

Essays in Systematic Theology 31: The Four *Entia Supernaturalia*: Expanding the 1957 Hypothesis with Earlier Course Notes¹

© Copyright 2011 by Robert M. Doran

‘... being in love is a response to being loved.’²

‘... our being in love with God is God’s gift to us,
his gift of himself to us, his loving us and our being loved by him.’³

‘Just as one has to learn to labor to bring out into the open one’s experience of one’s conscious and intentional operations generally, so too one has to perform a similar labor to identify in one’s own horizon and in its more outward fruits what is meant by the words “being in love with God.”’⁴

‘You have people who ask, What is religious experience? But you wouldn’t be here if you didn’t have it in some form. It can be a concealed vector, a component, an undertow in your life; but it is there. Otherwise, you would find something better to do than to listen to a talk about

1 This is the text of a lecture that was delivered at the 2009 West Coast Methods Institute, Loyola Marymount University, April 2009.

2 Bernard Lonergan, quoted from a lecture on ‘Dialectic and Foundations’ at the Regis College 1969 Institute on *Method in Theology*. See www.bernardlonergan.com at 53100DTE060.

3 Bernard Lonergan, quoted from the same lecture, the beginning of the third point on deriving special categories.

4 Bernard Lonergan, quoted from a lecture on ‘Horizons and Categories’ at the Regis College 1969 Institute on *Method in Theology*. See www.bernardlonergan.com at 53200DTE060.

theology. To identify it psychologically is not easy. However, it is not important either: by their fruits you shall know them.’⁵

1 Setting the Context

In a paper entitled ‘Consciousness and Grace’ published in *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* in 1993, I defended the following position:

The gift of God’s love for us poured fourth 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.⁶

5 Bernard Lonergan, quoted from a discussion session at the same institute. See www.bernardlonergan.com at 542R0A0E060.

6 Robert M. Doran, ‘Consciousness and Grace,’ *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 11:1 (Spring 1993) 75, now available on www.lonerganresource.com, as the first essay in the e-book ‘Essays in Systematic Theology.’

Responses to the paper appeared quickly, and for the most part they were critical of my position. Particular attention was drawn to my affirmation of a fifth level of consciousness. For now I wish to leave that issue to Jeremy Blackwood, who has recently written an account of the discussion that followed my article, and has provided a new and cogent way to talk about a fifth level. Blackwood argues convincingly and with sufficient evidence that the post-*Method* Lonergan really *did* intend to affirm a fifth level of consciousness.⁷ A very helpful criticism of my article came in a conversation with Joseph Komonchak, who did not address the issue of a fifth level but indicated that I needed to refine my expression in a way that was more sensitive to the distinction between consciousness and knowledge. To say, ‘...we experience ourselves as loved unconditionally by God and invited to love God in return’ is not quite accurate. To affirm that we have conscious experiences that subsequently may be interpreted in this way is a far more acceptable way of speaking. Komonchak also advised that I turn more in depth to unpublished works of the early Lonergan on the question of sanctifying grace to see whether these support or modify my position, again not on the issue of a fifth level, about which these early works say nothing, but rather regarding the basic thrust of my article – a thrust that is captured in the quotations from much later lectures by Lonergan with which I began the present contribution.

Here, then, I will report regarding an item in the Lonergan archives that I find remarkably relevant to the discussion that followed my 1993 article. That discussion has subsequently expanded to include the question of the validity, permanent or temporary, of the so-called four-point hypothesis contained in the sixth chapter of Lonergan’s Trinitarian systematics, in which the four divine relations are linked, respectively, to four created participations and imitations.⁸

7 Jeremy Blackwood, ‘Sanctifying Grace, Elevation, and the Fifth Level of Consciousness: Further Developments within Lonergan Scholarship,’ unpublished paper.

8 The hypothesis appears in the text of chapter 6 of Lonergan’s *Divinarum personarum* (1957 and 1959) and is repeated in the 1964 revision of that text, *De Deo Trino: Pars systematica*. It

The major issue in that portion of the discussion is whether Lonergan's later three-point statements regarding the divine self-communication – in the Incarnation, in the gift of grace, and in the beatific vision – is sufficient, and whether the four-point statement that results from distinguishing sanctifying grace and charity is little more than the fruit of the Aristotelian metaphysical framework within which the four-point hypothesis originally appeared. The archival document that I wish to refer you to is pertinent to the discussion of this hypothesis. What might be the first appearance in Lonergan's texts of this hypothesis can be found in his notes for a course on sanctifying grace in 1951-52,⁹ which is the text that I wish to report on in

can now be found in the Collected Works edition of these texts, *The Triune God: Systematics*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007) 470-73, where it reads in translation as follows: '... there are four real divine relations, really identical with the divine substance, and therefore there are four very special modes that ground the external imitation of the divine substance. Next, there are four absolutely supernatural realities, which are never found uninformed, namely, the secondary act of existence of the incarnation, sanctifying grace, the habit of charity, and the light of glory. It would not be inappropriate, therefore, to say that the secondary act of existence of the incarnation is a created participation of paternity, and so has a special relation to the Son; that sanctifying grace is a participation of active spiration, and so has a special relation to the Holy Spirit; that the habit of charity is a participation of passive spiration, and so has a special relation to the Father and the Son; and that the light of glory is a participation of sonship, and so in a most perfect way brings the children of adoption back to the Father.'

⁹ These notes have the archival number A205 in the Lonergan archives at the Lonergan Research Institute in Toronto, and can be found on www.bernardlonergan.com at 20500DTL040. One important page of these notes has been mistakenly relocated in the archives as the first page of A160 (16000DTL040 on the website). 2011: The notes will be published in 2011 or 2012 as chapter 7 in vol. 19 of Lonergan's Collected Works, *Early Latin*

the present paper. In these notes, the significance of the hypothesis approaches the importance that I granted it, since it is explicitly called the foundational statement in a systematic theology of sanctifying grace.

Lonergan's 1951-52 notes are divided into three sections: (1) a set of historical points, (2) a treatment of the biblical basis of the doctrine of sanctifying grace, and (3) a systematic synthesis regarding that doctrine. I can treat the historical notes only very briefly and the scriptural notes only partially, though both are well worth a great deal more attention than I can give them here.

2 The Historical Notes

A summary of the conclusion of the historical notes is all I can offer here. Lonergan is concerned with connecting the steps that led to the Lutheran and Reformed positions on justification. He roots these positions in the confrontationalism and conceptualism of Scotus and in subsequent nominalist and voluntarist doctrine. His concern in the section seems to be almost exclusively to set up a context that calls for a review of what the scriptures say about justification and salvation, which, he claims, cannot support the Lutheran and Reformed positions. That review follows immediately, and then heads him into the systematic treatment of the issue. Whether Lonergan would later maintain the same interpretation of Lutheran and Reformed theologies is irrelevant to our issue. I suspect he would not. But in this document, they simply set a context for the discussion that does not influence in any immanent or internal manner the scriptural notes or the systematic treatment, which may be read on their own independently of this contextual setting.

Theology, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour. The chapter is entitled 'Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace.'

3 The Scriptural Notes

The scriptural notes begin with a synthetic statement of the biblical basis for the notion of habitual or sanctifying grace. That notion, of course, does not appear as such in scripture. The point to the biblical notes is to present a scriptural basis for the Catholic understanding of justification. The synthetic statement of biblical doctrine reads as follows, in translation.

(1) Those whom God the Father loves as he loves his only-begotten Son Jesus (2) he gifts with the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit, so that, (3) reborn (4) into a new life, (5) they might become living members of Christ. By this gift, they, (6) the justified, (7) the friends of God, (8) the adopted children of God, (9) the heirs in hope of eternal life, (10) enter into participation in divine life.

Every one of these ten points, Lonergan maintains, has a firm biblical basis, and he supports that claim with abundant references for each point. Taken together the ten points provide a scriptural warrant for the later doctrine of habitual or sanctifying grace. ‘Sanctifying grace’ or ‘habitual grace’ is a synthetic category that unites these ten features, which themselves are abundantly present in the scriptures. The systematic part of the treatise shows how the biblical doctrine that Lonergan has expressed in this synthetic statement is possible, how this ten-point statement can be true.

Already in the biblical notes, however, Lonergan is making systematic statements, relating the Aristotelian framework for the emergence of the notion of sanctifying grace directly to the biblical data. Thus, not only is the specific character of habitual or sanctifying grace found in its unifying capacity with respect to the ten features of the biblical synthesis, but also Lonergan draws a parallel to Aristotle’s notion of the unifying capacity of ‘anima’ vis-à-vis habits and operations of various kinds, and so he links the notion of sanctifying grace as an entitative habit rooted in the essence of the soul to the ten biblical affirmations that he is synthesizing. As the soul is to the potencies of the soul and the habits rooted in them and the

operations that flow from the habits, so sanctifying grace is to the various features synthesized in the statement of biblical doctrine. These various features will later, in the systematic part of the treatise, be organized in a way that parallels, at least roughly, the Aristotelian relations of soul to potencies, potencies to habits, and habits to operations. This same Aristotelian framework for nature, then, becomes analogically the framework for understanding the supernatural. In doing so, it demands that the specific character of sanctifying grace be distinct from the specific character of the virtue or habit of charity, in a manner analogous to the way in which the soul is distinct from the faculty of the will. Charity is a more proximate principle of operations rooted not in ‘anima’ but in the will, that is, in one of the faculties or potencies of the soul.

A question that abides to this day is whether the replacement of the Aristotelian metaphysical framework with a methodical analysis of religious interiority will demand or even support this distinction. I have voiced support for the permanent validity of the distinction between sanctifying grace and charity, while those who appeal to a three-point rather than a four-point statement of the divine self-communication regard the distinction as unnecessary.

Because of the constraints imposed by time and length of this paper, I must limit myself to the comments that Lonergan makes on the first two elements in his biblical synthesis. It is here that he begins to introduce categories that will be developed in the systematic portion. Moreover, these two elements are the points most relevant to my present concern. They read again as follows: (1) Those whom God the Father loves as he loves his only-begotten Son Jesus (2) he gifts with the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit.

3.1 The Father Loves Us as He Loves the Son

The first affirmation in the synthetic statement is that ‘there are those who are loved by the Father as the only-begotten Son is loved by him.’ This affirmation is based on John 17.20-26, and especially verses 23 and 26, but Lonergan goes on to explain it in terms of Thomas Aquinas’s discussion of love, where a distinction is drawn between essential and notional love in

God. (For those unfamiliar with traditional terminology in Trinitarian theology the term ‘notional’ can be confusing. It refers to the personal properties of the divine persons, precisely as that by which we *know* each of them as distinct from the others.¹⁰)

The key texts from John read: ‘... I in them and you in me, that they may be perfectly one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me’ (vs 23). ‘... that the love with which you have loved me may be in them, and I in them’ (vs 26). Pauline texts are cited as well, but between the Johannine and Pauline texts, Lonergan introduces systematic categories from Aquinas to elucidate the point, and even more to set up his later systematic discussion.

The main point of Lonergan’s use of Aquinas in this section is that the special love by which God draws us into participation in the divine life is to be understood as effected by essential divine love, the love that is common to the three divine persons, but also as immanently constituted in terms of notional acts proper to each of the divine persons, thus setting up distinct relations on our part to each person. Essential divine love does not find us good in this special way in which divine life is shared with us until it has made us good in this way, and this it does through ‘*gratia gratum faciens*,’ the grace that makes us pleasing to God. That grace, as caused by God, is the result of essential divine love, but it establishes in us distinct relations to each of the divine persons and a distinct participation in the divine life of each of them.

3.2 The Gift of the Holy Spirit

The second affirmation contained in the general synthetic statement of scriptural teaching is to

10 ‘These divine attributes are called “notional,” not as if they were conceptual beings, but because they cause the divine persons to be known as distinct from one another.’ Bernard Lonergan, *The Triune God: Doctrines*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009) 413.

the effect that the Father gifts those whom he loves in this way with the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit. Again, both John and Paul are cited in support, with numerous texts from each, including Romans 5.5, which became Lonergan's principal text on the issue.

Again Aquinas is appealed to. From *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 38, aa. 1 and 2, Lonergan draws the following. A divine person can be given if the person belongs to another divine person by origin; and a divine person can be received by a rational creature joined to God, provided the divine person has been given to the rational creature by the person or persons to whom that person belongs by origin. Then the rational creature 'becomes a sharer in the divine Word and in the proceeding Love, so that she has at her disposal a power to know God and to love God rightly.'¹¹ The divine person that is properly called "Gift" is the Holy Spirit, since the first gift responsible for all other gifts is love, and the Holy Spirit proceeds in God precisely as Love.

The gift is a mission of the Holy Spirit to all who are 'participes gratiae.' And for Thomas, 'A divine person is said to be sent if that person exists in a new way in someone, and is said to be given if that person is possessed by someone. And neither of these occurs except in accord with ("secundum") the grace that makes one pleasing to God ("gratiam gratum facientem").'¹²

The essential issue in the systematic treatment will be the meaning of that difficult Latin word 'secundum.' What precisely is the relation between the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit and the created 'gratia gratum faciens?' Aquinas tells us that 'two things must be considered in the one to whom the mission happens: indwelling by grace and something new brought through grace.'¹³ The relation between those 'two things' has been a matter of dispute.¹⁴

11 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 38, a. 1.

12 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 43, a. 3.

13 Ibid. a. 6.

For Lonergan, the explication of the relation takes the following course. First, the Spirit is given to us insofar as the Spirit is had by us, and this posits a change, not in the Holy Spirit nor in God but in us. For whatever is predicated contingently of God is true through extrinsic denomination. That change in us is denoted by the term *gratia gratum faciens*, and it is understood in terms of something being given to us, created in us, that renders us pleasing to God. The statement that the Father and the Son send the Holy Spirit could not be true, were it not for this change in us. For anything predicated contingently of God, while constituted by the divine perfection, demands, if it is truly predicated, that there be a created external term as consequent condition of the truth of the statement that makes the predication. In this case the created consequent condition is *gratia gratum faciens*.

Second, *gratia gratum faciens* makes us pleasing to God in this special way because it is a created share in God's own life, that is, in the divine Word and in the proceeding Love, as Aquinas said in q. 38, a. 1. More precisely, that *gratia* is the created term of a relation to the Holy Spirit, and so the Holy Spirit is given to us precisely as the uncreated term of a created relation.

Third, for this reason, in the four-point hypothesis *gratia gratum faciens* will be said to be a created participation in and imitation of the divine relation that we call active spiration, since that is the uncreated relation of the Father and the Son together to the Holy Spirit, who proceeds as Love (*Amor procedens*) precisely from them, from their loving (*notionaliter diligere*). Thus, what makes us pleasing to God is that we have been given a share in the relation to the Holy Spirit that in God is called active spiration, the Father and the Son breathing the Holy Spirit, where the Son is precisely *Verbum spirans Amorem*. That change in us is simultaneously the created term of a created relation to the Holy Spirit that makes it possible for us to say truly

14 Karl Rahner elucidated the dispute in his famous article 'Some Implications of the Scholastic Concept of Uncreated Grace,' *Theological Investigations*, vol. 1, trans. Cornelius Ernst (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961) 319-46. His solution is different from Lonergan's.

that the Holy Spirit is sent to us by the Father and the Son and dwells in us as the other term, the uncreated term, of that created relation.

Fourth, that change is also what has come to be called sanctifying or habitual grace, whose specific character is here portrayed in terms of its unifying the various elements described in the scriptures that are synthesized in Lonergan's 10-point statement of biblical doctrine.

Fifth, the Holy Spirit, to whom we are related anew and in a special way by *gratia gratum faciens* participating in active spiration, is a Proceeding Love in God who is in turn related to the Father and the Son. The Spirit is a passive spiration that in its proper character is nothing but Love. Thus, charity will be our created participation in the Holy Spirit, a change in us, a created relation to the Father and the Son, a change that proceeds from the unification that is *gratia gratum faciens*, through divine favor finding, indeed making, us pleasing to God.

So even here, in his comments on the synthetic statement of biblical doctrine, Lonergan is setting up the need for a twofold terminology for the reality of the divine indwelling when that indwelling comes to be explained systematically.

The richness of these reflections leads me to ask, as I asked in 'Consciousness and Grace,' whether to speak of the methodical transposition of the category of sanctifying grace in terms of 'being in love with God,' or more precisely, in terms of an otherworldly being-in-love that is without conditions or qualifications or restrictions or reservations, as Lonergan does,¹⁵ is perhaps too compact. To me those expressions connote our participation through charity in the relation to the Father and the Son that is the Holy Spirit, but do not satisfactorily convey the participation in the created relation that makes it be true that the Holy Spirit is precisely *given* to us as a term of a relation; that is, it does not convey '*gratia gratum faciens*'; it does not adequately convey the 'making pleasing' that for me is better articulated biblically in 1 John 4.10

15 See Lonergan, *Method Theology* 289.

and 4.19 than in Romans 5.5, which leaves itself open to an interpretation that misses the point:¹⁶ ‘This is the love I mean: not our love for God, but God’s love for us when he sent his Son ... We are to love, then, because he loved us first.’

More needs to be done, then, to articulate the experiential element relevant to sanctifying grace. That element that will have something to do with the literal meaning of ‘*gratum faciens*,’ with being on the receiving end of a divine love that makes us pleasing to God by giving us a created participation in divine life in the form of a created relation to the Holy Spirit. That created relation shares in the uncreated relation of active spiration. It releases in us the love for God in return, the charity that is a created relation to the Father and the Son and a created participation in and imitation of the Holy Spirit, who is their mutual love for each other.

In an aside, let me comment simply that the genius of some of the best directors of the Ignatian *Spiritual Exercises* is reflected in the way they begin a retreat by asking the exercitant to meditate on scriptural passages that could enkindle in one the sense of being on the receiving end of divine love. Ignatius himself ends the *Exercises* with a contemplation for obtaining the love of God in return. These directors begin the *Exercises* by helping one become aware of God’s love for oneself. And in another aside let me add that, while I was composing this part of the paper, I came across the following from Diadochus of Photice in the Divine Office for Friday of the Second Week in Ordinary Time: ‘Anyone who loves God in the depths of his heart has already been loved by God. In fact, the measure of a man’s love for God depends upon how deeply aware he is of God’s love for him. When this awareness is keen, it makes whoever possesses it long to be enlightened by the divine light, and this longing is so intense that it seems to penetrate his very bones. He loses all consciousness of himself and is entirely transformed by the love of God.’ That passage reflects a mystical intensification of the set of relations offered in grace to all

16 The misinterpretation is shown when the passage is taken to refer to *our* love for God rather than *God’s* own love. The meaning is clearly the second, and Lonergan recognized that; but even Lonergan’s own reading of Romans 5.5 has been misunderstood.

men and women at every time and place. These relations would constitute the ‘special basic relations’ that for some reason are left out of the following central methodological passage in *Method in Theology*: ‘... general basic terms name conscious and intentional operations. General basic relations name elements in the dynamic structure linking operations and generating states. Special basic terms name God’s gift of his love and Christian witness. Derived terms and relations name the objects known in operations and correlative to states.’¹⁷ The passage invites us to ask, What about special basic relations? They are not mentioned. I am suggesting that the special basic relations are the created participations in the divine relations of active and passive spiration, through being on the receiving end of God’s love in *gratia gratum faciens* and loving God in return in charity.

4 The Systematic Synthesis

The systematic synthesis shows *how* this can be true. More specifically, how can sanctifying grace unify the various elements mentioned in the synthetic statement of biblical doctrine? Lonergan’s answer is in terms of formal effects. What true judgments can be made once one knows a formal intelligibility of some sort? In this case, the formal intelligibility is the entitative habit known as sanctifying grace, and the true judgments that can be made once one posits that intelligibility have to do both with the person gifted with sanctifying grace and with the God who gives the gift. The latter judgments concern what is truly said of God as the term of the relations that are established with the gift of *gratia gratum faciens*. With respect to divine love, these judgments can be concerned either with divine love considered essentially or with divine love properly attributed to one or other divine Person.

Divine love insofar as it is an effective principle is predicated essentially and so equally of the three divine persons. A corollary of this fundamental theorem is that every grace, insofar

¹⁷ Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 343.

as it is related to divine love as its effective principle, is related not to notional but to essential divine love. If such love is predicated of one divine person, excluding the others, that predication is not proper but by appropriation.

However, not everything that is predicated contingently of the divine persons is predicated by appropriation; and not everything that is predicated of the divine persons in respect to grace is predicated by appropriation. The mission of a divine person is predicated properly, not by appropriation, for one person sends and another is sent, and the one who sends is not sent and the one who is sent does not send. This applies to the missions of the divine persons with respect to *gratia gratum faciens*.

At this point the four-point hypothesis as such makes perhaps its first appearance in Lonergan's work. There are four graces to which the word 'grace' applies in a preeminent way: the grace of union, the light of glory, sanctifying grace, and the habit of charity.

The grace of union is that finite reality received in the humanity of Christ so that it exists through the personal act of existence of the divine Word. This grace is the external term in accord with which it is truly said, 'The Word became flesh.' *Summa theologiae*, 3, q. 17, a. 2, is referred to, and the issue there is settled in terms of relation ('habitus'). '... by the human nature there accrued to Him no new personal being, but only a new relation of the pre-existing personal being to the human nature (*nova habitudo esse personalis praeexistentis ad naturam humanam*), in such a way that the Person is said to subsist not merely in the divine but also in the human nature.'

The light of glory is that finite reality by which a created intellect is disposed to receive the divine essence as intelligible species and so to see God as God is in God's own self.

Sanctifying grace is that finite reality by which a finite substance is reborn and regenerated to participate in divine life itself.

The habit of charity is that finite reality by which a finite regenerated substance habitually possesses true friendship with God.

The ontological foundation of these four graces, these four *entia supernaturalia*, is grounded in exemplary causality, a point not mentioned as such in the later expression of the four-point hypothesis, even though it is implicit in the references to imitation.

The divine essence is the first exemplary cause which every finite being, whether created or 'creatable,' substantial or accidental, imitates. But the divine essence can be considered in two ways: insofar as it is absolute and common to the three divine persons, and insofar as it is really identical with one of the real divine relations, whether paternity or filiation or active spiration or passive spiration.

Since every finite substance has something of absolute reality about it, it can be said to imitate the divine essence considered insofar as the divine essence is absolute and common to the three divine persons. But since the four preeminent graces are intimately connected with the divine life, they can appropriately be said to imitate the divine essence insofar as the divine essence is identical to one or other divine relation.

Thus the grace of union imitates and in a finite manner participates divine paternity, the light of glory imitates and in a finite manner participates filiation, sanctifying grace imitates and in a finite manner participates active spiration, and the habit of charity imitates and in a finite manner participates passive spiration.

I must pass over for now much of the material here, which is more abundant than in the later expression of the hypothesis, in order to concentrate on the way in which Lonergan argues that the ten elements presented in the synthetic statement of biblical doctrine are unified by the notion of sanctifying grace.

Sanctifying grace, he has just stated, is a participation in the divine relation of active spiration. He proceeds to argue for the synthetic unity of the biblical elements by showing how each of these elements can be understood in terms of formal effects: first, immanent formal effects and then transcendent formal effects. There are primary and secondary immanent formal effects and primary and secondary transcendent formal effects. With each of these I will put in

parentheses the number the synthetic statement that corresponds to a particular formal effect of sanctifying grace.

Primary immanent formal effects are what can truly be said of a subject because of what is intrinsically constitutive of that subject. There are two intimately related primary immanent formal effects of sanctifying grace. First, it makes the one who has it a participant in divine life (10), for it imitates active spiration, and so establishes a special relation to the Holy Spirit (2). Second, simultaneously, as it were, it makes one pleasing to God, able to be loved with a special divine love (1). The explanation of the second of these primary immanent formal effects is very interesting to me from the perspective of what I said in ‘Consciousness and Grace.’ Since active spiration is the principle of the Holy Spirit, it is also the principle of proceeding divine Love itself. But the principle of any love is loveliness, and therefore active spiration is God as lovable, the divine goodness as the principle of love. Therefore, because sanctifying grace imitates active spiration, it imitates God insofar as God is lovable, it imitates the divine goodness in breathing love, and so it makes the one who possesses it lovable with a special divine love (1). Thus there returns the central theme of God’s love for us, in connection with sanctifying grace.

Secondary immanent formal effects are what can truly be said of a subject because they are distinct, necessary consequences of what is intrinsically constitutive of that subject. In this sense the infused virtue of charity, by which one is habitually a friend of God (7), is a secondary immanent formal effect of sanctifying grace. Again I am reminded of 1 John 4.19: We are to love, because God has first loved us. As active spiration stands to passive spiration, so sanctifying grace stands to charity. And as sanctifying grace imitates active spiration, so the virtue of charity imitates passive spiration, love that flows forth because it is the resultant of divine *notionaliter diligere*. Active spiration stands to passive spiration as principle stands to its resultant, and so sanctifying grace, *gratia gratum faciens*, stands to charity as a principle stands to its resultant. Besides, active and passive spiration are really distinct, correlative, inseparable, and equal. Therefore, sanctifying grace and charity are really distinct: with the infusion of grace,

charity is also infused; when charity is lost, so is grace; and the measure of grace in a person is the same as the measure of that person's charity.

Other secondary immanent formal effects of sanctifying grace are relative to one's state in life. For example, in those living on earth, faith and hope (9) would be secondary immanent formal effects of sanctifying grace.

There are also mixed immanent formal effects of sanctifying grace. They are introduced in the text without explanation of what is meant by 'mixed,' but that term means, I think, that they include both primary and secondary immanent formal effects. Thus, a first instance of these mixed effects is regeneration or rebirth (3) into a new life (4). Regeneration here means the arrival of a new nature to an existing person, a new first and remote principle of operation and new proximate principles of operation. Through sanctifying grace there comes to an existing rational creature primarily that grace itself which is the first and remote principle of operating supernaturally and meritoriously, the reciprocal relations to the Holy Spirit and to the Father and the Son, but secondarily the infused virtues and gifts which are the proximate principles of a supernatural life.

Another mixed immanent formal effect of sanctifying grace is that a rational creature is justified (6) with that justice of God by which God makes us just. There are several dimensions to that justice of God. We will have to skip over the details of this analysis, except for the first: justice is primarily truth (*Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 21, a. 2), not as simply existing in the intellect but as existing in the intellect and directing and moving the will. Thus the justice of God is the Word spirating love, which of course is active spiration.

So much for sanctifying grace considered in its immanent formal effects. Another major section considers sanctifying grace in its transcendent formal effects, effects that are truly said of one subject, in this case God or one or other of the divine persons, because of what is intrinsically constitutive of another subject or because of what flows from what is intrinsically constitutive of another subject, that is, us having been elevated to participation in divine life.

Whatever is said of God contingently is said not entitatively but terminatively, that is, of God as the term of a created relation. Many things are said of God contingently in the order of sanctifying grace, and so there exist transcendent formal effects of sanctifying grace.

These transcendent formal effects are of two kinds. For sanctifying grace can be considered as an effect of divine love, since it is out of love that God produces grace in a person, and it can also be considered as a term of divine love (for God loves the person made pleasing).

The transcendent formal effects of sanctifying grace as itself an effect of divine love regard essential divine love. All three persons are equally one effective principle of every creature whatsoever. And so this effective divine love is predicated equally of all three persons. And love that is predicated equally of all three is essential love. But the transcendent formal effects of sanctifying grace as terms are related to notional divine love. This assertion is proposed as probable with an intrinsic probability; for what Scripture and the Fathers say about the various relations of the divine Persons to the just seem to postulate that grace be a term of notional divine love. Arguments to the contrary put forth by theologians, in Lonergan's view, do no more than prove that grace not as a term but as an effect is related to essential divine love.

Thus, a transcendent formal effect of sanctifying grace in Christ as a human being is that the Father loves the Son as a human being with that notional love that is the Holy Spirit and Gift. The Father eternally and necessarily loves the Son as God by the Holy Spirit. In time and contingently the Father loves the Son as a human being by the Holy Spirit. This fact, being contingent, requires an appropriate external term. This appropriate term is nothing other than sanctifying grace, for it imitates extrinsically that active spiration whereby the Father loves. Eternally and by reason of his procession the Holy Spirit is Gift. In time and contingently the Holy Spirit is given to this particular person, Jesus of Nazareth. This fact, being contingent, requires an appropriate external term; and this appropriate term is sanctifying grace, for it imitates active spiration and therefore has a special relation to that passive spiration which is the Holy Spirit. (All of this is background to statement 1 in the biblical synthesis.)

Again, the transcendent formal effects of sanctifying grace in us represent systematic articulations of the elements contained in the synthetic statement of biblical doctrine. God the Father loves us with a love that is similar to that with which he loves Christ the man (1). By sanctifying grace we become adopted children of the Father (8). Therefore we are heirs, with the hope of eternal life (9). One who is truly adopted is made an heir. But our adoption now is incomplete, and will become complete with eternal life; therefore ‘with hope.’ Adoptive sonship means being made like God’s natural Son. Through sanctifying grace we are made like the Son as the Word spirating love (active spiration). Through the light of glory we are like the Son as Son, the Word begotten by the Father. The list continues: those who have been justified live as members of Christ (5), a point to which Lonergan devotes quite a bit of attention. The relation of Christ the Head to his members is also spelled out in some detail, which we must skip.

Another transcendent formal effect of sanctifying grace in the justified is that the Holy Spirit, existing from eternity as uncreated Gift, in time becomes the Gift given to the justified (2). Lonergan repeats his explanation, after commenting on some biblical passages: What is given to someone is possessed by that person. The just possess the Spirit insofar as this uncreated Gift is given to them through grace. Further, grace is the appropriate external term of this donation because it externally imitates active spiration and therefore possesses a proper relation to uncreated passive spiration. But the Spirit is had by participation through infused charity. For the virtue of charity externally imitates passive spiration, which is the Holy Spirit. Finally, in terms of fruition the Spirit is possessed insofar as through grace the just habitually have a true knowledge of God and a proper love for him.

Another transcendent formal effect of sanctifying grace in the justified is that the Father and the Son send and give the Holy Spirit to the justified person (2). Galatians 4.6: ‘God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!”’ John 14.16: ‘And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Counselor, to be with you forever ...’ John 14.26: ‘... the Counselor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name ...’ John 15.26: ‘But when the Counselor comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father ...’ John 16.7: ‘I will send him

to you.’ This mission and giving express both the eternal procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son and the temporal term that makes it possible for us to say that the Father and the Son send and give the Spirit and that the Spirit is sent and given. Since grace is the term of proceeding Love, it is the appropriate term according to which the Father and the Son are said to be sending and giving. Therefore, the three divine persons dwell in the souls of the justified. Accordingly, the three equally produce grace in the justified. And so they are present according to the same norm as that by which God is present in all things. This means that grace is a term of essential love. And so all give themselves, inasmuch as ‘to give’ means a free communication of oneself.

But grace is also a term of notional love. The Father is present as sending and giving; the Son is present as sent and giving; and the Spirit is present as sent and given. Accordingly, grace is the first intrinsic principle of supernatural life. And so in terms of fruition the divine Persons are possessed insofar as they are truly known and rightly loved. There is friendship in the true sense of the word between God and the justified (7). Friendship is a mutual love of benevolence founded upon an exchange of good(s). This friendship is founded upon the communication of the divine nature of God himself. It is benevolent love on the part of God, for grace is the term of both essential and notional divine love. It is also benevolent love on our part, for the love of God has been poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us [Rom 5.5].

In short, the ten features of the biblical synthesis proposed in the scriptural portion of the notes under scrutiny are explained systematically in terms of formal effects, immanent or transcendent, of the *gratia gratum faciens* that is the created participation in divine active spiration.

5 The Context Revisited

I believe these emphases support the basic thrust of the position I offered in ‘Consciousness and Grace,’ namely, that the gift of God’s love for us effects in us a relational disposition to receive

it, the disposition consequent upon being on the receiving end of God's love, a disposition that relates us to the Gift itself, the Holy Spirit. This disposition is the basis of our share in divine life and the foundation of our loving God in return in charity. Finally, I think the document here under scrutiny lends support to our continuing to try to mine the riches of the four-point hypothesis. The alternative, I fear, is that we will leave the theology of grace in a metaphysical halfway house between the commonsense affirmations of scripture and the methodical affirmations of a theology that takes its stand on interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness. I do not believe a methodical theology can take its stand in a genuine third-stage-of-meaning fashion without transposing and sublating Lonergan's earlier metaphysical analyses of these matters. If it does not work with the metaphysics, it will revert to a first-stage-of-meaning affair. This might be all right in some exercises in the functional specialty 'Communications,' but it will not do in Systematics. In a sense, the issue reduces to the question, What are we to do with Lonergan's metaphysical theology as we attempt to construct the new theology grounded in basic method? As I argued in my paper at the Lonergan Workshop last summer, the metaphysics should not be dropped – it is too rich, and it provides a needed control of meaning – but rather carried over and sublating into interiority.¹⁸ I continue to stand by that affirmation. In this case, the metaphysical distinction of sanctifying grace and the habit of charity is transposed into the categories of being on the receiving end of God's unqualified and unconditional love and loving God in return with all our hearts and minds and souls and strength and loving our neighbors as ourselves.

18 2011: See in this e-book Essay 29: 'Preserving Lonergan's Understanding of Thomist Metaphysics: A Proposal and an Example.'