

**Essays in Systematic Theology 58:
Lonergan's Philosophical and Theological Anthropology
as a Catholic Humanism¹**

I begin with three statements from Bernard Lonergan, each from a distinct period in his development. The first statement is from the preface to *Insight*, first published in 1957. The second is from a paper entitled 'Theology and Man's Future,' delivered at Saint Louis University in 1968. The third is from *Method in Theology*, first published in 1972.

(1) '[E]very statement in philosophy and metaphysics can be shown to imply statements regarding cognitional fact.'²

(2) '[A]ll theological questions and answers have to be matched by the transcendental questions and answers that reveal in the human subject the conditions of the possibility of the theological answers.'³

1 Originally published as 'Lonergan's Philosophical and Theological Anthropology as a Catholic Humanism,' *Salesianum* 79:1 (2017) 17-38.

2 Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, vol. 3 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992) 5.

3 Bernard Lonergan, 'Theology and Man's Future,' in *A Second Collection*, vol. 13 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Robert M. Doran and John D. Dadosky (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016) 125.

(3) ‘For every term and relation [in systematics] there will exist a corresponding element in intentional consciousness.’⁴

My thesis is that these statements reveal what for Lonergan an authentic contemporary humanism would be.

The statements show a remarkable consistency over the period of at least some fifteen years, on at least one point, namely, the foundational character of the position on the human subject that Lonergan expressed in *Insight* and developed in his later work. Nor do these statements admit exceptions: ‘*every* statement,’ ‘*all* theological questions and answers,’ ‘*every* term and relation.’

Moreover, the statements do not share the same immediate context, which might limit the scope of their relevance. Each occurs in a discussion whose setting is quite distinct from the settings of the other two.

1 The Context of the First Statement

The first statement occurs as part of the sixth of ten implications regarding ‘basic problems’ in philosophy, problems that can finally be addressed once one achieves an insight into insight. The fourth of these implications is that insight into insight will unify other departments of knowledge, and so will yield a philosophy. The fifth is that, since unifying and organizing knowing leads as well to a unification and organization of the known, insight into insight implies a metaphysics, where ‘metaphysics’ is understood to mean the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being, that is, of the known that is proportionate to human

4 Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, vol 14 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Robert M. Doran and John D. Didosky (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990) 317.

experiencing, understanding, and judging. But insight into insight is verifiable, and so the sixth point is that the philosophy and metaphysics that result from insight into insight will also be verifiable. How will they be verified? The answer is given in the claim that ‘every statement in philosophy and metaphysics can be shown to imply statements regarding cognitional fact.’ The verification will take place by identifying the implied statements about cognitional fact.

The primary illustration of what this means occurs in the brilliant argument toward the beginning of chapter 15, where Lonergan relies on the isomorphism of knowing and known already established in chapter 14⁵ and argues for the isomorphism of the metaphysical elements of potency, form, and act, respectively, with the three cognitional levels of experience, understanding, and judgment. But that is just the beginning. The three long chapters on metaphysics (15, 16, and 17) are prolongations and instantiations of the same basic point, and the statements in those chapters that claim to be metaphysical pronouncements are linked to a statement, implicit or explicit, regarding cognitional fact.

The theological import of precisely the same point is revealed in *Method in Theology*, when Lonergan argues that theological categories are both general (shared with other disciplines) and special (peculiar to theology), and that the base from which general theological categories are derived is ‘the attending, inquiring, reflecting, deliberating subject along with the operations that result from attending, inquiring, reflecting, deliberating and with the structure within which the

5 ‘If the knowing consists of a related set of acts and the known is the related set of contents of these acts, then the pattern of the relations between the acts is similar in form to the pattern of the relations between the contents of the acts.’ Lonergan, *Insight* 424.

operations occur.’⁶ The section on ‘General Theological Categories’ (pp. 267-69) illustrates the manner in which one can go either from objects to cognitional and existential operations or from such operations to the objects intended. The isomorphism of intentional structure with intended objects is an extension of the basic isomorphism of the levels of cognitional activity with the metaphysical elements, as specified in chapter 15 of *Insight*.

2 The Context of the Second Statement

The context of the second statement is more complex, but it is also more directly to the point of the present paper, since it explicitly addresses the issue of a contemporary humanism and indicates what Lonergan’s contribution might be to an authentic humanism.

The paper from which this statement is taken, ‘Theology and Man’s Future,’ is divided into two major sections. In the first section Lonergan specifies five areas in which theology has been or is about to be influenced by other disciplines: by history, philosophy, religious studies, method, and communications. But in the second section he addresses the question of what theology has to offer to these other disciplines. Not only does theology have a contribution to make to the humanities. In addition, Lonergan indicates his ‘substantial agreement’ with Karl Rahner’s position that ‘the dogmatic theology of the past has to become a theological anthropology.’⁷ It is in Lonergan’s spelling out of just what Rahner meant that we find our second statement.

6 Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 267.

7 Lonergan, ‘Theology and Man’s Future’ 125.

The theological anthropology into which dogmatic theology must be transformed would match ‘all theological questions and answers’ by ‘the transcendental questions and answers that reveal in the human subject the conditions of the possibility of the theological answers.’ For Lonergan, the transcendental questions are the ‘what, why, how?’ questions that propel one from experience to understanding, the ‘is it so?’ questions that move one from understanding to judgment, and the ‘what is to be done?’ questions that promote one from knowledge to decision. In another place, Lonergan argues that each of these sets of transcendental questions implies the question of God.⁸ And so he can state his basic agreement with ‘[Rahner’s] position ... that man is for God, that religion is intrinsic to an *authentic humanism*, that in theology theocentrism and anthropocentrism coincide.’ ‘On this basis,’ Lonergan continues, ‘[Rahner] *desires all theological statements to be matched by statements of their meaning in human terms.*’⁹

Lonergan is quick to defend Rahner against ‘a modernist interpretation of his view, namely, that theological doctrines are to be taken as statements about merely human reality ... His purpose is not to water down theological truth but to bring it to life, not to impose an alien method but to exclude the risk of mythology and to introduce into theological thinking the challenge of rigorous controls.’¹⁰ And Lonergan is also quick to add that the kind of theological anthropology that he finds Rahner recommending *does not yet exist*. Rather, it is what a ‘future theology’ ought to aim at being.¹¹

8 See Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 96-99.

9 Lonergan, ‘Theology and Man’s Future’ 125, emphasis added

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.

By extension, we may conjecture that the ‘authentic humanism’ which the coincidence of theocentrism and anthropocentrism represents also does not yet exist. It is the task of those who would implement Lonergan’s cognitional theory, existential ethics, and theological method to bring it about, precisely by working to fulfil the conditions set in our second statement. In the language of *Method in Theology*, ‘if modern theologians were to transpose medieval theory into the categories derived from contemporary interiority and its real correlatives, they would be doing for our age what the greater Scholastics did for theirs.’¹² As the greater Scholastics ‘recast Christian belief into a mold derived from Aristotle,’¹³ so our task is to transform the dogmatic theology that resulted from Scholastic endeavors into what Rahner calls a theological anthropology, which for Lonergan means transposing the theoretical categories of medieval theology into the terms and relations derived from ‘contemporary interiority,’ that is, from the interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness that Lonergan’s work promotes.

3 The Context of the Third Statement

The third statement indicates in more detail *how* the resultant coincidence of anthropocentrism and theocentrism can occur. In Lonergan’s terms, it indicates how the emerging theology grounded in intellectual, moral, and religious conversion can be a theological anthropology. By extension, we may conjecture that the grounding of other human-scientific disciplines in the same theological foundations of intellectual, moral, and religious conversion will contribute to their becoming further contributions to an authentic humanism. This is more than hinted

¹² Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 304.

¹³ *Ibid.*

at in the chapter in *Method in Theology* devoted to the functional specialty ‘communications.’

The third statement occurs in the context of a longer and much disputed section, the main point of which is that ‘the basic terms and relations of systematic theology will be not metaphysical, as in medieval theology, but psychological.’¹⁴ What is disputed is what precisely Lonergan intended that statement to mean. I present here my own conviction in this regard.

Lonergan writes, ‘As has been worked out in our chapters on method, on religion, and on foundations, 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.’¹⁵ Thus our statement: ‘For every term and relation there will exist a corresponding element in intentional consciousness.’¹⁶ Metaphysics is no longer the *Grund- und Gesamtwissenschaft*. That honor now goes to the statements regarding cognitional fact, existential ethics, and religious being in love that constitute the basic terms and relations grounding all systematic-theological statements and all categories whether general or special. From these

14 Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 317.

15 Ibid. To this statement I have added a suggestion regarding ‘special basic relations.’ See Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History: A Theology of the Divine Missions*, vol. 1, *Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012) 39. See below, section 6.

16 Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 317.

grounds all such statements and categories are to be derived.¹⁷ These grounds define what Lonergan means by the ‘authentic humanism’ that he mentions in commenting on Rahner. To be precise, ‘authentic humanism’ means that the normative theological subject transformed by intellectual, moral, and religious conversion is the arbiter of all theological statements, in a manner analogous to that in which cognitional fact is the arbiter of every philosophical and metaphysical statement. If every statement in philosophy and metaphysics implies statements regarding cognitional fact, so too every statement in systematic theology implies statements regarding not just cognitional fact, but also the unfolding of the transcendental notion of value (moral fact) and the immanent constitution of life in God (religious fact).¹⁸ There is an isomorphism not only of cognitional operations with metaphysical elements but also of moral unfolding with the levels of value in Lonergan’s proposed scale of values¹⁹ and of religious being-in-love with

17 See Bernard Lonergan, ‘Questionnaire on Philosophy: A Response,’ in Lonergan, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965-1980*, vol. 17 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005) 355-57.

18 For a position on the immanent constitution of life in God, see chapter 2 of Doran, *Missions and Processions*. The position is summarized below in section 6.

19 For an elaboration of the dynamics of the scale of values, see Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990, 2001) chapter 4 and parts 2-4 passim. The basic statement is found in Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 32-33. The point I am making is that vital, social, cultural, personal, and religious values are isomorphic with, respectively, experience, understanding, judgment, decision, and love, and that moral

supernatural participations in trinitarian life.²⁰ The objectification of that isomorphism would constitute the theological anthropology that Rahner (and Lonergan in agreement with Rahner) would claim is the legitimate successor to the dogmatic theology of the past. Again, as Lonergan emphasizes, neither he nor Rahner thought this theological anthropology was yet in existence. For both of them its development is the work of the decades ahead. It will be worked out one step at a time.

4 'Humanism' in *Insight*

Further confirmation of this claim regarding what Lonergan would regard as an authentic humanism, as well as various shades of meaning that may be assigned to the term 'humanism,' may be found in statements made in the final chapter and the epilogue of *Insight*. To these we now turn. Lonergan does not use the word 'humanism' very often, but it does appear six times in the final chapter of *Insight*, while the term 'humanist' appears twice in the same chapter and once in the epilogue to the same book. A differentiated and nuanced meaning for these words may be assembled from these occurrences.

Humanism is the topic of the final three points in Lonergan's lengthy exposition of the heuristic structure of the divine solution to the problem of evil –

conversion in its fullness is conversion to the integrity of the complete scale of values.

²⁰ See again chapter 2 of Doran, *Missions and Processions*, where religious being-in-love is differentiated in terms of memory, faith, and charity, and where memory and faith together are participations in divine active spiration, and so in the Father and the Son together, and charity is a participation in divine passive spiration, and so in the Holy Spirit. Again, see also below, section 6.

the points beginning with ‘In the twenty-ninth place,’ ‘In the thirtieth place,’ and ‘In the thirty-first place.’²¹

The first reference in that material is to a ‘transformed humanism.’²² More fully: The seventh point in the exposition of the heuristic structure of the solution to the problem of evil was to the effect that what would be introduced into human living partly to meet the problem of evil would be conjugate forms, habits, that in some sense are supernatural. As the exposition continues, we find that the solution will consist of some species of charity, hope, and faith. These introduce into human living

... a new, higher integration that enables [us], if [we] will, to rise above the consequences [of our waywardness], to halt and reverse the sequence of ever less comprehensive syntheses in which theory keeps surrendering to practice, to provide a new and more solid base on which [our] intellectual and social development can rise to heights undreamed of, and perpetually to overcome the objective surd of social situations by meeting abundant evil with a more generous good.²³

This means that ‘the solution will have a nature and content and significance and power of its own.’ It will be ‘a new level on which human living develops and rejoices,’ a level beyond the cognitional and moral levels spelled out in the first eighteen chapters of *Insight*, a level that will involve, among other things, ‘the mystery of [a] transformed humanism.’ This ‘new level’ Lonergan would later

21 Lonergan, *Insight* 745-50.

22 Ibid. 745.

23 Ibid.

specify in terms of a fifth level of consciousness.²⁴ In the language of ‘Theology and Man’s Future,’ the anthropology that formulates such a humanism must be not only philosophical, that is, cognitional-theoretic, epistemological, metaphysical, and ethical, but also in some sense theological, where, as in *Insight*, the ethical is the link from the basic philosophical issues to theology.

Moreover, the possibility must be entertained that the theology might just rest on the revelation of dimensions of truth that we never could discover for ourselves and that the higher integration of human living might lie quite beyond our familiar range of operations. The solution itself might even be ‘absolutely supernatural,’ by which is meant there is no possible creature for which it would be

24 Most of his references to a fifth level occur in question-and-answer sessions at Lonergan Workshops held at Boston College. These are available in audio format (the work of Gregory Lauzon) and transcriptions (done by myself) on the website www.bernardlonergan.com; one published reference, in response again to a question, occurs in ‘Lecture 2: The Functional Specialty “Systematics,”’ in Bernard Lonergan, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965-1980*, vol. 17 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004) 193. Jeremy Blackwood has established beyond any reasonable doubt that Lonergan did intend to affirm a fifth level. See his doctoral dissertation ‘Love and Lonergan’s Cognitional-Intentional Anthropology’ on the website www.lonerganresource.com. Blackwood’s research will soon be published in a book from Marquette University Press. Note that I am not saying that Lonergan intended to affirm the fifth level of consciousness *in the book* *Insight*. I am saying that the ‘new level on which human living develops and rejoices’ is *later* associated with a fifth level of consciousness.

the natural solution. Then its 'sole ground and measure' would be 'the divine nature itself ... Then faith includes objects beyond the natural reach of any finite understanding. Then hope is for a vision of God that exhausts the unrestricted desire of intelligence. Then charity is the transport, the ecstasy and unbounded intimacy that result from the communication of the absolute love that is God himself and alone can respond to the vision of God.'²⁵

But such a solution will encounter and wrestle with not only a natural, untransformed humanism expressed in a philosophy that de facto does not yield to a theological invitation – and so a philosophy that can perhaps be argued to be the philosophy of a subject in whom the new, 'fifth' level of consciousness has not emerged, for whatever reason – but also a 'humanism in revolt' against the divinely originated solution, against the grace that grounds habitual charity, hope, and faith and the operations that proceed from such supernatural habits. The 'transformed humanism' of the solution is thus a transcendence of any purely natural humanism, whether benign or malevolent.

[H]uman perfection itself becomes a limit to be transcended ... The humanist viewpoint loses its primacy, not by some extrinsicist invasion, but by submitting to its own immanent necessities. For if the humanist is to stand by the exigences of his own unrestricted desire, if he is to yield to the demands for openness set by every further question, then he will discover the limitations that imply [our] incapacity for sustained development, he will acknowledge and consent to the one solution that exists, and if that solution is supernatural, his very humanism will lead beyond itself.²⁶

25 Ibid. 746-47.

26 Ibid. 749.

But a humanism in revolt against the solution

... will ignore the problem of evil; it will contest the fact of a solution; it will condemn mystery as myth; it will demand reason and exclude faith; it will repudiate hope and labor passionately to build the city of man with the hands of man; it will be ready to love God in song and dance, in human feasting and human sorrow, with human intelligence and human good will, but only so ... [I]t rests on man's proud content to be just a man, and its tragedy is that, on the present supposition of a supernatural solution, to be just a man is what man cannot be ... [I]f he would be only a man, he has to be less. He has to forsake the openness of the pure desire; he has to take refuge in the counterpositions; he has to develop what counterphilosophies he can to save his dwindling humanism from further losses; and there will not be lacking men clear-sighted enough to grasp that the issue is between God and man, logical enough to grant that intelligence and reason are orientated towards God, ruthless enough to summon to their aid the dark forces of passion and of violence.²⁷

So we find in this final chapter of *Insight* (1) the natural, philosophic humanism that appears in the isomorphism of cognitional fact and known objects and in the extension of such analyses into an ethics, (2) the transformation and elevation of that humanism by the gift of the conjugate forms of charity, hope, and faith, and (3) the humanism in revolt that, refusing the gift, becomes in fact an anti-humanism.

Still, the context of the term 'humanist' as it appears in the epilogue to *Insight* makes it quite clear that the first humanism, the natural, philosophic humanism, has its own distinct merits and excellence. For here 'a humanist' is for

27 Ibid. 749-50.

all practical purposes defined as ‘one dominated by the desire not only to understand but also, *through understanding understanding, to reach a grasp of the main lines of all there is to be understood.*’²⁸ Again, we see here the theme of statements about reality implying statements about cognitional fact. And again, we see that there is for Lonergan a basic philosophical anthropology that grounds a large portion of the complete package referred to in ‘Theology and Man’s Future’ as ‘authentic humanism,’ the same portion that consists in the base of general theological categories: ‘the attending, inquiring, reflecting, deliberating subject along with the operations that result from attending, inquiring, reflecting, deliberating and with the structure within which the operations occur.’²⁹

Two further consequences follow, at least for our present purposes. First, Lonergan’s philosophical anthropology, and so his ‘authentic humanism,’ contains another dimension, which I have attempted to unpack in my explorations of what I call ‘psychic conversion.’ Second, the sublation of that philosophical anthropology into a theological anthropology can be further specified. I turn to the first of these points now.

5 Psychic Conversion

An often overlooked fact among Lonergan scholars is that for Lonergan human consciousness is twofold: intentional-spiritual and psychic. ‘... we are conscious in two ways: in one way, through our sensibility, we undergo rather passively what we sense and imagine, our desires and fears, our delights and sorrows, our joys and sadness; in another way, through our intellectuality, we are more active when we

28 Lonergan, *Insight* 753, emphasis added.

29 Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 267.

consciously inquire in order to understand, understand in order to utter a word, weigh evidence in order to judge, deliberate in order to choose, and exercise our will in order to act.³⁰ What here is the second way of being conscious is what Lonergan's work is all about: we consciously inquire about the data of experience in order to understand; when we understand we utter a word that expresses our understanding; we weigh evidence in order to judge whether we have understood correctly; on the basis of our grasp of evidence we judge; we raise questions for deliberation; we make decisions on the basis of our grasp of evidence for values; our decisions lead to our actions. But the first way of being conscious, the sensitive stream of our consciousness, is being changed by the very performance of these intentional operations. I feel differently when I understand from the way I felt when I was still confused. The sensitive-psychic flow changes again once I make a judgment based on a reflective grasp of evidence. Again, there is a further change when from deliberation about possible courses of action, I judge that one is better than the others and decide to follow it. Moreover, obstacles to performing the intentional operations can arise from the sensitive stream of consciousness itself, from a psychic resistance to raising relevant questions: from our sensations, images, emotions, desires, fears, joys, sadness, as well as from the individual, group, and general biases that are addressed by moral and intellectual conversion.³¹ In fact, Lonergan speaks also of a dramatic bias that is directly connected to this sensitive stream.³²

The lived connection between the two ways of being conscious is easily lost and difficult to recover. The second way of being conscious, at least as it functions

30 Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics* 139.

31 On individual, group, and general bias, see Lonergan, *Insight* 244-67.

32 See *ibid.* 214-31.

in what Lonergan calls the dramatic pattern of experience,³³ may be described, in terms taken from Eric Voegelin, as the search for direction in the movement of life.³⁴ But the first way is the very movement of life itself. To lose the connection between the two is to lose the way. And what I call psychic conversion establishes or re-establishes the connection between the two ways of being conscious.³⁵ While most of the work that I did in the period of discovering and articulating what I mean by the term ‘psychic conversion’ involved interpretative and dialectical encounter with the psychology of C.G. Jung,³⁶ there is a variety of ways of coming to establish or re-establish that connection. In *Subject and Psyche*³⁷ I gave deserved credit to Eugene Gendlin’s book *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning*,³⁸ and subsequently have become even more convinced that the techniques which Gendlin summarizes under the rubric of ‘focusing’ are a quite helpful mediation of psychic conversion.³⁹ I have also become increasingly convinced that the mimetic theory of René Girard is a most helpful guide to the distortions that occur in

33 See Lonergan, *Insight* 210-27.

34 See Eric Voegelin, ‘The Gospel and Culture,’ in *Jesus and Man’s Hope*, ed. D.C. Miller and D.Y. Hadidian (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1971) 63.

35 For a basic exposition of what I mean by psychic conversion, see chapter 2 in Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*.

36 See *ibid.* chapter 10.

37 Robert M. Doran, *Subject and Psyche*, 2nd ed. (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994).

38 Eugene Gendlin, *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning* (Toronto: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962).

39 See Eugene Gendlin, *Focusing* (New York: Everest House, 1978).

sensitive consciousness and to the subsequent distortions that occur at the levels of understanding, judgment, and decision.⁴⁰ Closely related to some of these distortions is Max Scheler's notion of *ressentiment*, especially as its core has been distilled by Lonergan:

[R]essentiment is a re-feeling of a specific clash with someone else's value qualities. The someone else is one's superior physically or intellectually or morally or spiritually. The re-feeling is not active or aggressive but extends over time, even a lifetime. It is a feeling of hostility, anger, indignation that is neither repudiated nor directly expressed. What it attacks is the value quality that the superior person possessed and the inferior not only lacked but also feels unequal to acquiring. The attack amounts to a continuous belittling of the value in question, and it can extend to hatred and even violence against those that possess that value quality. But perhaps its worst feature is that its rejection of one value involves a distortion of the whole scale of values and that this distortion can spread through a whole social class, a whole people, a whole epoch.⁴¹

The religious transformation of the first way of being conscious is beautifully expressed by Lonergan in the following words:

[T]he solution [to the problem of evil] will be not only a renovation of will that matches intellectual detachment and aspiration, not only a new and higher collaboration of intellects through faith in God, but also *a mystery that is at*

40 For my efforts to relate Girard and Lonergan, see chapter 9 in *Missions and Processions*.

41 Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 34.

*once symbol of the uncomprehended and sign of what is grasped and psychic force that sweeps living human bodies, linked in charity, to the joyful, courageous, wholehearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by a world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended.*⁴²

The philosophic result of this analysis is a threefold constitution of the human person: bodily organism, sensitive psyche, and spiritual intentionality. Here I hope I may be allowed to quote myself:

The *duality* of consciousness as psychic and intentional is ontologically grounded in a *threefold* constitution of the person. The person is a unity of living organism, sensitive psyche, and spiritual intention of intelligibility, the true and the real, and the good. The sensitive psyche mediates the tension of organism and spirit, and participates in the incommensurable schemes of recurrence that inform these two sets of processes. Neural process receives higher integration in psychic occurrences, but the psyche is also constellated into a variety of patterns of experience ... that correspond to realms of meaning ... These constellations stem from the participation of the sensitive psyche in the process of inquiry that institutes the knowledge of the real, and in the world-constitutive and self-constitutive praxis of the historical agent. This process of inquiry is a notion of being, a notion of value, a notion of transcendent mystery, where by 'notion' is meant a heuristic anticipation that unfolds through the structure of the process of inquiry. By virtue of the principle of correspondence between the operators of spiritual and psychological development, psychic constellations are the elemental sensitive

42 Lonergan, *Insight* 744-45, emphasis added.

anticipation or appropriation of differentiations of the notions of being, value, and transcendent mystery.⁴³

6 Philosophical Anthropology and Theological Anthropology

The first of our three key statements expressed part of a philosophical anthropology, that part that results from answering Lonergan's three basic philosophical questions: What am I doing when I am knowing? Why is doing that knowing? What do I know when I do it? At the end of the process of providing a basic response to these three questions, one will understand what Lonergan means by the first statement: "[E]very statement in philosophy and metaphysics can be shown to imply statements regarding cognitional fact."⁴⁴

An anthropology moves from being philosophical to being theological, first, when cognitional fact and its isomorphism with the structure of proportionate being are sublated by moral fact and its isomorphism with the scale of values, and then when both cognitional and moral fact are sublated by the immanent constitution of life in God and its isomorphism with the economic Trinity, the Trinity in history, or more precisely the contingent terms external to divine being that are the created consequent conditions of the immanent divine processions being also divine missions.

I have proposed a 'unified field structure' of systematic theology that would bring together a theologically informed theory of history relying on the unfolding of Lonergan's scale of values with an unfolding of Lonergan's so-called four-point theological hypothesis as it links the four real divine relations with four created

43 Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* 266-67.

44 Lonergan, *Insight* 5.

participations in, communications of, and imitations of trinitarian life: the *esse secundarium* of the incarnation, sanctifying grace, the habit of charity, and the light of glory.⁴⁵

The scale of values already fulfils the conditions that Lonergan would stipulate for his theological anthropology, since the scale itself is an objectification of the transcendental structure of graced consciousness, with its five levels of experience, understanding, judgment, decision, and religious love. The scale of values is isomorphic with graced consciousness. All its terms and relations have corresponding elements in intentional consciousness: vital values with experience, social values with understanding, cultural values with judgment, personal values with decision, and religious values with unqualified being in love. *Theology and the Dialectics of History* is a massive exercise in what Lonergan calls the functional specialty of Foundations, where the horizon within which theological statements make sense is objectified and the categories employed in those statements are derived.⁴⁶ Basic to that horizon is commitment to the integral scale of values.

45 For the basic conception, see chapter 7 in Robert M. Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).

46 I have subsequently suggested that these two tasks of objectifying horizon and deriving categories are so distinct as to call for an additional functional specialty. That specialty, which I call ‘horizons,’ corresponds to the fifth level in consciousness, and explicitly links the first and second phases consisting of the other eight specialties. I suggest replacing the name ‘foundations’ at the fourth level in the second phase with the name ‘categories.’ For the argument see Robert M. Doran, ‘The Ninth Functional Specialty,’ in *METHOD: Journal of*

But the four-point hypothesis, while linking the economic Trinity with religious experience, was still expressed by Lonergan in strictly metaphysical terms: secondary act of existence, sanctifying grace, habit of charity, light of glory. His full statement of it is 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.⁴⁷

What are the corresponding elements in intentional consciousness for these categories? Or in Rahner's terms, what are 'the transcendental questions and

Lonergan Studies, new series 2:1 (2011) 13-16; and Doran, *Missions and Processions* 111-23.

47 Bernard Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, vol. 12 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007) 471, 473.

answers that reveal in the human subject the conditions of the possibility of the theological answers?’⁴⁸

I offered to answer this question in chapter 2 of *Missions and Processions* with regard to sanctifying grace and charity, which are the two elements in the hypothesis that enter directly into our religious experience, and so correspond directly to ‘religious values’ in the scale of values. In the fifth chapter of the second volume of *The Trinity in History*, I will offer quite distinct suggestions with regard to the secondary act of existence of the incarnation, with emphasis on the consciousness of Christ.⁴⁹ I will spend most of the remainder of the present paper summarizing the material presented in *Missions and Processions* and reformulating it in terms of the question and thesis of the present paper.

But before I do so, let me develop a bit more the connection of the four-point hypothesis with the scale of values unfolded in *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. The answer to the question regarding the corresponding elements in intentional categories for the fundamental theological categories of sanctifying grace and charity would constitute an objectification of the fifth level in the scale of values, namely, the level of religious values. Grace (fifth level) is the condition of the possibility of the emergence of genuine personal value (fourth level). Persons of integrity are the condition of the possibility of the emergence of genuine cultural values (third level). The integrity of cultural values is the condition of the possibility of a just social order (second level). And a just social order is the

48 Lonergan, ‘Theology and Man’s Future’ 125.

49 Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History: A Theology of the Divine Missions*, vol. 2: *Missions, Relations, and Persons* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019) chapter 5.

condition of the possibility of the equitable distribution of vital goods to the entire community (first level).

Of such stuff history itself is made. In fact of such stuff the reign of God in this world would be made. If this link between the participation in trinitarian life named in the four-point hypothesis and the rest of the scale of values is correct, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* and *The Trinity in History* may be installments on the theological anthropology that for Lonergan and Rahner would replace the dogmatic theology of a previous era and that would ground an authentic humanism, where theocentrism and anthropocentrism would coincide.

But, again, what are the corresponding elements in intentional and religious consciousness for sanctifying grace and charity, which participate respectively in active and passive spiration?

In a class lecture that he gave at Boston College in 1980 during a seminar on *Method in Theology*, Lonergan indicated that the reality of what a metaphysical theology called sanctifying grace has actually been spoken of in three distinct sets of categories corresponding to three distinct stages of meaning. What for biblical authors was justification is what metaphysical medieval theologians called sanctifying grace, *gratia gratum faciens*; and what metaphysical medieval theologians called sanctifying grace is what Lonergan calls the gift of God's love, being in love in an unrestricted fashion, being in love with God's own love flooding our hearts.⁵⁰

Two successive transpositions have thus taken place with respect to naming the same reality: a transposition from justification to sanctifying grace, and a transposition from sanctifying grace to the love of and for God, total commitment.

50 This comment may be heard on item 98304A0E080 on the website www.bernardlonergan.com.

‘Justification’ is proper to a first, commonsense stage of meaning, ‘sanctifying grace’ to a second, theoretical and metaphysical stage, and ‘being in love with God’ to a third stage, one grounded in what Lonergan calls interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness. Thus statements with regard to sanctifying grace are transposed in a contemporary theological anthropology into statements that objectify the experience of the gift of God’s love, which is itself also a gift of loving God with God’s own love, that is, with and in the Holy Spirit.

So far, so good; all is or should be clear to this point. But the so-called four-point hypothesis complicates things enormously. For in the hypothesis sanctifying grace and charity, which (following Aquinas) are distinct but inseparable, are created consequent conditions of the procession of the Holy Spirit being also a mission of the Holy Spirit. The missions of the Son and of the Holy Spirit are the processions of the Son and of the Holy Spirit joined to created terms external to God that are the consequent conditions of the proceeding person being sent into human history with a task to fulfill.

Thus, the consequent condition of the procession of the Son being also a mission of the Son is the *esse secundarium* of the assumed humanity of the incarnate Word, because of which the statement that the second person of the Trinity *is* this man Jesus of Nazareth is true. The secondary act of existence is that ‘is.’

But for the moment we are concerned not with the mission of the Son but with the mission of the Holy Spirit. Sanctifying grace, Lonergan says, ‘is a participation of active spiration, and so has a special relation to the Holy Spirit.’ And charity ‘is a participation of passive spiration, and so has a special relation to the Father and the Son.’ What does this mean? If we can spell out the meaning that Lonergan intends in this terse statement of a marvelous theological vision, we will have come a long way toward indicating the manner in which the movement that

began with the isomorphism of cognitional fact and proportionate being in *Insight* became the coincidence of theocentrism and anthropocentrism in the new theology that his work makes possible.

From the standpoint of religiously and interiorly differentiated consciousness, the participation in the active spiration of the Father and the Son together, which participation a medieval metaphysical theology called sanctifying grace and scriptural theologies refer to as justification, consists in (1) the recalled reception, the memory, *memoria*, of the gift of God's love as this memory grounds (2) a subsequent set of judgments of value that we may call faith as the knowledge born of religious love. As participating in divine active spiration, such memory and faith together set up a special created relation to the indwelling uncreated Holy Spirit, who indwells precisely as the term of this special created relation. From memory and faith thus understood there flows the return of love for God the Father and the Son that we know as charity, which participates in the Proceeding Love that is the Holy Spirit, in divine passive spiration, and which sets up a special created relation to the indwelling uncreated Father and Son, who indwell precisely as the term of this special created relation. Memory and faith combine to imitate and participate in active spiration, and charity imitates and participates in passive spiration.

Such is our basic statement. Let us fill it out as best we are able.

The thesis that I am proposing transposes one part of Lonergan's four-point hypothesis – the part that treats the created participations in sanctifying grace and charity – into terms and relations derived from interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness. It speaks of memory and faith together (the recollected gift of divine love and loving along with the knowledge born of that gift) as the conscious representation of what the medievals meant by the entitative

habit of sanctifying grace and what the biblical authors meant by justification.⁵¹ Memory and faith thus understood and taken together imitate and participate in paternity and filiation, Father and Son. Together these created realities constitute an active loving that spirates charity in a manner analogous to, and participating by grace in, the way Father and Son breathe the Holy Spirit. Charity imitates and participates in passive spiration, the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the active loving, the *notionaliter diligere*, that is the actively spirating Father and Son together. Charity is a created proceeding love that, in a manner analogous to the uncreated Holy Spirit, loves the Father and the Son from whom the Spirit proceeds, and loves all things and especially all persons precisely *in* the Holy Spirit. The entire gift is elevating in that, while effected by the essential love common to all

51 That justification is an earlier name for the same thing is suggested also in Lonergan's 1951-52 statement of the biblical basis of what later became the theology of sanctifying grace: 'To those whom God the Father loves [1] as he loves Jesus, his only-begotten Son, (2) he gives the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit, so that (3) into a new life they may be (4) born again and (5) become living members of Christ; therefore as (6) justified, (7) friends of God, (8) adopted children of God, and (9) heirs in hope of eternal life, (10) they enter into a sharing in the divine nature.'⁵¹ Bernard Lonergan, 'Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace,' in *Early Latin Theology*, vol. 19 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011) 581. 'Sanctifying grace' or 'habitual grace,' then, is a synthetic category that unites these ten features of biblical doctrine in an expression proper to a later, theoretical, metaphysical stage of meaning.

three divine persons, it establishes in us created personal relations to each of the uncreated divine persons.

There is one love common to the three divine persons, but it is exercised in a distinct manner by each of them. That distinct manner is a function of what Thomas Aquinas calls that person's 'notional act.' The notional acts express in verbs the relations of opposition that *are* the divine persons: to speak, to be spoken, to love actively, to proceed as love. The love common to the three, not finding us good in the special way that a theology of grace is seeking, makes us good in that special way by elevating us to participation in trinitarian life. In doing so, that gift establishes in us distinct relations to each of the divine persons. The gift of recollected love and faith together is a created base of a created relation to the Holy Spirit, who dwells in us precisely as the term of that relation. That gift was called by the medievals 'gratia gratum faciens,' the grace that makes us pleasing to God. It is the same gift that the New Testament calls justification and that Lonergan's methodical theology calls the gift of God's love recollected in memory (where the word 'God's' is a subjective genitive) and the knowledge born of that recalled love. As establishing in us relations to each of the divine persons, it gives us a distinct participation in the divine life of each of them, since each of them is an uncreated relation to the other two, a relation that determines how each of them exercises the divine creative love.

Justification, sanctifying grace, the gift of being in love with the love of God and so in an unrestricted fashion participates in the active spiration or 'notional loving' (*notionaliter diligere*) whereby the Father and the Son love themselves and each other and us *by* the Holy Spirit, that is, by the Love that proceeds from the combination of saying 'Yes' and being the 'Yes' that is said taken together. To say 'Yes' and to be the 'Yes' uttered are, together, to breathe love. To be Father and to be Son are, together, to breathe Love. The Love that is breathed is the Holy Spirit,

by whom the Father and the Son love themselves and each other and us. Justification, sanctifying grace, being in love unrestrictedly, as effected or caused by the love common to the three persons, is a participation in active spiration, and so establishes a created relation to the Holy Spirit. But as breathing charity, it establishes within us a distinct relation to the Father and the Son. The charity effected by the three persons establishes in us distinct relations to the Father and the Son. It is immanently constituted in terms of the distinct divine relations of active and passive spiration, and it is to be understood as establishing a created imitation of and participation in those divine relations. More precisely, it is the base of a created relation to the uncreated Holy Spirit, who is an uncreated relation to the Father and the Son; as a result of our created relation to the Holy Spirit, there is also created in us the base of a created relation to the Father and the Son, a participation in the Spirit, namely, what a metaphysical theology calls the habit of charity and what a methodical theology would call the state of loving God in return and the operations that flow from that state. Charity is the grace-enabled assent to the gift of God's love. Thus the gift of God's love, sanctifying grace, justification becomes the love with which we love. But with a certain ontological priority it is the origin of a faith that is the knowledge born of love, which participates in an invisible mission of the divine Word, the *Verbum spirans Amorem*; from the love recollected in memory and the knowledge born of that love, an ultimately ineffable assent, there flows the love of God in return, the charity that participates in the passively spirated Holy Spirit. The relation is to Father and Son as breathing love: to the Father in eschatological hope, and to the Son in companionship, whether thematically through Christian conversion or non-thematically by fidelity to the universalist faith that emerges from the gift of God's love and the wisdom that knows no limitation by creedal confession. This is the immanent constitution of our life in God. It is isomorphic with the created participations in the trinitarian

relations that constitute the fruit of the divine missions. It constitutes a theological anthropology, where theocentrism and anthropocentrism coincide, and where there is born the authentic humanism that for our time results from the self-appropriation of the normative theological subject in love with God.