’s quasi-formal causality. The created grace caused by the divine self-communication can, I believe, still be referred to as a disposition to receive the uncreated gift, but not as a material or quasi-material cause in relation to a formal or quasi-formal

62 A full clarification of Lonergan’s meaning here would have to go into his notion of extrinsic predication. The created gift is not per se a condition of God’s dwelling in us – that is constituted by God alone – but of the truth that God dwells in us. Fuller explorations of these matters will, I hope, be undertaken in subsequent essays.

cause, but rather as a real relation of the creature to the creator consequent upon the divine self-communication and participating in the relations constitutive of the inner life of God, and conditioning the possibility of us having the truth that God dwells in us.⁶³

In the present essay I am suggesting that we identify this real relation with a fifth level or enlargement of consciousness. Further transposition of Lonergan's work on grace would regard the four levels of consciousness that constitute 'nature' as a principle of movement and of rest, as forming the human term of this relation and as standing in obediential potency to this real relation.

Before I close this paper, may I suggest that we must turn to human love to find the analogy by which we are able to reach some further understanding, albeit imperfect, of the reality of grace as we have presented it here. The positive dimensions of the analogy would be at least twofold. First, the reception of the love of another person for us changes us in such a way as to enable us to perform operations and experience states which previously were not within our capacity. I have made some initial forays into expressing this in chapter 8 of *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. Second (and this I still have to work out even in incipient fashion), the love of another person for us is somehow constitutive of us (without, of course, involving the indwelling of that other person in the same manner as the divine indwelling), and not in the manner of a formal cause, but in the manner of inviting us into a relation to the one who loves us, who would thus be one term of the relationship.⁶⁴

63 2009: I am in this paper not going into the Trinitarian aspects of the 1951-1952 position. That is being developed in work currently going forward.

64 2009 note: I would now express this in terms of the mutual self-mediation of which Lonergan speaks in 'The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,' in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996) at 174-76.

At any rate, let me close by simply repeating the transposition of the main elements of the first thesis of 'De ente supernaturali' that, drawing on some of Lonergan's later formulations, I have attempted to present here: The gift of God's love for us poured forth into our hearts is an uncreated grace that effects in us, as a relational disposition to receive it, the created grace of a fifth level of consciousness, at which we experience ourselves as loved unconditionally by God and invited to love God in return. This experience of being loved unconditionally and of being invited to love in return is the conscious basis of (1) our share in the inner life of God, (2) our consequent falling in love with God, and (3) the dynamic state of our being in love with God. The dynamic state of being in love with God, in turn, as equivalent to what the Scholastic tradition called the infused virtue of charity, is the proximate principle of the operations of charity whereby God is attained as God is in God's own self. The created, remote, and proportionate principle of these operations – what Scholastic theology called the entitative habit or sanctifying grace of a created communication of the divine nature – is the fifth level of consciousness, the experience of resting in God's unconditional love for us and of being invited to love in return, the real relation to and constituted by the indwelling God as term of the relation.