

**[NOTES ON THE GRACE OF JUSTIFICATION AND THE INDWELLING OF  
THE HOLY SPIRIT]<sup>1</sup>**

[Page 2]

The author, Carolus Boyer [*Tractatus de gratia divina*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1946)] treats habitual grace in three articles: (1) on the created gift inhering in the soul (pp. 146-65), (2) on the uncreated gift, the Holy Spirit himself (pp. 165-85), and (3) Aristotelian categories (pp. 186-94).

The first question regards two points: the exposition of catholic truth and the refutation of heretical error.

The authentic exposition of the truth is in the decrees of the Council of Trent, session VI: DB 793-96, 799, 800; DS 1521-24, 1528-29, 1530-31; ND 1925-28, 1932, 1933-34.

ND 1932: ‘... which is not only the remission of sins ...’<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [The pages that follow comprise the Lonergan archival document LP II-18, A 160, along with an English translation. The document can be found on [www.bernardlonergan.com](http://www.bernardlonergan.com) at 16000DTL040. The title is an editorial interpolation, there being no overall title assigned by Lonergan for this set of pages. The page numbers that appear in brackets throughout the text here are also an editorial interpolation indicating the present order of pages of the archival document. They begin with ‘Page 2’ because the initial page presently included with this sheaf of pages is misplaced and belongs to another archival document, LP II-30, A 205 (20500DTL040). Third, Lonergan’s own handwritten additions are indicated either by use of the *Monotype Corsiva* font or by explicit mention. Editorial interpolations occur within brackets. Finally, the section numbers are also an editorial interpolation, included to facilitate cross-referencing. The titles for the numbered sections are Lonergan’s own.]

‘... that by which he makes us just ...’<sup>3</sup>

ND 1933: ‘Although no one can be just unless the merits of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ are imparted to him/her ...’

The opposite error originates from Luther, who asserted:

- (1) concupiscence itself is original sin;
- (2) it [original sin] manifestly remains after baptism: DB 792, DS 1515-16, ND 512;
- (3) even the just sin in every deed;
- (4) but sins are covered over through the imputation of the merits of Christ;
- (5) as long as one believes with the certitude of faith, he justifies himself.

See Hermannus Lange, *De gratia tractatus dogmaticus* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1929) § 314, p. 222; DB 742, 771-72; DS 1452, 1481-82; ND 1923/2, 1923/31, 1923/32; Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 147-49.

---

<sup>2</sup> [More fully: ‘This disposition or preparation [for justification] is followed by justification itself, which is not only the remission of sins but also the sanctification and renewal of the interior person through the voluntary reception of grace and of the gifts, whereby from unjust the person becomes just, and from enemy a friend, that one may be “an heir in hope of eternal life” (Titus 3.7).’]

<sup>3</sup> [More fully: ‘... the single formal cause [of justification] is “the justice of God, not that by which he himself is just, but that by which he makes us just” (Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XIV, 12, 15).’]

[Pages 3-4]

## **1 Justice and holiness before God**

1. We are not justified by faith alone.<sup>4</sup>
2. Through faith and through acts of the other virtues we are disposed to justification.
3. Sacred scripture praises trust yet warns us against vain trust.
4. Faith that disposes us to justification is dogmatic faith, that is, the faith by which we believe that those things that God has revealed are true.
5. God is just beyond any human measure.<sup>5</sup>
6. True justice and holiness is according to the divine norms revealed to us by Christ.<sup>6</sup>
7. True justice and holiness belongs to the ‘new man’ who has been created according to God. Therefore this justice before God is neither from the law or the works of the law, nor from human testimony, either external or internal, but through the Gospel and faith.<sup>7</sup>
8. This justice before God is also from God and because of Christ’s redemption is conferred gratis upon those who believe and are baptized.<sup>8</sup>
9. This justice and holiness before God can be lost, and indeed is lost solely through any mortal sin.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> [See DS 1532, 1539, 1559; ND 1935, 1939, 1959.]

<sup>5</sup> [See below, §3.]

<sup>6</sup> [See below, §4.]

<sup>7</sup> [See below, §5.]

<sup>8</sup> [See below, §6.]

10. This justice and holiness before God can and ought to be increased by keeping the commandments and through conformity with Jesus Christ, and is not perfectly possessed before we enter into the resurrection and receive the prize from the just Judge.
11. In justification sins are truly wiped away.
12. The Holy Spirit himself is given and not only his gifts.
13. The Holy Spirit is given in every act of justification.
14. When the Holy Spirit is given, the Father and the Son also come.
15. In justification through the Holy Spirit we are made living members of Christ.<sup>10</sup>
16. In justification we are spiritually reborn into a new person, a new creation, to live a new life.<sup>11</sup>
17. In justification we are brought into the state of filiation by adoption.<sup>12</sup>
18. Justification is the beginning of our participation of the divine nature, which is to receive its fulfilment in heaven.<sup>13</sup>
19. In justification faith, hope, and charity are infused, and inhere in the soul as habits.<sup>14</sup>
20. The Holy Spirit is not given without a finite effect being produced in the just.<sup>15</sup>
21. This finite effect is neither ‘the uncreated gift itself’ nor ‘that which is the uncreated gift in us,’ but is ‘that by which the uncreated gift is in us.’<sup>16</sup>

<sup>9</sup> [See point 3 of Lonergan’s remarks in § 11.]

<sup>10</sup> [On being ‘a living member of Christ,’ see below, §§ 16-19.]

<sup>11</sup> [On new life (regeneration), see below, § 21.]

<sup>12</sup> [On adoptive filiation, see below, § 21.]

<sup>13</sup> [On participation of the divine nature, see below, § 21.]

<sup>14</sup> [See below, § 7.]

<sup>15</sup> [See below, § 8. The fourth page begins at this point.]

22. This uncreated gift as uncreated is constituted by God alone; hence God is to the condition of the just not only as the effective principle but also as the constitutive principle. This constitutive principle, however, is not within the just as an inherent form but is present to the just as the term of a relation.<sup>17</sup>
23. The finite effect by which the uncreated gift is present is physical and per se permanent.<sup>18</sup>
24. It is absolutely supernatural.<sup>19</sup>
25. It is the intrinsic principle of that new life by way of which we become and live just and holy before God.<sup>20</sup>
26. It is neither another infused virtue nor charity, but a physical accident in the genus of quality reducible to the species of habit and in the essence of the soul as its subject.<sup>21</sup>
27. In a way it is to the infused virtues and their act as the essence of the soul is to its potencies and their operations.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>16</sup> [See below, §9 and editorial footnote **xx**]

<sup>17</sup> [See below, §10. Student notes of Frederick Crowe and William Stewart indicate that the thesis read differently and was changed to this formulation as Lonergan taught the material. The original thesis read, ‘Quod per eundem effectum finitum non sola inhabitatio Spiritus Sancti sed etiam vivificatio iustorum per eundem Spiritum constituitur’ (‘Through this same finite effect there is constituted not only the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit but also the vivification of the just through the same Spirit’).]

<sup>18</sup> [See below, § 11.]

<sup>19</sup> [See below, § 12.]

<sup>20</sup> [See below, § 13.]

<sup>21</sup> [See below, § 14.]

28. It is sanctifying grace.<sup>23</sup>

29. Although there is a legitimate distinction between sanctifying grace, its relations, and their terms, nevertheless that abstraction is illegitimate by which sanctifying grace is understood by prescindng from relations that in the present economy of salvation belong to it essentially.<sup>24</sup>

30. By an imperfect analogy, the Holy Spirit is the soul of the whole mystical body of Christ such that the created grace received in the just is the single formal cause of justification.<sup>25</sup>

[Page 5]

## **2 Connections among the Mysteries<sup>26</sup>**

1. God gives in two ways.<sup>27</sup>

2. God gives himself in two ways.<sup>28</sup>

3. The gift of God by way of love is considered in two ways.<sup>29</sup>

4. The Father loves the Son by the Holy Spirit.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> [See below, § 15.]

<sup>23</sup> [See below, § 20.]

<sup>24</sup> [See below, § 27.]

<sup>25</sup> [See below, § 30.]

<sup>26</sup> [See below, §§ 27, 31. Stewart's notes, p. 7, continue the enumeration of the preceding list rather than beginning again with '1.' They also add several further statements.]

<sup>27</sup> [See below, § 31, 1.]

<sup>28</sup> [See below, § 31, 2.]

<sup>29</sup> [See below, § 31, 3.]

<sup>30</sup> [See below, § 31, 4.]

5. In a similar way, the Father loves by the Holy Spirit those whom he unites to the Son.<sup>31</sup>
6. Those whom the Father loves he does not find pleasing but makes pleasing.<sup>32</sup>
7. He makes them pleasing by the grace of the Son.<sup>33</sup>
8. He makes them pleasing because of the Son.<sup>34</sup>
9. He makes them pleasing through the Son.<sup>35</sup>
10. He makes them pleasing in the Son.<sup>36</sup>
11. Why the supernatural life is called 'life.'<sup>37</sup>
12. In what way the Holy Spirit is said to indwell.<sup>38</sup>
13. In what way participation in the divine nature is had through sanctifying grace.<sup>39</sup>
14. In what way adoptive filiation is had through sanctifying grace.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> [See below, §31, 5.]

<sup>32</sup> [See below, §31, 6.]

<sup>33</sup> [See below, §31, 7.]

<sup>34</sup> [See below, §31, 8.]

<sup>35</sup> [See below, §31, 9.]

<sup>36</sup> [See below, §31, 10.]

<sup>37</sup> [See below, §31, 11.]

<sup>38</sup> [See below, §31, 12 and 12 (*bis*).]

<sup>39</sup> [See below, §31, 13.]

<sup>40</sup> [See below, §31, 14. Propositions 15-17 are not expressly treated in §31, which suggests either (1) that Lonergan never completed the document or (2) that the typescript as it presently exists as an archival document is incomplete and there are missing pages. The latter suggestion is corroborated by Stewart's notes, which indicate that Lonergan treated the material in 15-17 and several other propositions as well, which do not appear in this list.]

15. In what way one is made a friend of God through sanctifying grace.

16. In what way one is made just before God.

17. In what way sins are remitted.

[Page 6]

### **3 God is just beyond any human measure.<sup>41</sup>**

(A) Isaiah 55.8-9: ‘My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor my ways your ways, says the Lord. As the heavens are above the earth, so are my ways above your ways and my thoughts above your thoughts.’ This text refers immediately to mercy, and explains, ‘God ... is most ready to pardon’ [Isaiah 55.7; see also Nehemiah 9.17]. The whole chapter speaks of the spiritual goods of the new covenant; and the principles that substantiate this transcendent mercy extend to all divine attributes. See Romans 9.14-26<sup>42</sup> and 11.30-36.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> [This is the fifth item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See p. xx.]

<sup>42</sup> [Romans 9.14-26: ‘What then are we to say? Is there injustice on God’s part? By no means! For he says to Moses, “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.” So it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God who shows mercy. For the scripture says to Pharaoh, “I have raised you up for the very purpose of showing my power in you, so that my name may be proclaimed in all the earth.” So then he has mercy on whomever he chooses, and he hardens the heart of whomever he chooses.

‘You will say to me then, “Why then does he still find fault? For who can resist his will?” But who indeed are you, a human being, to argue with God? Will what is molded say to the one who molds it, “why have you made me like this?” Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one object for special use if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with



(B) This explains the fact that ‘justice’ and ‘holiness’ are predicated analogously of God and of us. The divine essence is to a divine attribute as a finite essence is to its attribute.

(C) Hence one may gather that justice according to divine norms is only analogously known to us by natural reason; but inasmuch as it is known to us properly or as it is in itself, this is known only through revelation and faith.

[Page 7]

---

much patience the objects of wrath that are made for destruction; and what if he has done so in order to make known the riches of his glory for the objects of mercy, which he has prepared before hand for glory – including us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles? As indeed he says in Hosea, “Those who were not my people I will call my people, and her who was not beloved I will call beloved.” And in the very place where it was said to them, “You are not my people,” there they shall be called children of the living God.’]

<sup>43</sup> [Romans 11.30-36: ‘Just as you were once disobedient to God but have now received mercy because of their disobedience, so they have now been disobedient in order that, by the mercy shown to you, they too may now receive mercy. For God has imprisoned all in disobedience so that he may be merciful to all.

‘O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways! “For who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counselor?” “Or who has given a gift to him, to receive a gift in return?” For from him and through him and to him are all things. To him be the glory forever. Amen.’]

#### **4 True justice and holiness is according to the divine norms revealed to us through Christ.<sup>44</sup>**

Matthew 5.48: ‘Be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.’

Ephesians 4.30 – 5.2: ‘Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, in whom you are sealed for the day of redemption ...’; v. 32: ‘Be mutually kind, compassionate, and forgiving *as* God has been towards you in Christ’; 5.1-2 ‘Be therefore *imitators of God*, as dear children, and live your lives in love, just as Christ has loved us and gave himself up for us as a sweet-smelling sacrificial victim to God.’

John 15.12-13: ‘This is my commandment, that you love one another *as I* have loved you. There is no greater love than this, to lay down one’s life for one’s friends.’ See 1 John 3.16.<sup>45</sup>

John 13.15-16: ‘I have given you an example, that *as I* have done towards you, you also should do. I tell you most solemnly, no servant is greater than his master, and no messenger greater than the one who sent him.’ See Luke 22.24-27.<sup>46</sup>

1 Peter 2.20-25: [‘If you endure when you are beaten for doing wrong, what credit is that? But if you endure when you do right and suffer for it, you have God’s approval.

---

<sup>44</sup> [This is the sixth item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See p. xx.]

<sup>45</sup> [1 John 3.16: ‘We know love by this, that he laid down his life for us – and we ought to lay down our lives for one another.’]

<sup>46</sup> [Luke 24.22-27: ‘A dispute also arose among them as to which one of them was to be regarded as the greatest. But he said to them, “The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them are also called benefactors. But not so with you; rather the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like one who serves. For who is greater, the one who is at the table or the one who serves? Is it not the one at the table? But I am among you as one who serves.”’]

For to this you have been called, because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you should follow in his steps. “He committed no sin, and no deceit was found in his mouth.” When he was abused, he did not return abuse; when he suffered, he did not threaten; but he entrusted himself to the one who judged justly. He himself bore our sins in his body on the cross, so that, free from sins, we might live for righteousness; by his wounds you have been healed. For you were going astray like sheep, but now you have returned to the shepherd and guardian of your souls.’]

Philippians 2.5-8: ‘Let this mind be in you as also in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God ...’

Hebrews 12.1-4:<sup>47</sup> [‘Therefore, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us also lay aside every weight and the sin that clings so closely, and let us run with perseverance the race that is set before us, looking to Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith, who for the sake of the joy that was set before him endured the cross, disregarding its shame, and has taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of God. Consider him who endured such hostility against himself from sinners, so that you may not grow weary or lose heart. In your struggle against sin you have not yet resisted to the point of shedding your blood.’]

1 Corinthians 11.1: ‘Be imitators of me as I am of *Christ*.’ Also 1 Corinthians 4.16.<sup>48</sup>

Philippians 3.17: Συμμιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί ... ‘Join me in imitating Christ ...’<sup>49</sup> See vv. 20-21: ‘Our homeland is in heaven, where we expect ...’ (full conformity [with Christ] even as to his glorified body).

---

<sup>47</sup> [Lonergan does not specify where the intended reference ends. Verse 4 is a conjecture.]

<sup>48</sup> [1 Corinthians 4.16: ‘I appeal to you then, be imitators of me.’]

<sup>49</sup> [NRSV: ‘Brothers, join in imitating me ...’]

1 Thessalonians 1.6: ‘You were led to become imitators of us, and of *the Lord*. You received the word (of God) despite your tribulations ...’

1 Corinthians 1.18-31: wisdom of the world vs. wisdom of the cross.

1 Corinthians 2.2, 9-16: wisdom of the cross, of the Spirit, of Christ.

1 Corinthians 9.21-23 [‘To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (though I am not free from God’s law but am under Christ’s law) so that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, so that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all people, that I might by all means save some. I do it all for the sake of the gospel, so that I may share in its blessings.’]

Colossians 3, all; v. 3: ‘You are dead, and your life is hidden with Christ in God.’ See also 1.28 [‘It is he whom we proclaim, warning everyone and teaching everyone in all wisdom, so that we may present everyone mature in Christ.’] 2.6 [‘As you therefore have received Christ Jesus the Lord, continue to live your lives in him.’] 2.20 [‘If with Christ you died to the elemental spirits of the universe, why do you live as if you still belonged to the world?’]

Ephesians 2.10 [‘For we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life.’] 2.21-22 [‘In him the whole structure is gathered together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are build together spiritually into a dwelling place for God.’] 3.6 [‘... the Gentiles have become fellow heirs, members of the same body, and sharers in the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel.’] 3.17-21 [‘... and that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith, as you are being rooted and grounded in love. I pray that you may have the power to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ that surpasses knowledge, so that you may be filled with all the fullness of God. Now to him who by the power at work within us is able to accomplish abundantly far more than all we can ask or imagine, to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations, forever and ever.

Amen.'] 4.16 ['... from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body's growth in building itself up in love.'] 4.20-24 ['That is not the way you learned Christ! For surely you have heard about him and were taught in him, as truth is in Jesus. You were taught to put away your former way of life, your old self, corrupt and deluded by its lusts, and to be renewed in the spirit of your minds, and to clothe yourselves with the new self, created according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness.'] 5.1 ['Therefore, be imitators of God, as beloved children ...'].]

Galatians 2.19-20 ['For through the law I died to the law, so that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God.'] 3.25-29 ['But now that faith has come, we are no longer subject to a disciplinarian, for in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith. As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus. And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to the promise.'] 4.19 ['My little children, for whom I am again in the pain of childbirth until Christ is formed in you.']]

Romans 6.3-6<sup>50</sup> ['Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we will certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin.']. 8.17 ('sharing his sufferings so as to share his

---

<sup>50</sup> [Lonergan has simply 'Rom 6.3ss.' The extent of the intended reference is a surmise.]

glory’). 14.7-9<sup>51</sup> [‘We do not live to ourselves, and we do not die to ourselves. If we live, we live to the Lord, and if we die, we die to the Lord; so then, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord’s. For to this end Christ died and lived again, so that he might be Lord of both the dead and the living.’]

Philippians 3.4-14 [‘If anyone else has reason to be confident in the flesh, I have more ... Yet whatever gains I had, these I have come to regard as loss because of Christ. More than that, I regard everything as loss because of the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and I regard them as rubbish, in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but one that comes through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God based on faith. I want to know Christ and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by becoming like him in his death, if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead. Not that I have already obtained this or have already reached the goal; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own. Beloved, I do not consider that I have made it my own; but this one thing I do: forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead, I press on toward the goal for the prize of the heavenly call of God in Christ Jesus.’]

[Page 8]

**5 True justice and holiness belongs to the ‘new man’ who has been created according to God. Therefore this justice before God is neither from the law or the works of the law, nor from human testimony, either external or internal, but from the gospel and faith.**<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> [Lonergan has ‘Rom 14.6ss. The change is editorial.]

<sup>52</sup> [This is the seventh item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See p. xx.]

(A) Ephesians 4.23: ‘Be renewed in the spirit of your minds and clothe yourselves with the new self according to the likeness of God in true justice and holiness.’

(B) Galatians 2.21: ‘... if justification comes through the law, then Christ died for nothing.’ Galatians 3.11: ‘It is clear that by the law no one is justified before God; the one who is righteous will live by faith.’

(C) Romans 3.20: ‘... “for no human being will be justified in his sight” by deeds prescribed by the law, for through the law comes the knowledge of sin.’ Romans 3.28: ‘For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.’

(D) Romans 10.3: ‘Being ignorant of the justice that comes from God, they have not submitted to God’s justice.’ 1 Corinthians 4.3-4: ‘But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged by you or by any human court. I do not even judge myself. I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted. It is the Lord who judges me.’

(E) Romans 1.16-17: ‘I am not ashamed of the gospel. It is the power of God for salvation for everyone who has faith, the Jew first and also the Greek. For in it the justice of God is revealed through faith for faith (a Hebraism = through ever increasing faith). As it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.”’ (See Galatians 3.11 [quoted above], Hebrews 10.38).<sup>53</sup> Romans 3.21-22: ‘Now apart from the law, the justice of God has been disclosed and is attested by the law and the prophets. The justice of God is through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe.’ Romans 9.30-32: ‘Gentiles, who did not strive for justice, have attained it, that is, justice through faith; but Israel, in striving for the justice that is based on the law, did not succeed in fulfilling the law. Why not? Because they did not seek a justice based on faith but as if it were based on the law.’

[Page 9]

---

<sup>53</sup> [Hebrews 10.38: ‘... but my righteous one will live by faith.’]

**6 This justice before God is also from God, and because of Christ's redemption is conferred gratis upon those who believe and are baptized.<sup>54</sup>**

DB 799; DS 1528-29; ND 1932: The single formal cause is the justice of God, not that by which he himself is just, but that by which he makes us just.

Philippians 3.4-14<sup>55</sup>

Romans 5.12-21, especially v. 19 [19: 'For just as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous'].

Romans 3.21-26<sup>56</sup>

Titus 3.4-7 ['But when the goodness and loving kindness of God our Savior appeared, he saved us, not because of any works of righteousness that we had done, but according to his mercy, through the water of rebirth and renewal by the Holy Spirit. This Spirit he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior, so that, having been justified by his grace, we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.']

---

<sup>54</sup> [This is the eighth item above under 'Justice and Holiness before God.' See p. xx.]

<sup>55</sup> [See above, p. xx.]

<sup>56</sup> [Romans 3.21-22 are given above, but the entire passage reads: 'But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is attested by the law and the prophets, the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously committed; it was to prove at the present time that he himself is righteous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus.']



[Page 10]

**7 In justification, faith, hope, and charity are infused to inhere in the soul as habits.<sup>57</sup>**

1. This matter is treated more fully in the treatise on the theological virtues.
2. Faith, hope, and charity are infused in justification: DB 800; DS 1530-31; ND 1933-34.

Charity inheres: DB 800, 821; DS 1530-31, 1561; ND 1933-34, 1961; *de fide definita*.

Faith, hope, and charity abide: *de fide*.

Faith, hope, and charity are physically permanent: *theologically certain*.

3. Preliminary note:

That the justified believe, hope, and love is clearly found in scripture and tradition.

Hebrews 10.38: ‘My just man lives by faith.’ *So also Galatians 3.11, Romans 1:17.*<sup>58</sup>

Hebrews 11.1: ‘Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for.’ *See also Romans 8.23-25.*<sup>59</sup>

1 Corinthians 13.1-13: charity.

---

<sup>57</sup> [This is the nineteenth item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See p. xx.]

<sup>58</sup> [Galatians 3.11 is quoted above, p. xx. Romans 1.17: [‘For in (the gospel) the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.”’]]

<sup>59</sup> [Romans 8.23-25: ‘... we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies. For in hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope. For who hopes for what is seen? But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience.’]]

Church Fathers: Rouët de Journal, *Enchiridion Patristicum* (EP), series 237-81.

4. In justification, faith, hope, and charity are not only transient acts but also permanent qualities.

Permanent: 1 Corinthians 13.1-13 [13: ‘And now faith, hope, and love abide ...’].

Qualities: things are either substances or quantities or qualities or relations or ...; but faith, etc., are not substances, or quantities, or ... Therefore they are qualities. This is the solution to the question about the faith, hope, and charity of children: DB 483, DS 904.

5. These permanent qualities are operative principles in the manner of a nature, i.e., they are virtues. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1-2, q.110, a. 2 c.

God provides for the living members of Christ no less than for all other living things. Matthew 11.30: ‘My yoke is sweet and my burden light.’

But God equips other living things with permanent principles from which, by a certain natural force and spontaneously, proper acts are performed.

Likewise, therefore, God equips the living members of Christ with permanent principles from which, by a certain natural force and spontaneously, proper acts, namely acts of faith (my just man lives by faith), hope (faith is the substance of things to be hoped for), and charity.

[Page 11]

## **8 The Holy Spirit is not given without a finite effect being produced in the just.<sup>60</sup>**

This conclusion is certain.

(1) Now it is said of the Holy Spirit contingently, *and indeed in the second way as an operation*, that he is given, is possessed, dwells.

---

<sup>60</sup> [This is the twentieth item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See p. xx.]

(2) What is predicated contingently about God is predicated through extrinsic denomination. (For there is nothing contingent in God.)

(3) An extrinsic denomination is not true unless there is some real extrinsic denominator. (This is clear, for otherwise there would be no truth-correspondence between the intellect and the thing).<sup>61</sup>

This conclusion at least touches upon the assertions of the following: Peter Lombard, who denies any created gift of charity apart from act; Gregory of Rimini and the Nominalists, who hold that a true indwelling can be had through external acceptance alone; Lessius, Petavius, Thomassinus, and to some extent Scheeben, who conceive the indwelling of the Spirit as a gift more or less independent of created grace.<sup>62</sup>

[Page 12]

**9 This finite effect is neither ‘the uncreated gift itself’ nor ‘that which is the uncreated gift in us,’ but is ‘that by which the uncreated gift is in us.’<sup>63</sup>**

---

<sup>61</sup> [In the original typescript, Lonergan’s original ordering for these three statements was (2), (3), (1). Subsequently, he indicated by hand that the statement placed third in the original ordering should be placed first, the statement placed first in the original ordering should be placed second, and the statement placed second in the original ordering should be placed third. Lonergan’s amended ordering of the three statements has been followed here.]

<sup>62</sup> See Lange, *De gratia* 330, §444, b. [In this instance, Lonergan cites the page number before the section number.]

<sup>63</sup> [This is the twenty-first item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See p. xx. It seems that Lonergan’s first caption for this section was: ‘This finite effect is not “that which is the uncreated gift” but is “that by which the uncreated gift is in us.”’]

It is not the uncreated gift itself: obviously, for a finite effect is created, and the created is not uncreated.

It is not the uncreated gift itself in us: this is also obvious, for an uncreated gift does not cease to be uncreated by the fact of its being in us.

It is that by which the uncreated gift is in us:

(a) from the exclusion expressed in the two preceding premises;

(b) from the reasoning by which the existence of this finite effect is established. For this effect is posited as a real condition for the truth of the assertion, ‘the uncreated gift dwells in us.’ This real condition is ‘that by which,’ as a ‘form’ is that by which matter becomes a being in act, as *esse* is that by which an essence exists, and so on.<sup>64</sup>

This conclusion at least touches upon the positions of all those who from this indwelling conclude to a special presence of God through a special effect produced in us, so that thereafter they think of nothing except this special effect.

[Page 13]

---

This appears on the back of this page. It looks as if he simply turned the page over and started again on the other side.]

<sup>64</sup> [Lonergan does not expressly specify here, as he will do in later writings, that the condition is neither a prior nor a simultaneous condition but a consequent condition. For his later clarification, see *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, vol. 7 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002) 96-99; *The Triune God: Systematics*, trans. Michael G. Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, vol. 12 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007) 440-41, 454-73.]

**10 This uncreated gift as uncreated is constituted by God alone; hence God is to the condition of the just not only as the effective principle but also as the constitutive principle. This constitutive principle, however, is not within the just as an inherent form but is present to the just as the term of a relation.<sup>65</sup>**

*Terminology*

*principle*: that which is first in some order

*effective*: that from which, by which, [as cause]

*constitutive*: that by which

*inherent form*: a form received in potency and limited by potency

*term*: that to which the subject in a relation is related

*condition, or status, of the just*: includes not only all that is intrinsic to the just but also all that are included in the formality of just

*Part 1*

Theological note: seems evident from the terms themselves.

Argument: The uncreated as uncreated is constituted through the uncreated alone; but only God is uncreated; therefore, the uncreated gift as uncreated is constituted by God alone.

*Part 2*

---

<sup>65</sup> [This is the twenty-second item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See p. xx. It is clear from notes of students that it replaced an earlier statement, which in translation would read: ‘*Through this same finite effect* [that is, created sanctifying grace] there is constituted not only the indwelling of the Holy Spirit but also the vivification of the justified through the same Spirit.’]

Note: conclusion that is certain from the previous part of the argument.

Argument: that by which anything is constituted is to that ‘anything’ as a constitutive principle; but God himself is that by which the uncreated gift as uncreated is constituted, and this gift belongs to the condition of the just; therefore ....

Major premise: by definition.

Minor premise: the first part of it follows from previous propositions; for the second part, see propositions 12-14.<sup>66</sup>

Put in another way: that which not only gives but is also given is not only an effective principle but also a constitutive principle; but in justification God not only gives but is also given; therefore ...

### *Part 3*

Note: the negative assertion is evident from philosophy; the positive assertion contains the minimum that is held by all theologians.<sup>67</sup>

Argument: the infinite God cannot be a received form limited by the receiving potency.

Unless God is present to the just at least as the term of a relation, he is not present in any manner, and this negates indwelling.

---

<sup>66</sup> [(12) The Holy Spirit himself is given and not only his gifts. (13) The Holy Spirit is given in all justification. (14) When the Holy Spirit is given, the Father and the Son also come. P. **xx** above.]

<sup>67</sup> See Christianus Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, tomus v: *De gratia; de lege divina positiva*, 3rd ed. (Herder: Freiburg im Breisgau, 1908) 195, no. 342; Henricus Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1940) 132-33; Lange, *De gratia* §455, pp. 342-43.

*Objection:* God is either received intrinsically or he is not a constitutive principle; but he cannot be received intrinsically (from part 3); therefore he is not a constitutive principle.

*Answer:* We deny the supposition in the major premise, that is, that every constitutive principle is received intrinsically. It is clear that there is no relation without a term, and equally clear that the term of a relation is not received intrinsically in the subject. For example, there is no wife without there being a husband, and yet a husband and a wife are two complete beings fully distinct from each other. So also concerning a soul and the Holy Spirit as the guest of the soul.

[Page 14]

## **11 This finite effect is physical and per se permanent.**<sup>68</sup>

1. 'Physical' is meant as opposed to 'moral,' not in its etymological meaning of 'natural' (*physis*, 'nature') as opposed to 'supernatural.'
2. It is a physical effect if it is truly predicated of the just by a simply intrinsic denomination. But it is so predicated, for it is that by which God is extrinsically denominated as indwelling. It would be a vicious circle if the just so denominated God extrinsically that they themselves were denominated extrinsically by God, for in that way there would be no truth-correspondence.
3. This effect is per se permanent if the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is per se permanent; but the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is per se permanent, for it is present in all the just, and the just remain just until their justice ceases on account of mortal sin.

---

<sup>68</sup> [This is the twenty-third item above under 'Justice and Holiness before God.' See above, p. xx.]

[Page 15]

**12 This finite effect is absolutely supernatural.**<sup>69</sup>

1. That which exceeds the proportion of any finite substance is absolutely supernatural.

That which is absolutely supernatural is an accident that is defined in terms of God as he is in himself. For any finite substance exists according to a formality by which God can be imitated extrinsically; and it is defined solely by this formality considered in itself, for a substance is an essence that is defined as that which is, without reference to anything else.

Every natural accident exists according to the proportion of a finite substance. But an absolutely supernatural accident, inasmuch as it is a possible being, is finite according to a formality by which God can be imitated extrinsically, but inasmuch as it is an accident it includes in its formality a relation to another, and finally, inasmuch as it is absolutely supernatural it has a relation to God as he is in himself.

2. That by which the Holy Spirit is extrinsically denominated as dwelling in (and vivifying and sanctifying) the members of Christ has an intrinsic relationship to the Holy Spirit, that is, to God as he is in himself.<sup>70</sup>

Therefore it is absolutely supernatural.

[Page 16]

---

<sup>69</sup> [This is the twenty-fourth item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See above, p. xx.]

<sup>70</sup> [In *The Triune God: Systematics* 472-73, Lonergan will speak of *gratia sanctificans* as having ‘a special relation to the Holy Spirit,’ because it is a participation of active spiration. **See also whatever we do in this volume about A205.**]



**13 This same finite effect is the first intrinsic principle of that new life by which we are made just and holy and live accordingly before God.<sup>71</sup>**

*Terminology*

*This same effect:* see propositions 20-23.<sup>72</sup>

*that new life:* see propositions 8-10, 15-19.<sup>73</sup>

*Meaning of the assertion:* It posits a nexus between this finite effect and the various properties of the supernatural life.

*Opinions*

Generally speaking, theologians place the foundation of the indwelling in sanctifying grace itself, which they understand as the first principle of the supernatural life. But there are divergent opinions as to how sanctifying grace effects the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

*Argument*

The finite effect whereby the Holy Spirit indwells is *either* the first intrinsic principle of the new life, *or* a consequence flowing from this principle itself, *or* some entity independent of this new supernatural life.

But the second and third alternatives are inadmissible; therefore the first is correct.

---

<sup>71</sup> [This is the twenty-fifth item above under ‘Justice and Holiness before God.’ See above, p. xx.]

<sup>72</sup> [See p. xx above.]

<sup>73</sup> [See p. xx above.]

*As to the major premise:* there are apparently no other alternatives.

*As to the minor premise:* Against the second alternative, *either* the consequence itself adds a perfection above the degree [of perfection] of the first intrinsic principle, and then it neither flows from the first principle nor is a consequence of it, *or* it does not add anything above the degree of perfection of the first principle, and then there appears no reason why the first principle itself is insufficient for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Against the third alternative, (a) it is incompatible with the teaching of the Fathers concerning the Holy Spirit as the principle of our sanctification (EP, series 357); (b) it involves an error in methodology in excluding the purpose of theology, which is an understanding of the mysteries from the connection among them, and so on (DB 1796, DS 3016, ND 132).

[Page 17]

**14 This first intrinsic principle is neither another infused virtue nor charity, but is a physical accident in the genus of quality reducible to the species of habit in the essence of the soul as its subject.**<sup>74</sup>

(a) It is not an infused virtue.

This follows from the very notion of virtue, which perfects a potency in respect to its act in accordance with its nature.

An infused virtue cannot be the first intrinsic principle of supernatural life if it presupposes something else as the first intrinsic principle; but it does presuppose something else; therefore ....

The major premise is evident.

---

<sup>74</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1-2, q. 110, aa. 1-4. [In the original typescript, this reference was inserted by hand]. See Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina*, Thesis 15, pp. 186-94.

As to the minor: in order that human potencies be perfected in respect to their acts that are above human nature, human nature itself must be elevated; otherwise these perfections of the potencies would not be virtues, because a virtue is ordered to act according to the nature of its subject.

(b) It is not another virtue besides charity.

For a person can lose the state of justice before God and still retain other virtues. It is defined that faith is not always lost when grace is lost, DB 838, DS 1578. It is commonly taught that the same is true in the case of other infused virtues.

(c) It is not charity itself.

From the general argument concerning every infused virtue.

In particular, charity is the love of friendship. The love of friendship supposes some equality between the friends. This equality is had through a participation of the divine nature, i.e., through the first intrinsic principle of the supernatural life.

Therefore charity is not the first intrinsic principle if it supposes something else; but it does suppose something else; therefore ....

(d) It is a physical accident. This is theologically certain, DB 800, 821; DS 1530-31, 1561; ND 1933-34, 1961.

It is an accident. A thing is either a substance or an accident. But it is not a substance, for in justification one is not changed substantially. Besides, a substance cannot be absolutely supernatural and still finite.

It is a physical accident. See proposition 22.<sup>75</sup>

(e) It is in the genus of quality reducible to the species of habit.

In the genus of quality: for it makes its subject to be 'such' – that is, makes the person to be just or holy.

---

<sup>75</sup> [P. xx above.]

It is not a quantity, for it is a spiritual reality, nor relation, for it is a first principle, nor is it in the other genera, because it is intrinsic, and not by extrinsic denomination.

It is in the species of habit. There are four species in [the genus] quality: habit and disposition, power or potency and impotence, passible (alterable) qualities, and form and figure.<sup>76</sup> It is not potency or impotence, because these directly regard acts; nor is it a passible quality or form and figure, because these are sensible realities.

(f) It is in the essence of the soul as its subject.

It is either in the essence of the soul or in a potency; if it were in a potency, it would be a virtue; therefore it is in the essence of the soul.

From the notion of habit: a habit either perfects nature itself or perfects a potency in ordination to its operation.<sup>77</sup> In the latter case it would be a virtue; in the former it is in the nature itself as its subject for the perfecting of that nature.

[Page 18]

**15 This first intrinsic principle is in a way related to the infused virtues and their acts as the essence of the soul is to its potencies and their operations.<sup>78</sup>**

1. As the essence of a soul is the principle from which the potencies flow (if a being is human, it necessarily has an intellect), so this first principle is that from which flow the infused virtues (if one is just [before God], one necessarily has faith, hope, and charity – DB 800, DS 1530-31, ND 1933-34.
2. As the essence of the soul is the principle through which is determined the formal object proportionate to the potencies (the intellect knows the intelligible in sensible

---

<sup>76</sup> [See Aristotle, *Categories* 8b, 25-10a, 17.]

<sup>77</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1-2, q. 49, a. 3; q. 50, a. 2.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid. q. 110, a. 4, ad 1m.

data because the soul is spiritual and yet the form of the body),<sup>79</sup> so this first intrinsic principle is that through which is determined the object proportionate to the virtues (it is absolutely supernatural and therefore the virtues are directed to acts by which God is attained as he is in himself.

3. Still, this principle is an accident, and the essence of the soul is substantial; hence the analogy is imperfect.

[Page 19]<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid. 1, q. 85, a. 1 c.

<sup>80</sup> [There are indications that this page 19 is a subsequent insertion in the original typescript. First, page 19 shifts the express focus of the discussion from the finite effect produced in the just by the gift of the Holy Spirit by introducing a brief, express consideration of those who are ‘living members of Christ.’ The next page of the typescript (page 20), however, returns again to the issue of the finite effect that is the *intrinsic first principle* of the new life by which we are made just and holy and live accordingly before God. Page 20 begins ‘*Quod hoc primum principium...*,’ as if there were no gap between what was discussed on page 18 of the transcript and what is about to be discussed on page 20. Further, at the very beginning of page 19 of the typescript the numeral ‘5’ is typed, followed by ‘6,’ ‘7,’ and ‘8,’ none of which connects with anything on page 18. Moreover, these numerals are themselves crossed out to be replaced with handwritten numerals ‘12,’ ‘13,’ ‘14’ and ‘15.’ And these, in turn, are crossed out and replaced with handwritten numerals, ‘15,’ ‘16,’ ‘17,’ ‘18,’ and again none of these connects with anything on page 18 or page 20 of the document. Now, as it happens, proposition 15 (see above p. **xx**) is the only proposition among the initial thirty propositions which speaks expressly of ‘living member of Christ.’ If this page 19 were in fact taken from another document, the uncrossed-out

## 16 A living member of Christ is a friend of God.

(a) Friendship is mutual love of benevolence in the sharing of some good (common enjoyment, common activity).

(b) God loves us by conferring sanctifying grace; the justified person loves God with the habit and act of charity flowing from sanctifying grace. The good to be communicated is the gift of God by way of vision; the good already communicated is the gift of God by way of indwelling.

---

‘15’ at the top of it, after two crossings-out, may well indicate Lonergan’s subsequent attempt to connect what is on this page with proposition 15. Finally, there is the fact that proposition 27 (see above p. **xx**) connects with what the editors have numbered as § 15, but proposition 28 connects with neither § 16 nor § 17 nor § 18 nor § 19, all of which make reference to ‘a living member of Christ,’ but with § 20 on page 20 of the typescript. The evidence, then, is quite strong that this page 19 is a subsequent insertion in the original typescript, drawn possibly from another document. **It is close to the meaning of proposition 15 in the list ‘Nexus mysteriorum’ above.** Lonergan may have inserted the page here, thinking perhaps that although the insertion results in something of a break in the continuity of the discussion, there remains a sufficient link between the notions of *justice* before God, the *holiness* that belongs to the ‘new man,’ and charity as the love of *friendship* in the preceding pages, on the one hand, and the affirmations in §§ 16-19 that as a living member of Christ one is a *friend* of God, is *just* before God, enjoys the *remission of sins*, on the other, to warrant the insertion of the page at this point. Indeed, later (see § 30) in clarifying what is meant by ‘mystical body,’ Lonergan will say that the term is ‘said properly of the living members of Christ.’]

### **17 A living member of Christ is just before God.<sup>81</sup>**

(a) Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1-2, q. 113, a. 1. There is justice regarding acts, as the acts of a person are regulated in keeping with the norms of commutative, legal, or distributive justice. There is also justice as the interior order of a person, in that one's reason is totally subject to God and the lower powers are subject to reason.

Here we are speaking of this interior ordering of a person.

b) As the infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Spirit flow from sanctifying grace there is produced an interior ordering of a person.

As this ordering is in keeping with the divine norms revealed by Christ and carried out through incorporation in Christ, there is interior justice before God.

c) This interior rectitude is twofold: one is in the heavenly city, where the glorification of the body will be completed; the other is here below, where concupiscence remains and venial sins remain, but grace is in control so that the just can avoid all mortal sin.

### **18 A living member of Christ enjoys the remission of sins.<sup>82</sup>**

If sin is understood as enmity towards God, it is taken away through friendship with God. But if sin is understood as a lack of due order in a person, it is taken away through justice before God.

Accordingly, since friendship and enmity are incompatible, and since rectitude and disorderedness are incompatible, it is metaphysically impossible for a living member of Christ not to enjoy the remission of sins.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> [This is close to the meaning of proposition 16 in the list 'Nexus mysteriorum' above.

See p. xx.]

<sup>82</sup> [This is close to the meaning of proposition 17 in the list 'Nexus mysteriorum' above.

See p. xx.]

*There is no remission before justification, DB 799, DS 1528-29, ND 1932 but per se in justification itself there is a free act because the infusion of the virtues is a pre-motion.*<sup>84</sup>

**19 In the present order there is no remission of sins unless one is a living member of Christ.**<sup>85</sup>

(a) DB 795, DS 1523, ND 1927: without rebirth in Christ one will never be justified.

(b) From the nature of the case: for in the present order a person is destined to a supernatural end; but without the infusion of grace he is not ordered to that end, and therefore is disordered, and so a sinner.

(c) The infusion of grace is absolutely required. Otherwise there would be a contradiction: one would be well ordered because his sins are forgiven, and disordered because destined to a supernatural end.

[Page 20]

**20 This first principle is sanctifying grace.**<sup>86</sup>

*Terminology*

---

<sup>83</sup> See Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 131, at bottom.

<sup>84</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1-2, q. 113, aa. 3-5, 7-8. [This sentence was inserted by hand in the original typescript, along with the reference to Aquinas. In the left margin of the document adjacent to the insertion there is also a reference to Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 327 ff. It would seem that Lonergan is referring to Thesis XXIX in Boyer's book, the discussion of which extends from p. 327 to p. 333.]

<sup>85</sup> Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 323-24.

<sup>86</sup> [This is the twenty-eighth item above under 'Justice and Holiness before God.' See above, p. xx.]



*grace*: a finite gift not owed to [human] nature which perfects a person in one's orientation to eternal life.

*sanctifying*: that by which one is holy.

*holy*: considered absolutely, God as he is in himself

considered relatively: unitively, one who is united, joined to God;

assimilatively, one who is able to operate according

to divine norms

It is grace: for it is absolutely supernatural and is ordered to eternal life.

It is holy: unitively, for it is that by which the Holy Spirit is given, indwelling, sealing, filling the souls of the just; assimilatively, for it is the first intrinsic principle of the whole of supernatural life.

1 Corinthians 3.16-17;<sup>87</sup> hence EP 251, 607, 780.

#### *Patristic basis*

St Basil the Great: St Basil the Great: EP 941: angels are holy through participation, the Holy Spirit is holy by the nature of holiness. EP 950, 960: angels are made holy through communion and presence with the Holy Spirit. EP 944, 960: describes the communicating of the Spirit and sanctity to humans. EP 36, 40, 158, 159: the gift of the Spirit and sanctity coincide. EP 219, 251, 253 (Irenaeus); EP 449 (Origen); 548 (Cyprian); 613 (Methodius); EP 1282 (Ambrose);<sup>88</sup> EP 1701 (Augustine); EP 2063, 2080, 2099 (Cyril of Alexandria).

---

<sup>87</sup> [1 Corinthians 3.16-17: 'Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy that person. For God's temple is holy, and you are that temple.']

<sup>88</sup> [In the original typescript, Lonergan had 'Chrys,' referring presumably to John Chrysostom, which seems to be a mistake.]

[Page 21]

## 21 Participation of the divine nature<sup>89</sup>

1. Regeneration, that is, as in the New Testament.

The notion of regeneration is developed in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 27, a.2 c. Generation, in a general sense: the origin of one thing from another; thus Aristotle, *De generatione et corruptione*. In the proper sense: the origin of a living thing from a conjoined living principle; thus, however, a hair from the head, worms in an animal [supposing spontaneous generation]. In the more proper sense: the origin of a living thing from a conjoined living principle, with a resulting likeness in nature; one human being from another.<sup>90</sup>

2. Filiation: the same as generation in the more proper sense. Adoption: the acceptance of an unrelated person (not a son or daughter) having the rights of a son or daughter, especially the right to inherit.

Adoption is (a) a juridical or moral entity, (b) it is opposite to natural filiation, and (c) it supposes a likeness in nature (a man is not said to adopt a dog, according to the opinion of theologians).<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> See J. van der Meersch, 'Grâce,' DTC VI (12) 1611-15; J. Bellamy, 'Adoption surnaturelle de l'homme par Dieu dans la justification,' DTC I (1) 434-35; Boyer, *Tractatus de Gratia Divina* 185. [This corresponds to the eighteenth item above under 'Justice and Holiness before God.' See above, p. xx. In the original typescript, the references are added by hand.]

<sup>90</sup> [See also Bernard Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics* 190-93.]

<sup>91</sup> See Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 129-30.

Adoptive filiation is said to be a secondary effect of sanctifying grace, inasmuch as it is not a necessary but a conditioned consequence of sanctifying grace. Christ had sanctifying grace but not by adoption: he was the natural Son of God.<sup>92</sup>

3. It seems appropriate to distinguish between the communication (κοινωνία) and the participation (μέθεξις) of the divine nature – not according to the way these words are used in scripture or by the Fathers or theologians, but according to the distinction between their concepts.

(a) There are four ways in which the divine nature is communicated:

(a') through internal processions the divine nature is communicated from the Father to the Son and from the Father and the Son to the Holy Spirit;

(b') through the hypostatic union the divine nature is communicated to the humanity of Christ such that the same person is both God and man;

(c') through sanctifying grace the divine nature is communicated to the souls of the just in that an uncreated gift is given to them for their possession;

(d') through the light of glory the divine nature is communicated to the intellects of the blessed as an intelligible species for them.

(b) There are three ways in which the divine nature is participated:

(a') by virtue of the fact that the divine nature or essence is the foundation of ideas or possibles and that God's knowledge is the cause of things, every finite essence, possible or actual, is an analogous imitation and hence participation of the divine nature;

(b') by the same token, though in a more excellent way, the grace of hypostatic union, sanctifying grace, the light of glory, and all other absolute realities that

---

<sup>92</sup> Carolus Boyer, *De Verbo Incarnato* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1948) 12.

import a relationship to God as he is in himself, are participations of the divine nature, for they are finite essences;

[Page 22]

(c') among these last, sanctifying grace in a special way is a participation of the divine nature because it is like a nature, in that it is the first intrinsic principle of a new and supernatural life.

(c) Hence sanctifying grace has three distinct aspects:

(a') it is a terminal participation of the divine nature inasmuch as it is that by which the uncreated gift is given; see Lange, §§414, 443, pp. 306, 329.

(b') it is a formal participation inasmuch as it is an analogous imitation of the divine nature and indeed to an absolutely supernatural degree;

(c') it is an originating participation (1) proximately, inasmuch as the supernatural life on this earth flows from it, and (2) remotely, inasmuch as through meritorious acts it is the seed of eternal life.

(d) Terminal participation of the divine nature is different from the communication of the divine nature through sanctifying grace in that (1) terminal participation directly refers to sanctifying grace while indirectly referring to the uncreated gift that is had through sanctifying grace, and (2) the communication of the divine nature through sanctifying grace directly refers to the communicated uncreated gift while indirectly indicating that this communication is made to us through sanctifying grace.

[Page 23]

## **22 Existence of the problem**

‘Among the scholastics, as Weigl notes (*op. cit.*, p. 226), the role of uncreated grace takes second place, and attention is above all directed to divine filiation conferred by created grace itself.’<sup>93</sup>

‘On this a very difficult question, how God’s inhabitation in the just is to be explained and conceived, there is a variety of opinions among theologians.’<sup>94</sup>

Concerning the opinion of Paul Galtier, Lennerz writes: ‘Thus it seems that this explanation, among those that up to now have been proposed on this difficult and obscure matter, is to be preferred.’<sup>95</sup>

Pius XII, [in his encyclical *Mystici corporis Christi*] concerning the Holy Spirit as soul of the mystical body of Christ,<sup>96</sup> praises inquiry for advancing our understanding of this teaching; and he gives two norms for guarding against teaching an exaggerated union with God or a function that is exclusive to the person of the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>93</sup> Van der Meersch, ‘Grâce,’ DTC VI (12) 1614, bottom of the column. [Van der Meersch is referring to the book by Eduard Weigl, *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien* (Mainz: Verlag von Kirchheim & Co., 1905). In his article at the bottom of column 1614, Van der Meersch cites p. 126, and Lonergan reproduces this in his quotation. However, given what Van der Meersch reports Weigl as saying, the correct page from Weigl’s book, would seem to be p. 226, not p. 126. Accordingly, the editors have change ‘p. 126’ in the quote to ‘p. 226.]

<sup>94</sup> Lennerz on inhabitation, *De gratia redemptoris* 105.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.* 118-19. [In his discussion of inhabitation in these pages, Lennerz cites the book by Paul Galtier, *L’habitation en nous des trois Personnes: le fait – le mode*, 2nd ed. (Paris:Gabriel Beauchesne, 1928) 227 ff.]

<sup>96</sup> *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 193-248, on page 231. [The encyclical was issued on June 29th 1943. Lonergan is referring to §§78-79.]

[Page 24]

### 23 The roots of the problem

1. The roots of the problem are speculative and historical: *one* root is the Neo-Platonist error, which influenced both the Fathers themselves<sup>97</sup> and also, not only through the Fathers but also through Pseudo-Dionysius, both the *Liber de Causis* and other Arabs in the Middle Ages; *another* root is the illegitimate abstraction stemming from exaggerated conceptualism.

2. Neoplatonism is a philosophical doctrine which in its development over several centuries assumed Plato's confusion of the logical and ontological orders, worked out a metaphysical system of the universe, and founded and propounded a moral and mystical doctrine (flight from things of the senses, contemplation of those of the intellect).

This doctrine was systematically proposed by Proclus in more than 200 propositions set out in the Euclidean manner in his *Elements of Theology*.<sup>98</sup> This exposition, as systematic, adds to the statements of the earlier centuries order and rigor regarding terms and deductions. Also, it expressed clearly what others more cautiously tend to.

3. The Neo-Platonic confusion of the logical and ontological orders not only consists in a positing of universals on the side of reality but also involves a confusion between

---

<sup>97</sup> René Arnou, 'Platonisme des Pères,' DTC XII (24) 2258-2392; see also his *De "Platonismo" Patrum. Textus et documenta, Series theologica 21* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1935).

<sup>98</sup> Proclus, *The Elements of Theology*, a revised text with translation, introduction and commentary by E.R. Dodds (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933 [2nd ed., 1963; pages cited below are from the 1933 edition, which would be the one Lonergan used]).

assimilation and union: according to sound philosophy, similars as such are not united; according to the Neo-Platonists, especially in the case of spiritual things, assimilation and union mean virtually the same thing.

(a) Proposition 35: ‘Every effect remains in its cause, proceeds from it, and reverts upon it’ (Dodds 39).

It remains in its cause: for it is similar to its cause and therefore identical with it; it proceeds, for there is diversity (proposition 30). It reverts upon its cause, because it is its good (proposition 31), and in fact it reverts, joins, attains, and communicates with its cause through assimilation (proposition 32).

(b) Hence it is clear that conjunction, or spiritual union, does not occur through local motion; the easy conclusion, therefore, is that this union in nothing else than assimilation.

Thus the quotations from Plotinus, Sallustius, Basil, Augustine, and Pseudo-Dionysius.

4. This Neo-Platonic doctrine influenced the theology of indwelling in three ways: it influenced (1) the formulation of the doctrine (of indwelling), (2) the understanding of the doctrine, and (3) the interpretations of the teachers.

It influenced the formulation of the doctrine in not clearly distinguishing between the created gift of assimilation and the uncreated gift. For both are expressed as one by whoever makes no distinction between assimilation and union.

It influenced the understanding of the doctrine, for by explaining assimilation, the distinct problem of explaining union disappears.

It influenced the interpretations of theologians: (a) non-Catholics would conclude that there is no indwelling, and (b) Catholics would conclude that there is no distinct problem.

### 23.1 Union is assimilation

Clinching the Neo-Platonist position that κοινωνία (communication), συναφή (conjunction), επιστροφή (return) and συνδεῖν (to bind together) are just ὁμοιωσις (assimilation) is the consideration that spiritual union cannot be spatial proximity.<sup>99</sup>

Plotinus, *Enneads*, vi, ix, 8 [Volkmann, II, 519, 30] (*cited, Dodds, proposition 28*):<sup>100</sup>  
τὰ ἀσώματα σώμασιν οὐ δεῖργεται: οὐδ' ἀφέστηκε τοίνυν ἀλλήλων τόπῳ,  
ἑτερότητι δὲ καὶ διαφορᾷ. 'The incorporeal are not kept apart from bodies: therefore  
they do not stand apart from each other locally through their otherness and difference.'

Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ix, 17 [ML 41, 271] (*cited Dodds prop 28*)<sup>101</sup>: 'si ergo  
Deo quanto similior, tanto fit quisque propinquior, nulla est ab eo alia longinquitas quam  
eius dissimilitudo.' 'If therefore the more one is like God the more one is nearer to him,  
there is no greater distance from him than dissimilarity.'

Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, ix, 23; MG 32, 109 AB. Arnou, 'Platonisme des Pères,'  
DTC XII (24) 2310: 'Union with the Holy Spirit is not local proximity – how could a body  
draw near to what has no body – but a separation from the passions that have come upon

---

<sup>99</sup> [Apart from the Greek, Lonergan typed this sentence in English. The reason is not clear.]

<sup>100</sup> [See Dodds, *The Elements of Theology* 216. On p. vi, Dodds write, 'Plotinus is cited by the traditional subdivisions or by Volkmann's pages and lines. For the convenience of readers I have usually given both references, the latter in brackets.' Lonergan follows Dodds's practice. The person being referred to is Richard Émil Volkmann (1832-72).]

<sup>101</sup> [Ibid.]



the soul through love of the flesh. Purify the soul of its passions, restore in it its original image of the King, that is the only manner to draw near to the Paraclete.’<sup>102</sup>

Dodds in Proclus proposition 32 cites: Sallustius, ed. Nock, p. 26, line 22: ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀγαθοὶ μὲν ὄντες δι’ ὁμοιότητα θεοῖς συναπτόμεθα, κακοὶ δὲ γενόμενοι δι’ ἀνομοιότητα χωριζόμεθα. ‘Those of us who are good are united to the gods through our likeness to them, but those of us who have become wicked have become separated from them through dissimilarity.’

Plato, Theaetetus, 176 B: φυγή δὲ ὁμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. ‘Flight [from this world to the other] means becoming like God as much as possible.’

Plotinus, Ennead I, viii, 1 [Volkman’s pages and lines, I.99.14], condition of knowledge.<sup>103</sup> Τῆς γνώσεως ἐκάστων δι’ ὁμοιότητος γιγνομένης. ‘... the knowledge of each through increasing similarity.’

Proclus, frag. CMAG,<sup>104</sup> VI, 148: theoretical possibility of theurgy, using the gods through magic signs.<sup>105</sup> οἱ πάλαι σοφοὶ ... ἐπήγοντο θείας δυνάμεις εἰς τὸν θνητὸν τόπον καὶ διὰ τῆς ὁμοιότητος ἐφειλκύσαντο: ἰκανὴ γὰρ ἡ ὁμοιότης συνάπτειν τὰ ὄντα ἀλλήλοις. ‘The wise men of old ... brought down divine powers into this mortal place, having drawn them down through similarity: for similarity is sufficient to attach beings to one another.’

---

<sup>102</sup> [Lonergan’s own English rendering of Arnou’s French rendering of Basil’s text.]

<sup>103</sup> [Lonergan’s remark ‘condition of knowledge’ is in English in the original typescript.]

<sup>104</sup> [CMAG = *Catalogue des MSS. Alchimiques Grecs.*]

<sup>105</sup> [Lonergan’s remark again is in English in the original typescript.]

Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Divinis Nominibus*, [cap.] 9, [no.] 6 [Thomas Aquinas, Mandonnet ed, II, 579 bottom, 581 top.<sup>106</sup>] και ἔστιν ἡ τῆς θείας ὁμοιότητος δύναμις ἢ τὰ παραγόμενα πάντα πρὸς τὸ αἴτιον ἐπιστρέφουσα. ‘And the power of likeness to the divine is that which turns all the produced towards their cause.’

See Arnou, ‘Platonisme des Pères,’ *Textus et Documenta*, p. 9 [for the following citation]. Ps. Dion., *De Div. Nom.*, I, n. IV, MG 3, 589 D [Thomas Aquinas, Mandonnet ed., II, 245-46, 237-8.<sup>107</sup>] ‘We are being driven towards the godlike monad and divine union.’

[Page 26]

### 23.2 *Union consists in assimilation*

Proclus, *Elementa Theologica (The Elements of Theology)*, ed. E. R. Dodds, Oxford, 1933.)

Proposition 32: Πᾶσα ἐπιστροφή δι’ ὁμοιότητος ἀποτελεῖται τῶν ἐπιστρεφόμενων πρὸς ὃ ἐπιστρέφεται.

το γὰρ ἐπιστρεφόμενον πᾶν πρὸς πᾶν συνάπτεσθαι σπεύδει καὶ ορέγεται τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸ κοινωνίας καὶ συνδέσεως. συνδεῖ δὲ πάντα ἡ ὁμοιότης, ὥσπερ διακρίνει ἡ ἀνομοιότης καὶ δίστησιν. εἰ οὖν ἡ ἐπιστροφή κοινωνία τίς ἐστι καὶ συναφή, πᾶσα δὲ κοινωνία καὶ συναφή πᾶσα δι’ ὁμοιότητος, πᾶσα ἄρα ἐπιστροφή δι’ ὁμοιότητος ἀποτελοῖτο ἄν.

---

<sup>106</sup> [Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula omnia*, tomus II, ed. P. Mandonnet (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1927). The text from Pseudo-Dionysius on which Aquinas is commenting on pp. 579-81 is on p. 578.]

<sup>107</sup> [Ibid. The text from Pseudo-Dionysius on which Aquinas is commenting on pp. 245-46 is on pp. 237-38.]

*‘All reversion is accomplished through a likeness of the reverting terms to the goal of reversion.*

‘For that which reverts endeavours to be conjoined in every part with every part of its cause, and desires to have communion in it and be bound by it. But all things are bound together by likeness, as by unlikeness they are distinguished and severed. If, then, reversion is a communion and conjunction, and all communion and conjunction is through likeness, it follows that all reversion must be accomplished through likeness.’<sup>108</sup>

Proposition 35: Πάν τὸ αἰτιατὸν καὶ μένει ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ αἰτίᾳ καὶ πρόεισιν ἅπ’ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπιστρέφει πρὸς αὐτήν. *‘Every effect remains in its cause, proceeds from it, and reverts upon it.’*

There follows a long proof.<sup>109</sup>

Proposition 30: (30) *‘All that is immediately produced by any principle both remains in the producing cause and proceeds from it.’* Πάν τὸ ἀπὸ τινος παραγόμενον ἀμέσως μένει τε ἐν τῷ παραγόντι καὶ πρόεισιν ἅπ’ αὐτοῦ.<sup>110</sup>

Proposition 31: *‘All that proceeds from any principle reverts in respect of its substance upon that from which it proceeds.’* Πάν τὸ προϊὸν ἅπὸ τινος κατ’ οὐσίαν ἐπιστρέφεται πρὸς ἐκεῖνο ἀφ’ οὗ πρόεισιν.<sup>111</sup>

Prop. 29: *‘All procession is accomplished through a likeness of the secondary to the primary.’* Πᾶσα πρόοδος δι’ ὁμοιότητος ἀποτελεῖται τῶν δευτέρων πρὸς τὰ πρῶτα.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> [See Dodds, *Elements of Theology* 37. The Greek is on p. 37. Dodds uses italics in his translation to highlight the proposition and distinguish it from the elaboration that follows.]

<sup>109</sup> [Ibid. 39. The proof is also on p. 39.]

<sup>110</sup> [Ibid. 35.]

<sup>111</sup> [Ibid. The elaboration of the proposition ends on p. 37.]

<sup>112</sup> [Ibid.]

NB: Proposition 29 is ‘omne agens agit sibi simile’; but similitude is a partial identity (for Platonists); hence proposition 30, which saves identity by remaining, immanence, and difference by procession.<sup>113</sup>

Proposition 23. Πάν τὸ ἀμέθεκτον ὑφίστησιν ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ τὰ μετεχόμενα, καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ μετεχόμεναι ὑποστάσεις εἰς ἀμεθέκτους ὑπάρξεις ἀνατείνονται.

τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀμέθεκτον, μονάδος ἔχον λόγον ὡς ἑαυτοῦ ὄν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλου καὶ ὡς ἐξηρημένον τῶν μετεχόντων, ἀπογεννᾷ τὰ μετέχεσθαι δυνάμενα. ἢ γὰρ ἄγονον ἐστήξεται καθ’ αὐτό, καὶ οὐδὲν ἂν ἔχοι τίμιον· ἢ δώσει τι ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τὸ μὲν λαβὼν μετέσχε, τὸ δὲ δοθὲν ὑπέστη μετεχομένως.

τὸ δὲ μετεχόμενον πᾶν, τινὸς γενόμενον ὑφ’ οὗ μετέχεται, δευτέρον ἐστὶ τοῦ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως παρόντος καὶ πάντα ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ πληρώσαντος. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ ὄν ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐκ ἔστιν· τὸ δὲ πᾶσιν ὡσαύτως παρόν, ἵνα πᾶσιν ἐλλάμπη, οὐκ ἐν ἐνὶ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τῶν πάντων. ἢ γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἐστίν ἢ ἐν ἐνὶ τῶν πάντων ἢ πρὸ τῶν πάντων. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ἐν πᾶσιν ὄν, μερισθὲν εἰς πάντα, πάλιν ἄλλου ἂν δέοιτο τοῦ τὸ μερισθὲν ἐνίζοντος· καὶ οὐκέτ’ ἂν τοῦ αὐτοῦ μετέχοι πάντα, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ἄλλου, τὸ δὲ ἄλλου, τοῦ ἐνὸς μερισθέντος. εἰ δὲ ἐν ἐνὶ τῶν πάντων, οὐκέτι τῶν πάντων ἔσται, ἀλλ’ ἐνὸς. εἰ οὖν καὶ κοινὸν τῶν μετέχειν δυναμένων καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πάντων, πρὸ τῶν πάντων ἔσται· τοῦτο δὲ ἀμέθεκτον.

*‘All that is unparticipated produces out of itself the participated; and all participated substances are linked by upward tension to existences not participated.*

‘For on the one hand the unparticipated, having the relative status of a monad (as being its own and not another’s, and as transcending the participants) generates terms capable of being participated. For either it must remain fixed in sterility and isolation, and so must lack a place of honour, or else it will give something of itself, whereof the

---

<sup>113</sup> [In the original typescript, this remark by Lonergan is in English.]

receiver becomes a participant, whilst the given attains substantial existence as a participated term.

‘Every participated term, on the other hand, becoming a property of that particular by which it is participated, is secondary to that which in all is equally present and has filled them all out of its own being. That which is in one is not in the others; while that which is present to all alike, that it may illuminate all, is not in any one, but is prior to them all. For either it is in all, or in one out of all, or prior to all. But a principle which was in all would be divided amongst all, and would itself require a further principle to unify the divided; and further, all the particulars would no longer participate the same principle, but this one and that another, through the diremption of its unity. And if it be in one out of all, it will be a property no longer of all but of one. Inasmuch, then, as it is both common to all that can participate and identical for all, it must be prior to all: that is, it must be unparticipated.’<sup>114</sup>

There are three terms: ἀμέθεκτον, μετεχόμενον, μετέχον [imparticipable, participated, participant]; logically the first is the intension of a concept and the last is the extension, while the μετεχόμενον is the link between intension and extension; but logic for Platonists is also ontology; and this is the root of Platonist paradox in this and other forms, e.g., union is constituted by similarity.

See Pseudo-Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus*, [cap.] 2, [no.] 5 [MG 3, 641-44]: ἀμεθεκτῶς μετεχόμενα. *Dodds affirms that Plotinus never went so far as to affirm the transcendent to be αμεθεκτόν. In Procl. Prop. 23, p. 211, citing Enneads VI, 5. 3.*

[Page 28]

---

<sup>114</sup> [For this, see Dodds, *The Elements of Theology* 27, 29.]

*Neoplatonism = ontological conceptualism*<sup>115</sup>

5.<sup>116</sup> Another root of the difficulty is illegitimate abstraction.

According to conceptualists, if there are distinct terms with different meanings, there are distinct concepts; and if there are distinct concepts, there is a legitimate abstraction of one from the other.

According to St Thomas, *In Boethium de Trinitate.*, q. 5, a. 3 c., there is no legitimate abstraction when the line of intelligible connection is broken: father cannot be abstracted from son, because although they are two things adequately and really distinct from each other, a father is not father unless he has a child, and a son is not a son without a father.

6. Another root, connected with the above, is a positivism according to which certain theologians restrict the function of theology to enunciating dogmas clearly and distinctly, and relegate to obscure or fruitless disputations the search for understanding through the connection of the mysteries with one another and through the analogy with nature.

7. Illegitimate abstraction destroys this very nexus; positivism considers this depredation to be unimportant.

8. To speak of the created gift in abstraction from the uncreated gift seems to be a case of illegitimate abstraction. P. Lange, [*De gratia*] §455 [pp. 342-43],<sup>117</sup> is very good on this point: ‘one total gift.’

---

<sup>115</sup> [Handwritten by Lonergan at the top of this page of the original typescript. This page was out of sequence in the notes, and has been placed in its proper location.]

<sup>116</sup> [This continues the enumeration given above. See p. xxx.]

<sup>117</sup> [Lonergan actually had §445 in the original typescript. But the expression *unum donum totale* occurs in §455 of Lange’s book and nowhere else. In §455, Lange is

### 23.3 *The far more common opinion*<sup>118</sup>

1. The just possess a share in the divine nature inasmuch as they have sanctifying grace.

For thus they have the remote proportionate principle for performing operations proper to God – to love God as he is in himself, and to see God intuitively.

One who has a principle for acts that are proper to some nature participates in that nature.

The just have the intrinsic principle for acts that are proper to the divine nature.

Therefore ...

2. The just possess adoptive filiation in that they are creatures participating in the divine nature, that is, through sanctifying grace alone.

Since they participate, they are sons; but since they are creatures, their filiation is not natural, hence adoptive. Christ is not a son by adoption, because Christ's person is not created.

3. The just have the Spirit dwelling in them in that they possess the intrinsic principles of cognitional and volitional operations whose object is God as he is in himself.

This is based upon St Thomas. Beginning with John of St Thomas, Thomists speak of a connection with mystical experience of divine presence; Suarez places greater emphasis on the notion of love, on the demands of friendship.

discussing uncreated and created grace. It seems likely, then, that Lonergan meant to type '§455' and not '§445.' Accordingly, this change has been made and the corresponding pagination for §455 inserted.]

<sup>118</sup> See Van der Meersch, 'Grâce,' DTC VI (12) 1611-15; Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 112-19, 125-33; Lange, *De gratia*, Theses 14-16 [pp. 296-348], on opinions and theological reasons.

4. Another opinion: The just have the Spirit dwelling in them insofar as God, present in all his effects through his essence, knowledge, and power, is present in a special way to the extent that he produces effects that are absolutely supernatural, assimilation to the divine nature.

Thus Vasquez, Galtier 1549-1604], whom Lennerz prefers.<sup>119</sup>

N.B.: Here is the difficulty with the former opinion:

The object of knowledge and of love can be either present or absent. To know and love God as intimately present to one supposes but does not effect his presence. *A general presence – philosophical knowledge – does not seem to be sufficient: the Holy Spirit sent by Christ is given as indwelling, sealing, crying out, ‘Abba, Father.’*

Pius XII, [in his encyclical *Mystici corporis Christi*,] posits presence first and then knowledge and love.<sup>120</sup> This, it seems, is his interpretation of St Thomas.

Here is the difficulty with the second opinion:

It is true that grace is a special assimilation to God; still, it is neither infinite nor perfect, but attains a certain degree of perfection and assimilation. Grace itself is not an uncreated gift.

It is one thing for God to be present, but another thing for God to be a gift given and possessed. By the fact that God produces grace, there is a special presence; but it does not follow that the gift of God himself is possessed. *Romans 5.5.*

[Page 30]

## **24 Some opinions on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and our justice**

*Peter Lombard.*<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> [See Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 117-19.]

<sup>120</sup> *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 231 or 232. [See note xxx below.]



We do not possess the created virtue of charity, but the Holy Spirit himself is in us instead.

This opinion was generally rejected at Paris in the time of St Bonaventure.<sup>122</sup>

*L[eonhard] Lessius.*<sup>123</sup>

He distinguished the grace of justification, (a) as to its physical entity, and (b) as to its relationship to the Holy Spirit, which God, by a reasonable but contingent decree, linked to this entity.

He taught that the grace of justification considered as a physical entity is the formal cause of our justice; and considered in its relationship to the Holy Spirit, it is the formal cause of adoptive filiation and participation in the divine nature.

Pesch states that Lessius' only error was in holding the separability of justification and adoptive filiation.<sup>124</sup>

*[Dionysius] Petavius.*<sup>125</sup>

He taught that the doctrine of the Greek Fathers was as follows:

<sup>121</sup> See Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 166.

<sup>122</sup> [‘Iam S. Bonaventura signabat hanc sententiam ex his esse in quibus “communiter doctores Parisienses non sequuntur Magisterium.”’ Ibid.]

<sup>123</sup> See Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 121-24

<sup>124</sup> See Christianus Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, tomus II: *Tractatus dogmatici, Pars I: De Deo uno secundum naturam; Pars II. De Deo trino secundum personas* (Herder: Friburg im Breisgau, 1895), no. 678 [p. 344], quoted by Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 124-25, note 130. [This same point regarding Pesch's position is mentioned again. See §26, p. xx below.]

<sup>125</sup> See Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 167-68.

(a) The habit of charity or grace is the link or bond by which we are united to the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit himself makes us children by adoption, so much so that if no created quality were infused in us, the Spirit himself by his very being would make us children of God.

(b) Although the three divine persons dwell in the just, still only the Spirit is present as the quasi-form of our justification.

This opinion is rejected by theologians generally.

For an assessment of the Greek Fathers, see Joseph Mahé, 'La sanctification d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,' *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 19 (1909) 30-40, 469-92.

[Matthias Joseph] Scheeben.

See his *Die Mysterien des Christentums*, vol. 2 in *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Josef Höfer (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1941) § 30, pp. 141-47 [in English: *The Mystery of Christianity*, trans. Cyril Vollert (St. Louis, MO: B. Herder Book Co., 1946) § 30, pp. 165-71]; *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik III*, vol. 5 in *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Wilhelm Breuning und Franz Lakner (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1948) [§ 169], nos. 832-84 [pp. 393-421].<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 168. [Lonergan's references to Scheeben's writings are taken from Boyer. Boyer has 'Dogmatik II, n. 832 sqq.,' which seems to be a misprint for 'Dogmatik III, n. 832 sqq.' In *Dogmatik III*, no. 832 is the beginning of § 169. Accordingly, the editors have changed the reference from 'Dogmatik II' to 'Dogmatik III' and specified the page range from the beginning of § 169 on p. 393 to its end on p. 421.] Lange, *De gratia* 342-43, §455. Malachi Donnelly, 'The Indwelling

Scheeben taught that our justification is constituted not solely by a physical entity infused and inherent in us but also by an uncreated gift, tri-personal, in the manner of a quasi form.

He made many excellent suggestions; but it is hard to tell where metaphor ends and proper language begins. As a result, his teaching was simply rejected by many, while defended by others to a greater or lesser degree.

Along this line there are others to be mentioned: Passaglia, Schrader, de Regnon, Waffelaert.<sup>127</sup>

[Page 31]

## 25 Opinions of the Fathers

See [the previously mentioned article by] Mahé, ‘La sanctification d’après Saint Cyrille d’Alexandrie.’

EP, series 353-60.

Sebastian Tromp, *De Spiritu Sancto anima corporis mystici: Testimonia selecta e patribus Graecis. Textus et documenta, Series theologica 1* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1932). *De Spiritu Sancto anima corporis mystici: Testimonia selecta e partibus Latinis. Textus et documenta, Series theologica 7* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1932).<sup>128</sup>

---

of the Holy Spirit according to M.J. Scheeben,’ *Theological Studies* 7 (June 1946) 244-80. Summary, pp. 278-79.

<sup>127</sup> On Waffelaert, see [the brief remarks in] Van der Meersch, ‘Grâce,’ DTC VI (12) 1615.

<sup>128</sup> [In the original typescript, Lonergan inserted this reference by hand.]

(A) Romans 8.14-15 (2 Timothy 1.7); Galatians 4.4-6; John 17.21.<sup>129</sup>

(a) Participation in the divine nature because we receive an uncreated gift:

Athanasius, EP 766, 770, 780; Didymus of Alexandria, EP 1071; Cyril of Alexandria, EP 2107.

(b) Adoptive filiation through Christ and the uncreated gift: Clement of

Alexandria, EP 407; Athanasius, EP 766, 788; Cyril of Jerusalem, EP 813. See also 948 [Basil], 1273 [Ambrose], 1433 [Augustine], 1777 [Augustine], 2106 [Cyril of Alexandria].

(B) Genesis 1. 26-27; Romans 5.12-20.<sup>130</sup> (The old and new man throughout the New Testament.)

---

<sup>129</sup> [Romans 8.14-16: ‘For all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God. For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, “Abba! Father,” it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God ...’

2 Timothy 1.7: ‘... for God did not give us a spirit of cowardice, but rather a spirit of power and of love and of self-discipline.’

Galatians 4.4-6: ‘But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children. And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!”’

John 17.21: ‘... that they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me.’]

<sup>130</sup> [Genesis 1.26-31: ‘Then God said, “Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every

---

creeping thing that creeps upon the earth. So God created humankind in his image, in the image of god he created them; male and female he created them. God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth ... God saw everything that he had made, and indeed, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.’

Romans 5.12-19: ‘Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned – sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law. Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come. But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died through the one man’s trespass, much more surely have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for the many. And the free gift is not like the effect of the one man’s sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brings justification. If, because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised dominion through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness exercise dominion in life through the one man, Jesus Christ. Therefore just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man’s act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all. For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous. But law came in, with the result that the trespass multiplied; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, so that, just as sin exercised dominion in death, so grace might also exercise dominion through justification leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.’]

Justice and holiness is the restoration of the image of God destroyed in the first man, covered over through assimilation to Jesus Christ. See EP 31, 253, 361, 746, 973, 1282, 1698, 2080, 2106.

[Page 32]

### 25.1 *Influence of Neoplatonism*

EP – The indwelling of the Holy Spirit is not referenced in the Cappadocians, (except Basil, 944) Augustine, John Damascene.

Influence upon ascetical and mystical conceptions, EP 973.<sup>131</sup>

See Basil, 944, and Cyril of Alexandria, 2080, John Damascene, 2360, 2370.

St Thomas's reaction:

*Supra III Sententiarum*, d. 10, q. 2, a. 1, sol. 3: through an active medium, through a formal, inherent, exemplary cause.

*Summa theologiae*, 3, q. 23, a. 3: by imitating the unity between Father and Son.

[Page 33]

### 25.2 *Indwelling of God and of the Spirit: Teaching of the Fathers*

[All references below are to *Enchiridion Patristicum*]

36: Epistle of Barnabas: **intimates the priority of remission [of sins], etc.**<sup>132</sup>

Remission of sins, hope, renewal, new creature, hence God's indwelling in us.

89: The *Shepherd* of Hermas, a well-known and obscure text.

<sup>131</sup> [At this point in the original typescript, Lonergan has 'Arn Text.' Presumably, he is referring again to Arnou's *De "Platonismo" Patrum*.]

<sup>132</sup> [Here and below, the text in red appears as red in the original typescript.]

- 158: Tatianus: at the beginning, the Spirit dwelt in all; as a result of sin, the Spirit leaves; polytheism; now the Spirit dwells not in everyone but only in the just; prophecy.
- 159: Tatianus: **assimilation to God from the indwelling of the Spirit**. We ought to seek the Spirit; to unite our soul to the Spirit; to live and behave in accordance with this union (συσυγίαν, ξευγνύναι); without the Spirit, humans are superior to animals only by reason of speech, for they lack likeness to God (ὁμοιωσις τῷ θεῷ).
- 219: Irenaeus: The Spirit is the principle of regeneration through baptism; the principle of prophecy; resting in a person, carrying out the will of the Father; effecting the renewal from the old state to newness in Christ.
- 251: Irenaeus: the indwelling of God and the Spirit is effected if they have faith.
- 449: Origen: The Holy Spirit is not a body but a sanctifying power.
- 607: Novatian: The Holy Spirit ‘is given as one inhabiting in our bodies and producing holiness.’ ‘[The Spirit] produces a second birth, a seed of the divine nature ... the pledge of a promised inheritance ... and makes us temples of God, interceding for us ...’
- 683: Aphraates: The Spirit of Christ through baptism, the heavenly Spirit, rebirth, lost through sin.
- 770: Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos*, Oration IV: The Son in himself is in the Father; but through the Son we receive a share in the Spirit, and thus a share in God.
- 780: Athanasius, *Ad Serapionem*: Through the Spirit we are sharers in God; therefore the Spirit is God. The Spirit is God because he deifies us.
- 813: Cyril of Jerusalem: Through the Spirit we become sons of God; but Christ is the Son of God.

872: Hilary: The Spirit of God and of Christ is in us. Cites Romans 8.11<sup>133</sup> and adds,  
 ‘We are vivified, therefore, by the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us through him who  
 raised Christ from the dead.’

[Page 34; numbered ‘2’ in the typescript.]

944: Basil: As light illuminates, and that which is thus illuminated illuminates other  
 things, so the Holy Spirit makes the just to be perfectly spiritual, and from this  
 they radiate grace to others. Hence, abiding in God, assimilation to God, and, the  
 greatest of all, deification.

1071: Didymus of Alexandria: A creature cannot be participated in substantially by a  
 rational soul so as to dwell in it; this is proper to God alone. But the Holy Spirit is  
 participable substantially: τὸ δ’ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα μεθεκτὸν οὐσιωδῶς ὑπαρχει.  
 The priority of the Father is indicated; hence all Three necessarily indwell.

1186: John Chrysostom: One who possesses the Spirit possesses Christ also; indeed, he  
 necessarily possesses the entire Trinity.

1216: John Chrysostom: As a result of baptism, the very best of good things: forgiveness  
 of sins, sanctification, participation in the Spirit, adoptive filiation, eternal life.

2107: Cyril of Alexandria: those born of the Spirit are born of God; through the Spirit, a  
 sharing in the divine nature.

2114: Cyril of Alexandria: Who receives the Spirit has a share in God.

[Page 35]

## 26 Directive Principles

---

<sup>133</sup> Romans 8.11: ‘If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he  
 who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his  
 spirit that dwells in you.’



1. There exists a true sharing in the divine nature and adoptive filiation, although there is no explicit definition of this fact based on intrinsic reason; nevertheless it is so clearly contained in scripture and tradition that it must be said to be simply a matter of faith.<sup>134</sup>

Therefore, it cannot be reduced to a mere metaphor or to a moral assimilation where one is conformed to God by reason of one's good works.

2. There is no identification with God.

Condemnation of Eckhart, DB 510-13, DS 960-63, and of Molinos, DB 1225, DS 2205, ND 2007/5.

Pius XII seriously warned that 'there must be rejected every sort of such mystical union by which the Christian faithful in whatever way would so go beyond the order of created beings and wrongly transgress upon the divine that even one attribute of the eternal deity could be predicated of them as being proper to them.'<sup>135</sup>

The Father is God, the Son is God, the Spirit is God, this man Jesus Christ is God; the just are not, not even according to a single attribution.

3. One must be careful in speaking about the relationships of the just to different divine persons.

That is, God the Son is incarnate, not the Father nor the Holy Spirit.

Is this not different concerning the Holy Spirit? By no means; this is denied by virtually all theologians.

DB 703, DS 1330, ND 325: all things are one where there is no relational opposition.

---

<sup>134</sup> See Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 87.

<sup>135</sup> *Mystici corporis Christi*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 231.

Pius XII emphatically stated that ‘all things must be held to be common to the Trinity inasmuch as they relate to God as their supreme efficient cause.’<sup>136</sup>

This statement perhaps leaves a certain latitude in a case where God is not an effective but a constitutive principle. We shall leave this question to the treatise on the triune God, both on account of its difficulty and also in order not to deal with distinct questions at the same time.<sup>137</sup>

4. The statement, ‘... grace and charity which are poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit and remain in them ...’ DB 821, see 800; DS 1561, see 1530-31; ND 1961; see 1933-34. This clearly indicates a finite, physical, and per se permanent gift. The opinion of Lombard is ‘close to heresy.’

[Page 36]

5. ‘*A single formal cause.*’

(a) DB 799, DS 1528-29, ND 1932: ‘... a single formal cause ... “the justice of God ... by which he makes us just” ... each one receiving justice in us according to the measure which the “Holy Spirit imparts it to each person as he wills ...” [1 Corinthians 12.11].’

DB 809 at end, ND 1947: ‘... for the justice which is said to be ours because we become just by its inherence in us is that of God himself, since it is infused in us by God through the merit of Christ.’

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> In his treatment of sanctifying grace in 1951-52, Lonergan does take up this question in a quite emphatic way.

DB 796, DS 1524, ND 1928: ‘In these words (Colossians 1.12-14<sup>138</sup>) suggests that the justification of the sinner might be described as a transition from the state in which one is born as a child of the first Adam to the state of grace and “adoption as children” [Romans 8.15] of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ our Savior ...’

(b) The intention of the Council was to reject the opinions proposed by [Johann] Gropper [1503-59], [Albert] Pighi [1490-1542], [Gaspar] Contarini [1483-1542], and [Girlando] Seripando [1493-1563] concerning a twofold justice: namely, that there is one justice inherent in us, and another justice, that of Christ himself, imputed to us through the merits of Christ. The Council teaches that the single formal cause is the justice inherent in us.

(c) From this teaching of the Council the conclusion was that the opinion of Ripalda and Lessius was ‘close to heresy.’

Bellamy, ‘Adoption surnaturelle de l’homme par Dieu dans la justification,’ DTC I (1) 429: ‘totally unjust severity.’

(d) Bellamy himself judges that the opinions of Lessius, Petavius, and Scheeben are incompatible with the teaching intended and deduced from the tenor of the decrees, from the history of the Council, and from the Roman Catechism. Ibid. 434-36.

(e) Previously, in a long-running controversy with Scheeben, Granderaath ‘absolutely rejects that any notion of formal cause be assigned to created grace.’<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> [Colossians 1.12-14: ‘... giving thanks to the Father, who has enabled you to share in the inheritance of the saints in the light. He has rescued us from the power of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.’]

<sup>139</sup> Lange, *De gratia* §455, p. 343. See also Bellamy, ‘Adoption surnaturelle de l’homme par Dieu dans la justification,’ DTC I (1) 430.

(f) Less severely, but along the same lines, Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 170, and at 181: ‘*Therefore the Holy Spirit is not the cause of our adoption, neither as the principal form nor as a previously given form nor as a proper form, of which created grace would be only either an effect or a condition, or link, by divine disposition.*’ *Is he speaking per se of ‘form in the strict sense’?*

(g) Franzelin rejected what he believes to be the opinion of Lessius and Petavius (*mostly* Petavius), but admitted, ‘...but we say that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is the “peak of perfection,” in terms of both holiness and of adoption, not as a formal cause but as an efficient cause and as the term to which we are united.’<sup>140</sup>

(h) Lange, §455, p. 342 [italics in original]: ‘... the formal cause, *strictly* speaking, that is, *intrinsically informing*, is created grace, but uncreated grace as the term of a relation can be said to be a formal cause in an *analogous sense*, that is, *extrinsic* and *assisting* (just as an exemplar cause also is reduced to a formal cause).’

‘What created grace confers by informing, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit produces by way of a term.’<sup>141</sup>?

[Page 37]

---

<sup>140</sup> [Ioannis Bapt. Franzelin, *Tractatus de Deo Trino secundum personas*, 4th ed. (Paris: A. Roger & F. Chernoviz, 1895) 581, note 2. In the archive document, Lonergan refers again to Bellamy’s article, ‘Adoption surnaturelle de l’homme par Dieu dans la justification,’ at DTC I (1) 430, where Bellamy quotes this same text from a note that appears on p. 636 of the 3rd edition (1881) of Franzelin’s book.]

<sup>141</sup> [In Lange, this part of the quote appears prior to the text quoted in the preceding paragraph. Further, in the archive document, Lonergan places the question mark outside the quote marks for the quoted sentence, indicating perhaps that he is querying whether it is correct to say that what created grace confers by informing, the [indwelling] of the Holy Spirit produces by way of a term.]

(i) Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 133, likewise expressly admits that the Spirit can be said to be a form in a broader sense: as the term of a relation he can be said to be an extrinsic, assistant, form' of the subject of the relation ... 'in the manner of an assistant and analogous form.' And he quotes Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae* v: *De gratia. De lege divina postiva*, §342 [p. 195], in this sense.

(j) Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, II: *Pars II. De Deo trino secundum personas* §678 [pp. 343-44], taught that Lessius's only error was to affirm the separability of justification and the uncreated gift.

(k) Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 124: 'Although this opinion (of Lessius) is in no way contrary to the definition of the Council of Trent.'

Lange, *De gratia* §455 [pp. 342-43]: the same; Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, II: *Pars II. De Deo trino secundum personas* §676 [pp. 342-43]: the same.

Reason: The Council had no intention whatever to determine what belongs to grace as a physical entity and what belongs to grace as the foundation of a relation to the Holy Spirit.

N.B. – Boyer does not list Lessius among the adversaries but says that he is a precursor of Petavius.<sup>142</sup>

*What we say:*

1. The Council affirms that there is a single formal cause of justification, and understands it to be created grace received in the just.
2. The Council does not exclude but supposes and clearly proposes the Catholic teaching on the mystical body of Christ.

---

<sup>142</sup> Boyer, *Tractatus de gratia divina* 168.

(a) DB 795, DS 1523, ND 1927: ‘they would never be justified if they were not reborn in Christ, since this rebirth bestows on them, through the merits of his passion, the grace through which they become just.’

(b) DB 796, DS 1524, ND 1928: transition to the state of grace and of adoption is the transferral to the kingdom of his beloved Son [Colossians 1.13]; see DB 796, DS 1524, ND 1928 at the beginning, and DB 795, DS 1523, ND 1927.

(c) DB 809, DS 1546, ND 1947, middle: the just are described as living members of Christ; and in the canon, DB 842, DS 1582, ND 1982, they are called living members of Christ.

3. The Holy Spirit, then, is the soul of the mystical body of Christ; and ‘form’ has the same meaning as ‘soul,’ for ‘soul’ is defined as the first act or form of an organic body.

4. To say, therefore, that the teaching of the Council denies to the Holy Spirit any notion of form would be to say that the Council denies to the Holy Spirit any notion of soul of the mystical body of Christ.

5. In addition, there are authorities such as Franzelin, Pesch, Lange, and Lennerz, not to mention those, such as [Hugo] Hurter, who like Scheeben’s doctrine.

6. There is also P. M. de la Taille, whose ‘finite actuation by infinite act’ contains the idea of a more eminent form.<sup>143</sup>

7. *Therefore* ‘single formal cause’ signifies formal cause in the strict sense, received intrinsically.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup> [The more usual expression in English is ‘created actuation by uncreated act’ or ‘eminent actuation.’ See Maurice de la Taille, ‘Actuation créée par acte incréée,’ *Recherches de science religieuse* 18 (1928) 253-68.]

[Page 38]

6.<sup>145</sup> Inadequate theories.

Theologians may truly affirm what is contained in scripture and tradition and the magisterium, and yet when they come to the speculative and explanatory part prefer what accords less well with dogma.

(a) The inadequacy of those theories which do not sufficiently preserve the concept of a special uncreated gift.

[Jean Martíez de] Ripalda [1594-1648], [Domenico] Viva [1648-1726], [Gabriel] Vásquez [1549-1604].<sup>146</sup>

Just as God is present through his operating, so does he indwell through a most special operation, the production of grace.

Against this is that according to this opinion indwelling is reduced to a particular case of ordinary presence, that is, through operating, and thus there is no uncreated gift.

More seriously: if God is given as an uncreated gift through an operation that produces grace, he is similarly given as uncreated gift, albeit of a lesser degree, through an operation that produces a fly.

---

<sup>144</sup> [On the back of p. 37, Lonergan wrote: ‘... that Lessius’ only error was that by God’s free ordination and therefore separably (*separabiliter*), created grace has a relation to the Holy Spirit.’ This would seem to be a reference to Pesch’s position regarding Lessius, which Lonergan mentions above.]

<sup>145</sup> [Numbered 5 in the original typescript; changed here to ‘6,’ to follow the subheading above ‘5. “A single formal cause”.’]

<sup>146</sup> See Lange, *De gratia* §444 [pp. 330-31], §455 [pp. 342-43]

(b) The inadequacy of those who, following in the footsteps of the above, seek in a secondary property of grace a special reason why God should indwell.

That is to say, they try to avoid the consequences of the prior position, but without success.

Lange notes the opinions: Suarez, the Salmanticenses, Billuart, Froget, and others.<sup>147</sup>

(c) The inadequacy of those who put too great a separation between uncreated and created grace.<sup>148</sup>

In this way Gregory of Rimini, together with the Nominalists, admit that indwelling can take place through extrinsic acceptance alone. (Here there is a vicious circle in extrinsic denominations.)

Thus also Petavius, Thomassinus, and Lessius conceive uncreated grace as a gift more or less independent from created grace. Scheeben does the same in admitting the metaphysical possibility of separation.

[Page 39]

**27 Although there is a legitimate distinction between sanctifying grace, its relations, and their terms, that abstraction is illegitimate by which sanctifying grace is understood by prescindendo from the relations that in the present economy of salvation belong to it essentially.**

Thomas Aquinas, *In Boethium de Trinitate*, q. 5, a. 3 c.

*Terminology*

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid. §444 [p. 330].

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.



(a) To understand, which is known by experience, is one thing; to conceive, which the intelligent do expressing their understanding, is another; to judge is a third, which the intelligent do by comparing their concepts to their principles.

b) Hence there is (1) to distinguish, which means to form distinctly diverse concepts as diverse; there is (2) to abstract, which means to understand one thing while disregarding another; and there is (3) to separate, which means to judge that this is not that.

*Meaning of the assertion*

(a) This assertion is methodological: it inquires about distinctions and abstractions; it declares that because a distinction is legitimate it does not follow that an abstraction is legitimate.

(b) The purpose of this assertion is to judge those suppositions which underlie the opinions and arguments of theologians concerning sanctifying grace. Here are some examples:

(a') Lessius distinguished between sanctifying grace as a physical entity by itself and this same entity as a bond uniting one with the Holy Spirit.<sup>149</sup>

Thereupon he asserted that grace under the first aspect justifies a person but does not deify, which it effects under the second aspect.

We admit the distinction as legitimate; but we reject the abstraction according to which grace is understood by prescinding from that which is intelligibly connected with it.

(b') Lennerz<sup>150</sup> makes a similar distinction but instead chooses to understand deification by prescinding from the fact that sanctifying grace is the foundation of a relation to the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>149</sup> See Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 121-24.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 125, bottom, and 126.

(c') Lange says: 'Sanctifying grace and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit are better conceived as *one total gift*, absolutely inseparable, but as a twofold reality containing an element that *presents a twofold aspect*.'<sup>151</sup>

If these words are taken strictly, they will do away even with distinctions.

(c) This assertion directly deals with the previous methodological question; indirectly, it touches upon the opinions of theologians which, however, are considered directly elsewhere.

[Page 40]

### *Argument*

(a) From St Thomas's doctrine, *In Boethium de Trinitate*, q. 5, a. 3 c.:

Foot and animal are distinct from each other as are snubness and nose, accident and subject, father and son. However, a foot cannot be understood prescinding from the animal, nor snubness from a nose, an accident from its subject, a father from his son. 'Therefore, when that which constitutes the formality of a nature and through which that nature is understood, is ordered to and dependent upon something else, then clearly that nature itself cannot be understood apart from that other.'

Therefore, equally, if sanctifying grace in its formality includes an order to and dependence upon something else, it cannot be understood apart from that other.

(b) From analogy: We understand an intellectual soul not by prescinding from but by considering its relation to the body whose form it is and its relations to the faculties, habits, and acts of which it is the first intrinsic principle. For 'soul' is defined either as

---

<sup>151</sup> Lange, *De gratia*, §455, p. 342-43. [Quote appears on p. 343; Latin italics in original.]

See Van der Meersch, 'Grâce,' DTC VI (12) 1613, bottom.

the first act of an organic body or as that first principle by which we are alive, feel, and understand.

In the same way, sanctifying grace is understood according to its relations.

(c) From the nature of theology: First, from the fact that theology is a certain wisdom, and it is the work of wisdom to set things in order.<sup>152</sup> Hence a theologian must not prescind from but consider and determine the order of things among themselves.

Secondly, from the [First] Vatican Council: ‘... a most fruitful understanding of the revealed truths can be had both from the analogy with natural knowledge and from the connection of the mysteries with one another and with our ultimate end’ [DB 1796, DS 3016, ND 132]. But this analogy and this connection are not grasped by prescinding from the relations that belong to the formality of sanctifying grace.

[Page 41]

## **28 The Holy Spirit and the mystical body of Christ**

Encyclical [of Pius XII], *Mystici corporis, Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 193-248.

See also Leo XIII, *Divinum illud*, in *Acta Sancta Sedis (ASS)* 29 (1897) 652-53.

Quoted at length in Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris* 106-108.<sup>153</sup>

1. The mystical body of Christ implies various relationships: between the body and the Head, who is Christ; in the body itself, among the members of the body, hierarchical bonds and the bonds of charity; between the Head and the Holy Spirit; between the body and the Holy Spirit. We are dealing here with this last relationship.

2. Pius XII compares the mystical body with both a natural body and a moral body.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>152</sup> See Thomas Aquinas, *Sententia libri Ethicorum* 1, lect. 1.

<sup>153</sup> [In the typescript, the reference to *Divinum illud* and to Lennerz is inserted by hand.]

<sup>154</sup> *Mystici corporis Christi*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 221-22.

(a) *Natural body*: Its principle of unity joins the parts together such that the parts themselves do not subsist on their own. Each part is uniquely intended for the good of the whole body.

*Mystical body*: Each part subsists on its own; each part is a person, the ultimate subject of attribution. The members are not for the sake of the body, but the body is for the sake of the members, the members for the sake of Christ, and Christ for the sake of God.

b) *Moral body*: ‘There is no other principle of unity than its common purpose, and the common collaboration of all members towards this same end effected through a social authority.’<sup>155</sup>

*Mystical body*: Its principle of unity, besides that which belongs to a moral body, is ‘not natural but of the supernatural order, altogether infinite in itself and uncreated: the divine Spirit who, as St Thomas says, “being numerically one and the same, fills and unites the whole Church.”’<sup>156</sup>

This principle, ‘really existing and operative both in the structure as a whole and in each of its parts, is of such excellence that by its very nature it is immeasurably superior to whatever bonds of unity may hold together a physical or a moral body.’<sup>157</sup>

3. Pius XII (a) praises the search for a fuller understanding of this doctrine, and (b) proposes two norms for such an inquiry: ‘But let this be held by all as incontestable, if they would not depart from the truth and the orthodox teaching of the Church, (1) that every sort of mystical union is to be rejected by which the faithful would in any way pass beyond the realm of creatures and without warrant enter the divine, *so that even a single*

---

<sup>155</sup> [Ibid. 222.]

<sup>156</sup> [Ibid. (Quoting Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, q. 29, a. 4 c.)]

<sup>157</sup> [Ibid.]

*attribute of the eternal Deity could be predicated of them as their own.* (2) And furthermore, let this be borne firmly in mind, that in these matters all things are to considered as common to the Most Holy Trinity, inasmuch as they regard the same God as the supreme cause.’<sup>158</sup> (c) He refers to the teaching of Vatican I on the connection among the mysteries, and therefore (d) he quotes Leo XIII: ‘This marvelous union, which goes by the name of indwelling, differs only in circumstance or degree from that in which God embraces the blessed in heaven.’<sup>159</sup>

*[The following appears on the back of this page 41, but with ‘PTO’ at the bottom of the front of the page. The ‘PTO’ suggests continuity in exposition. The ‘a’ after ‘Plenius’ in the original typescript, however, while not precluding continuity, suggests that this addition was an afterthought. If this is correct, the ‘a’ could be read as ‘e.’]*

More fully (recalling St Thomas): ‘The divine persons are said to indwell inasmuch as, being present in a most mysterious way in living creatures endowed with intellect, they are attained by them through knowledge and love, yet in a manner that transcends all nature and is entirely intimate and unique. In order to inquire into this so that we may at least in some small degree approach it, the way and method that the [First] Vatican Council strongly commends in such matters must not be neglected ...’<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> [Ibid. 231. The italicized text represents underlined text in Lonergan’s original typescript. The numerals in parentheses are Lonergan’s addition and are not found in the text he is quoting.]

<sup>159</sup> [Ibid. 232. (Quoting *Divinum illud, Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 29 (1897) 653.)]

<sup>160</sup> Ibid. 231-32. [In the original typescript, ‘160’ is typed next to ‘*atingantur*’ (‘attained’), and after the quote ends ‘160’ appears again, followed by ‘Cf. S Thom I 43 3,’ which is a reference to *Summa theologiae* 1, q. 43, a. 3. All of this reproduces the numeral and note found in *Mystici corporis Christi*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35

[Page 42]

## 29 How the Holy Spirit is said to be the soul of the mystical body of Christ

(a) 'Let it suffice to assert that while Christ is the Head of the Church, the Holy Spirit is its soul.'<sup>161</sup>

(b) In what way the Holy Spirit is said to be the soul:

(a') He is the principle of union between the Head and the body and among the diverse parts of the body;

(b') He is totally in the Head, totally in the body, and totally in each member;

(c') He is present in and assists each member according to their various functions and duties, in keeping with the greater or lesser degree of spiritual health that they enjoy;

---

(1943) 232. After this, Lonergan has in English: 'NB Presence prior to knowledge and love.' This remark, it seems, is Lonergan's interpretation of what Thomas says in the article. If one were to consider the special presence, the uncreated Gift existing newly in someone (*novo modo existit in aliquo*) according to (*secundum*) the perfecting created gift of sanctifying grace, of which Thomas speaks in the article, as being not merely an ontological presence but as registering psychologically as well, and thus equate the created, perfecting gift with what Lonergan will later refer to as the dynamic state of unrestricted or other-worldly being-in-love as *experienced*, it is at least tempting to entertain the possibility that this one-sentence remark by Lonergan is a faint intimation or prefiguring of two of his later positions, namely, that the created, perfecting gift of sanctifying grace is *consequent upon* and not constitutive of the special presence, and that this consequent created, perfecting gift itself precedes and gives rise to our knowledge of God and to our *acts* of loving God.]

<sup>161</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis Christi*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 220, quoting Leo XIII, *Divinum illud*, ASS 29 (1897) 650.

(d') 'He it is who by the breath of heavenly life in every part of the body whatsoever is to be deemed the principle of vital and truly salvific action';

(e') Although he is in each [member], he operates upon those of a lower status through the ministry of those who are higher;

(f') He always gives birth to new members; he refuses to dwell in members that are totally cut off from the body;

(g') He is present and operative; in short, he is the soul.<sup>162</sup>

(c) The Holy Spirit is the principle of vital and salvific action in two ways: (a) as moving the penitent sinner but not yet dwelling in him, in cases of attrition (DB 898, DS 1678, ND 1624), and (b) both dwelling in and moving the just; that is, indwelling through habitual grace and moving through actual grace.

[Page 43]

**30 By an imperfect analogy, the Holy Spirit is the soul of the entire mystical body of Christ in such a way that created grace received in the just is the single formal cause of justification.**

There are two assertions here: (a) that the Holy Spirit is the soul of the mystical body of Christ, but by an imperfect analogy, and (b) that created grace is the single formal cause of justification.

We shall have to explain, then, how the Spirit can be the soul or form of the entire body without at the same time being the form of each of the members.

[*Terminology*]

---

<sup>162</sup> See *ibid.* 219-20 [for all of these; no. 4 is not a paraphrase but a quote].

*Holy Spirit*: third person of the Trinity. We leave aside the question whether this is said of the Spirit by appropriation only or as proper in some way.

*soul*: the first act of an organic body.

*analogy*: for example, A : B :: C : D.

*perfect analogy*: one in which the analogated<sup>163</sup> concept is predicated of each term in the proper sense. For example: God exists in the proper sense; a man exists in the proper sense; yet existence is predicated analogously of God and a man.

*metaphorical analogy*: one in which the analogated concept is predicated of one term in the proper sense but metaphorically of the other term: e.g., regal dignity in a man and in a lion.

*imperfect analogy*: in which the analogated concept is predicated of one term in the proper sense and partly in the proper sense and partly in an improper sense of the other term.

The imperfect analogy at issue here is the imperfect equality of two analogies: just as (soul : a whole body :: sight : an eye) so in a way but truly (the Spirit : all the members :: created grace : this particular member).

*mystical body*: said properly of the living members of Christ;<sup>164</sup> it is that body that Paul speaks of, whose Head is Christ and whose members are Christian believers.

---

<sup>163</sup> [In the original typescript, Lonergan first typed '*analogica*' but typed '*analogata*' over it. This appears more clearly three lines further on.]

<sup>164</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis Christi*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 193-248 [inserted by hand in original typescript]; E. Dublanchy, 'Église,' DTC IV (8) 2150-55; A. Michel, 'Jésus Christ,' DTC VIII (15), 1349-55; see the bibliography in Joseph J. Bluett, 'The Mystical Body of Christ: 1890-1940,' *Theological Studies* 3/2 (1942) 261-89.



*created grace*: includes virtues, gifts of the Holy Spirit, DB 799-800, DS 1528-31, ND 1932, 1933; excludes uncreated grace, the gift of the Holy Spirit himself.

*formal cause*: here in the proper sense; it is also used in an improper sense regarding the exclusion of imputed justice.

That the Spirit is the soul [of the mystical body] is clear in the magisterium of the church.

This is so neither by a perfect analogy nor by a mere metaphor. The first of these negative statements is theologically certain; the second is by far the more probable opinion, indeed, after Pius XII's encyclical [*Mystici corporis*], perhaps completely certain.

That it is so by an imperfect analogy is the conclusion from the foregoing.

That created grace is the single formal cause is defined in the Council of Trent, DB 799-800, DS 1528-31, ND 1932-33; see DB 809, DS 1546-47, ND 1947, at the end, for an understanding of DB 799, DS 1528-29, ND 1932, not for drawing a conclusion.

[Page 44]

[*Argument*]

1. The Holy Spirit is the soul of the entire mystical body of Christ:

(a) We presuppose the scriptural texts already referred to.

Ephesians 4.4: taking care to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

One body, one Spirit ...

This one body that is mentioned is the mystical body

The one Spirit is the Holy Spirit.

The juxtaposition strongly suggests that the Holy Spirit is the spirit or soul of this body.

This was the understanding of the Fathers of the Church.

(b) For the Fathers, see [the previously cited texts by] Tromp, *De Spiritu Sancto anima corporis mystici: Testimonia selecta e patribus Graecis* and *De Spiritu Sancto anima corporis mystici: Testimonia selecta e partibus Latinis*.

(c) Leo XIII, *Divinum illud*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 29 (1897) 650. Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 220.

## 2. The Spirit is the soul by an imperfect analogy.

(a) It is not by a perfect analogy, for in this way the members of the mystical body would be [bodily] organs lacking their own subsistence and destined only for the good of the body as a whole.

On the contrary, Pius XII teaches that the members retain their proper subsistence, that they are not meant for the body but that the body is for the members, and the members for Christ, who is for God.<sup>165</sup>

This is clear: if the analogy were perfect, it would not be the member who would sin but the Holy Spirit, just as it is not one's hand or eye that sins but the person.

(b) Nor by a merely metaphorical analogy. There is a real principle of unity besides the common end and the social authority<sup>166</sup> directing the members to that end, namely, the Holy Spirit himself.

This principle of unity is superior to the principle of unity not only in a moral body but also in a physical body.

'... [this principle] really existing and operative both in the structure as a whole and in each of its parts is of such excellence that by its very nature it is immeasurably

---

<sup>165</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis Christi*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 221-22.

<sup>166</sup> [Reading *auctoritatem socialem ... dirigentem*; see above, on 'moral body.']

superior to whatever bonds may hold together a physical or a moral body to be beyond measure.’<sup>167</sup>

(c) It is by an imperfect analogy. There is an imperfect analogy if the Holy Spirit is present and operative in the members and unites them in the way that the soul is present and operative in the bodily organs and unites them. But the Holy Spirit is so present and operative. Therefore ...

As to the minor premise: see Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 219-20.

Presence of the Spirit: in the Head, see Luke 4.18-19 [‘The Spirit of the Lord is upon me ...’]; in the members (indwelling).

Uniting: the Spirit is totally in the Head, totally in the body, and totally in each of the members; the principle of union between the Head and the body and among the diverse parts of the body.

Operating: (a) as principle of any vital and salvific action; (b) is always producing new members, refuses to dwell in members who are utterly cut off from the body; (c) present and assisting each member according to their various functions and duties in keeping with the greater or lesser degree of spiritual health they enjoy; operates also upon those of a lower status through the ministry of those who are higher.

[Page 45]

3. Created grace received in the just is the single formal cause of justification.

The justice of God by which we are made just is the single formal cause of justification (DB 799, DS 1529, ND 1932); but created grace received in the just is the justice of God (DB 809, DS 1547, ND 1947, at the end); therefore ...

---

<sup>167</sup> Pius XII, *Mystici corporis Christi*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 222.

4. How these two are reconciled.

(a) There is a problem. The soul is the form of the body and therefore the form of the organs; but the Spirit is the soul, the form of the mystical body; therefore it is the form of the members.

(b) There is a solution. The Council of Trent in no way excluded but rather supposes and clearly teaches the doctrine of the mystical body of Christ.

DB 842, DS 1582, ND 1982: the just are living members of Christ.

DB 809, DS 1546, ND 1947: Christ has a vital influence upon his members; and according to Pius XII the Holy Spirit is a principle of union between the Head and the members.<sup>168</sup>

DB 795, DS 1523, ND 1927: If they were not reborn in Christ they would never be made just.

DB 796, DS 1524, ND 1928: transition to the state of grace and adoptive filiation is the transferral (DB 795, DS 1523, ND 1927) to the kingdom of the Father's beloved Son.

(c) How the soul is related to the members of a natural body.<sup>169</sup>

(a') The soul is related to the individual organs in two ways. First, inasmuch as it communicates its own existence, *esse*, to the body it communicates existence to the organs as well. Second, inasmuch as accidental forms result in the organs from the soul (such as sight in the eye), the soul gives to the organ 'to be an organ in act.'

There is a real difference between these two: for example, a blind eye has first act but not second act; a blind eye exists because the animal exists, but a blind eye is not in act an organ of sight.

(b') The soul is related to the unity of the organs among themselves in two ways. First, inasmuch as it communicates its existence to the body, it gives existence to several

---

<sup>168</sup> [Ibid. 219-20.]

<sup>169</sup> See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 76, a. 8.

organs at the same time. Thus the soul gives to the organs their material unity, such as that unity that exists between the eyes and the ears and the tongue of one who is simultaneously blind, deaf, and mute. Second, inasmuch as accidental forms result in the organs from the soul, the soul constitutes the principle of vital union among the organs, that is, the union among the eyes and ears of one who is neither blind nor deaf.

(d) How the Holy Spirit is related to the members of the mystical body.

(a') A form is an intrinsic determining constitutive principle.

The Holy Spirit must necessarily be denied to be an intrinsic determinant, for in that case created grace would not be the single formal cause.

But the Holy Spirit is necessarily included as a constitutive principle in some way; for if 'constitutive' were denied him, the Holy Spirit would not be the soul of the mystical body any more than God is the soul of the universe. For God is present and operative everywhere, totally in the whole, totally in all the parts; but God is in no way a soul, because he is in no way a constitutive principle.

[Page 46]

(b') We set out the likeness and differences between the Spirit and a soul.

(i) The soul communicates its own existence to the body, so that a single substantial composite results. In this one composite there are organs; they have existence from it; hence the perfection and operation received in the organs is received along with the perfection or operation of the composite.

(ii) The Spirit gives his existence to the mystical body, not by way of a form but by way of a gift. He does not directly give to the body and indirectly to the members, but directly to the members and indirectly to the body. The result is not one substantial composite but an accidental union. Therefore the members are not in the mystical body, but the coexistence of the members is the mystical body. The members do not exist

through the existence of the Spirit; the perfection and operation of the members is neither the perfection nor the operation of the Spirit.

(iii) From the production of the soul there naturally result internally [*ab intra*] the accidental forms in organs that are properly disposed to receive them. From the gift of the Spirit there naturally result externally [*ab extra*] in the members sanctifying grace, infused virtues, and the gifts of the Spirit.

The first result (the objective consequence) is from a formal principle in the strict sense. The second result is not from a formal principle but from an external gift that at the same time involves an internal gift.

(iv) The soul is a constitutive principle of vital union among the informed organs. The Spirit is a constitutive principle of vital union among the members. *See above, the proof for the imperfect analogy.*

The Spirit is truly the constitutive principle of this union, for the uncreated gift itself is one and the same in the whole body and in each of the living members. The Spirit is not the constitutive principle of this union in the same way as the soul is the constitutive principle of the vital union among the organs; for the soul does this as an *ens quo* in a substantial composite, whereas the Spirit does it as an *ens quod* in an accidental union.

(e) Hence we conclude:

The Spirit is the soul of the mystical body as a whole, yet in such a way that it is in no way either the soul or the form of the individual members of this body, but only the gift given exteriorly.

The answer, therefore, to the syllogism above<sup>170</sup> stating the problem is as follows:

The major premise: The soul is the form of the body and therefore the form of the organs.

---

<sup>170</sup> [See above, p. xx.]

That the soul is the form of the body, we grant; that therefore it is the form of the organs, the form received in the organs themselves, we deny (a blind animal is not the same as a dead animal); that the soul is the form of the composite in which the organs are, we also grant.

That the Spirit is the soul or form of the mystical body directly, we deny; that it is so indirectly through the members by a perfect analogy, we deny, but by an imperfect analogy, we grant.

Therefore the Spirit is the form of the members not directly but indirectly by an imperfect, not a perfect, analogy.

[Page 47]

**31 The connection of the mysteries with one another and with our ultimate end:  
Grace is God's gift given by way of love ordered to God's gift by way of vision.<sup>171</sup>**

1. God gives in two ways.

Friendship is mutual benevolent love based upon the sharing of some good.<sup>172</sup> This shared good may be something extrinsic to the friends, such as a party, or intrinsic, such as matrimony. Accordingly, God gives in two ways: he gives of his own goods, as in creation, and he gives himself, as in the supernatural order.<sup>173</sup>

2. God gives himself in two ways.

To those whom he has brought to eternal life, God gives himself in the beatific vision. To those whom he is bringing to eternal life, God gives himself in love. For God loves the just, and indeed in an infinite way, namely as destined to the gift of the beatific

---

<sup>171</sup> For these statements, see and compare above, pp. xx-xx.]

<sup>172</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 2-2, q. 23, a. 1 c.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid. 1-2, q. 110, a. 1 c.

vision. But to those whom one loves to the extent of giving oneself one already actually gives his love; for the gift of love is the first gift from which all the other gifts proceed.<sup>174</sup> And to those to whom God gives his love he by that very fact gives himself; for he is his love, just as he is his essence, his existence, and his understanding.

3. The gift of God by way of love is considered in two ways.

In the first way, God's love is considered as essential, that is, as a relationship of the lover to the person or thing that is loved.

In the second way, this love is considered as notional, that is, as a rational act proceeding from an act of understanding and an act of practical judgment.

These are not two loves but one and the same love under different aspects.<sup>175</sup>

Considered in the first way, divine love is the divine essence. As the divine essence, it is common to the three persons; and by this love the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit love the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit and all creation.

Considered in the second way, divine love is the proceeding Holy Spirit. In this love the Spirit does not love but *is* love; and by this love the Father and the Son love by the Holy Spirit, and the Father and/or the Son and the Son and/or the Father love every creature.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> Ibid. 1, q. 38, a. 2 c.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid. q. 37, a. 1 c. [The reference to Aquinas cited in this note was inserted by hand in the original typescript.]

<sup>176</sup> Ibid. a. 2. [Divine love considered as essential is common to the three divine persons, whereas when considered as notional, distinctions are made as to how the three persons exercise the one essential divine love, each in his own way. Here the 'act of understanding' and 'the practical judgment' are, respectively, the Father and the Son, actively loving, and the Holy Spirit is the love that proceeds from their active loving.]



Besides, under the first aspect, the Father and the Son and the Spirit love and in loving give their love, that is, the divine essence itself, and in this way the Father, the Son, and the Spirit give and are given.

Under the second aspect, the Father and the Son both give but are not given; and the Spirit is given but does not give.<sup>177</sup>

[Page 48]

#### 4. The Father loves the Son by the Holy Spirit.<sup>178</sup>

The Son is one and the same person possessing two natures, one divine, one human. It has already been determined that the Father loves God the Son by the Holy Spirit. But the Father also loves the Son [as man] by the Holy Spirit, for the Son as man is the same person. This love of the Father for the Son was manifested at the Jordan when John was baptizing Jesus. For a voice was heard saying, ‘This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased’ [Matthew 3. 17; Mark 1. 11; Luke 3.22], and the Holy Spirit was seen in the form of a dove descending on Jesus.

#### 5. In a similar way, the Father loves by the Holy Spirit those whom he joins to the Son.

He loves by the Holy Spirit: for he gives them the uncreated gift, the Holy Spirit indwelling and sanctifying. The Father joins us to the Son: ‘No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him’ (John 6.44). The Father joins us to the Son as man because of the merits of the Son as man: see the treatise on God the Redeemer. The Father joins us to the Son as man through the instrumentality of the Son: the Son as man founded the Church and instituted the sacraments; through the Church and the sacraments we are incorporated into the Son. The Father joins us to the Son through the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>177</sup> Ibid. q. 38, a. 1.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid. q. 37, a. 2.

Through the gift of the Spirit we are made living members of Christ, for the Spirit is the constitutive principle of vital union between the Head and the members and among the members themselves.

6. Those whom the Father loves he does not find pleasing but makes pleasing.<sup>179</sup>

Those whom we love, we love on account of their goodness. We do not produce this goodness in them but we find it already present in another. Since, however, God is the first cause of all things and of all goodness, it is impossible for God to love those whom he has already found good, but necessarily he makes those whom he loves to be good. Since God loves us in two ways, namely, in giving himself and in giving us of his goods, it follows that there are two degrees of created goodness and lovability, one supernatural and the other natural. In creating and conserving and governing all things, God gives us of the good things that he has; in adding to the natural order supernatural goodness and lovability, which is *gratia gratum faciens*, ‘grace that makes us pleasing,’ sanctifying grace, he gives himself.

[Page 49]

7. The Father makes them pleasing by the grace of the Son

(a) The Son as man has the grace of union by reason of which it is true that this man is God in the person of the Son. As the Father loves the Son as man by the Holy Spirit, so also he loves the Son as man by the Holy Spirit the uncreated gift. See above, number 4. In the same way, the Son as God loves himself as to his humanity by the Holy Spirit, the uncreated gift. The result of this is that the Son as man possesses the created gift of sanctifying grace; the result of sanctifying grace is charity, and the result of charity in him who cannot sin is the beatific vision. Just as sanctifying grace is proper to the Son

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibid. 1-2, q. 110, a. 1.

as man, because the Holy Spirit is his own proper Spirit, so charity is proper to him and likewise the beatific vision. For it is necessary that he who is truly God must know and love God as he is in himself.

(b) Further, this grace that is proper to the Son as man, since it results from the hypostatic union, is extended to others, not, of course, in its root, the grace of union, but in its consequences, namely the gift of the Spirit, sanctifying grace, charity, and the beatific vision to those who persevere.

#### 8. The Father makes them pleasing because of the Son.

(a) According to the law of love: ‘a friend of my friend is a friend to me’; ‘love me, love my dog.’

(b) According to the law of merit.

(c) According to the law of asking.

(d) According to the law of satisfaction.

#### 9. The Father makes them pleasing through the Son.

(a) The Son as man instituted the Church and the sacraments.

(b) The Son himself also loves them by the Holy Spirit, and sends his Spirit to them. John 15.26; see 14.16, 26; Romans 8.[9]-11.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>180</sup> [John 15.26: ‘When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the spirit of truth who comes from the Father, he will testify on my behalf.’ John 14.16: ‘And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate, to be with you forever.’ John 14.26: ‘But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you.’ Romans 8.9-11: ‘But you are not in the flesh; you are in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you. But if Christ is in you, though the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit is life because of righteousness. If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the

10. The Father makes them pleasing in the Son.

(a) Through union: “he abides in me and I in him, John 6.56; 15.

The just abide in him, that is, they remain in the mystical body, whose life is participation in his own life, communicated to the just because of him and through him.

The Son as man abides in the just; for he himself comes with his gift, the Holy Spirit.

Therefore the Eucharist is both the symbol and the realization of the mystery of the mystical body of Christ.

(b) Through assimilation:

The grace of Christ in us tends to the same effect as in Christ himself.

Romans 8.29: ‘Those whom he foreknew he also predestined to become conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn in a large family.’

‘Learn from me, for I am gentle and humble of heart’ [Matthew 11.29]. ‘I have given you an example’ [John 13.15].

*The Imitation of Christ. The Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius.* Mystical experience. John 14.16-17.

[Page 50]

11. Why the supernatural life is called ‘life.’

(a) On the notion of life, see Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 18, aa. 1-3.

---

dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.’ Lonergan’s text had Romans 8.8ss., but 9-11 seems preferable.]

‘Those are properly living beings which move themselves according to some kind of motion.’<sup>181</sup> ‘The term “life” is taken from a certain external phenomenon about a thing, namely, its self-movement; but this term is not applied in order to signify this phenomenon itself but to indicate the substance whose property it is by its very nature to move itself or act upon itself in some way or other to perform an operation.’<sup>182</sup> ‘... to act in some way or other’ is illustrated in explaining that God moves himself inasmuch as he understands himself.<sup>183</sup>

living: a substance with such a nature

to live: to be in such a nature

life : to live :: racing : to run

(b) Two things, therefore, belong to a living creature: (a) that it moves itself in some way or other to act to perform an operation, and (b) that it does this in accordance with its nature.

This definition cannot be applied without qualification to the supernatural life. For the supernatural life is the life of a member: the just are the branches of the vine, not the vine itself (John 15); they are the shoots of the wild olive grafted on to the olive tree, Romans 11.17-24, not exactly. DB 809, DS 1546-1547, ND 1947.

Therefore we must consider whether the members of Christ move themselves and whether they do this connaturally.

(c) The operations of the just are vital acts: the just move themselves to faith, to hope, and to charity.

---

<sup>181</sup> Ibid. 1, q. 18, a. 1; (motion taken either properly or commonly, *ibid.*).

<sup>182</sup> Ibid. a. 2.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid. a. 3, ad 1.

These operations are in the full sense proper to the just themselves. They are elicited in the just, not in Christ or in the Spirit; the just believe and hope and love imperfectly and they sin – neither Christ nor the Spirit do any of these things.

As to these operations, then, they are attributed solely to the members and not to Christ or the Spirit. However, they are produced by Christ and by the Holy Spirit as their first effective principle insofar as they are good and supernatural; they are produced by the members also insofar as they are free.

(d) The connaturality of the operations is connaturality that is appropriate not to the substance but to the member.

For example, one's eye has not only a principle by which the eye does its proper work, namely, sight in order to see, but also has various links by which it is enabled to do its proper work in accordance with the good of the whole person.

Also, in the sense appetites, both the concupiscible and irascible, there is not only a principle by which they perform acts of desiring and anger, but also the moral virtues of temperance and fortitude by which they perform these acts in accordance with a superior principle, namely reason.

In a similar way there are in the just not only sanctifying grace and the infused virtues by which supernatural operations become connatural to them, but also the gifts of the Holy Spirit by which it becomes connatural to them to be easily moved and directed by the instinct of the Holy Spirit.<sup>184</sup> (reason : sense appetite :: the Holy Spirit : the just.)

Romans 8.14: 'All who are led by the Spirit of God are the children of God.'

The necessity of special helps for perseverance.

---

<sup>184</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1-2, q. 68, aa. 1-3; Lange, *De gratia*, §§458-61, pp. 345-48.

No created principle is sufficient to act with perfect justice and holiness before God; for these works are according to divine standards; and no creature can be the principle of perfect action.<sup>185</sup>

Thus grace effects not only assimilation but also union.

[Page 51]

## 12. How the Holy Spirit is said to dwell in the just<sup>186</sup>

(a) Some say: just as God is everywhere present in producing natural effects, so also is he present in a special way in producing supernatural effects and especially in conferring and conserving sanctifying grace. This special presence of God is called ‘indwelling.’

It must be granted that in this way there is a special presence of God; but it seems we must confess that this does not explain the gift of God; Romans 5.5; one can be present and not be a gift.

(b) Hence others say: God indwells inasmuch as he is had, possessed. A thing is had and possessed when we are pleased to have it for our free use and enjoyment. And so through grace, the virtues, the gifts, and especially charity we have God for our use and enjoyment by knowing and loving supernaturally.

---

<sup>185</sup> See Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, q. 27, a. 5, ad 3. [See also Bernard Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St Thomas Aquinas*, vol. 1 in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000) 46, 232-33, 380-81, 426.]

<sup>186</sup> [All that is on page 51 of the original typescript is probably a first attempt at dealing with the topic of how the Holy Spirit is said to indwell, since the same heading with the same section number 12 is repeated at the top of the next page.]

It must be granted that this is a better explanation of the nature of gift; but it is not as good an explanation of the nature of presence or indwelling; for we can know and love even when absent.

If one insists that being intimately present is a very perfect, indeed supernatural likeness of God by way of which we are able to know and love God, it seems we must reply this is not a matter of the presence of a created gift nor of the presence of a likeness of the uncreated gift, but of the presence if the uncreated gift himself.

(c) Hence we say: the indwelling and the gift of the uncreated God involves three things: first, that God gives himself to the just, second, that because he gives himself he is present as gift, as indwelling, and third, because the gift is present with us, *we are able* to use and enjoy it through supernatural knowledge and love.

That God is given to the just is beyond doubt: see Romans 5.5.

(a) The way in which God gives himself must be explained, it seems, by love. But the nature of love is grasped more by reflecting than it is by explaining it in words. Κοινά τὰ τῶν φίλων: 'friends have all things in common.' The greater is the love, the more the distinction between one's own and the other's, between 'mine' and 'yours,' diminishes, and the more what belongs to each friend becomes common to both. This sharing of good things manifests their more intimate personal union and communion: *a friend is 'a second self.'* Before we love we think about ourselves, about what will be of advantage to us, we think about what might get in our way, we desire things and go after them. But once we have been affected by love, another self is present, and we think about that other, we think about his good, we feel his pain, rejoice with him, and whatever he fears or desires, whatever he pursues or avoids, we ourselves equally fear and desire, pursue and avoid as if it were our own.

[Page 52]

12. [bis] How the Holy Spirit is said to dwell in the just.



(a) The nature of intimate personal love.

To love someone means to will good to that person.

Love itself is not the same thing as the effect of love: love in itself is a matter of willing good to someone, but the effect that follows upon love is to do good gratuitously to that person.

Since a cause is known from its effects, based on its effects we distinguish between love in general and a more intimate, a personal, love.

Love in general wills good to someone in such a way that in a single act or even habitually one does good to the person loved.

In an intimate personal love one wills good to the person loved in giving him a radical gift, the gift of oneself; from this all the good things that one could ever do for the person loved are in a way done in this one act.

For a fuller understanding of the nature of this intimate love, let us consider two effects resulting from it, one exterior, the other interior.

The exterior effect of intimate love is that κοινά τὰ τῶν φίλων, ‘friends have all things in common.’

For the greater such love is, the more the distinction between one’s own and the other’s, between ‘mine’ and ‘yours,’ diminishes, the more one’s own goods are held in common with one’s friend’s, and the more the friends choose certain pursuits for them to enjoy together.

The interior effect is that ‘a friend is a second self.’

Before we love, we think mostly about ourselves and our own good: what is good for me, what could harm me; I fear this and avoid it, I desire that and go after it.

But after we experience intimate love, one’s ‘other self’ is present; and whereas previously we used to think about ourselves, now we think equally about our friend. We consider what is good for both of us, what could harm us both; and we rejoice as much

about our friend's good as about our own, feel his pain as our own, have the same desires and fears, pursuits and dislikes, the same activities and enjoyments.

Also, the exterior effect flows from this interior effect; but both effects arise from this intimate love itself.

Let us now proceed to define intimate love. For the sake of clarity we distinguish the *quasi*-object of intimate love, its act, and its effects.

The *quasi*-object of intimate love, *as* intimate, is, primarily, the transformation of the way in which one is related to the pursuit and enjoyment of the end, and secondarily it is the change of the end itself or of the pursuit of it, or of the enjoyment of it, inasmuch as these follow from the primary object.

And these are explained more fully: there is a threefold relation to the end, namely, to will it, to pursue it, and to enjoy it. The way of being related to the end is called *finis cui*, the end-for-whom, that is to say, to will [the end] for oneself, or to will it for oneself and for one's friend. The primary *quasi*-object of intimate love is the transformation of the way [of being related to the end], transformation in the end-for-whom; the secondary and conditioned *quasi*-object is the transformation in the *finis qui* or [*finis*] *quo*, the end-which or the end-by-which, according to the requirements of the primary [*quasi*-]object.<sup>187</sup>

The act or habit of intimate love is to will this *quasi*-object.

The primary effect of intimate love is the transformation of the way in which one is related to the end: this effect is had immediately through the very act of intimate love and is conserved through habit, for this primary effect is produced not by acting but by willing.

---

<sup>187</sup> [Lonergan did not write 'quasi' here, but the inclusion of the world would seem to be required to maintain consistency with what he said earlier in the paragraph.]

The secondary effect is the change of the end-which or the end-by-which, *change in its pursuit or enjoyment*; and this effect is produced partly by willing and partly by acting.

[Page 53]

(b) Does God have intimate personal love?

God has intimate personal love within himself: the Father communicates infinite good to the Son, and the Father and Son communicate infinite good to the Holy Spirit; this good is God's *esse*, the very being of God, with all that follows from it.

God has intimate personal love for what is outside himself: (1) through the hypostatic union the divine existence is communicated to the humanity of Jesus Christ; (2) through sanctifying grace an uncreated gift is communicated to the just; (3) through the light of glory God himself is communicated so as to be known intuitively and loved and enjoyed.

(c) Is the primary effect of intimate divine love for the just the gift of the Holy Spirit and *the basis* of the indwelling?<sup>188</sup>

The primary effect is that which is constituted by loving, namely, that transformation of the way of being related to the end, the radical gift of oneself to the other, and the acceptance of the other into one's intimate life through an affectionate caring for the beloved.

Those whom God loves are by that fact given the radical gift of himself along with accepting them into his intimate life through the affectionate caring for them (a friend is another self). According to the first, there is the gift, and according to the second, there is *the basis* of the indwelling, the affectionate caring, of the Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>188</sup> [Here and a few lines further on Lonergan first typed *inhabitatio*, then by hand added *fundamentum* in both cases.]

See Romans 8.9-11,<sup>189</sup> 14-16,<sup>190</sup> 26-27;<sup>191</sup> Galatians 4.6;<sup>192</sup> Ephesians 4.30 ('do not grieve the Holy Spirit'); John 14.16-18,<sup>193</sup> 14.26,<sup>194</sup> 15.26,<sup>195</sup> 16.7-15.<sup>196</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> Romans 8.9-11: 'But you are not in the flesh; you are in the Spirit, since the Spirit of God dwells in you. Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him. But if Christ is in you, though the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit is life because of righteousness. If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you.'

<sup>190</sup> Romans 8.14-16: 'For all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God. For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, "Abba! Father!" it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God ...'

<sup>191</sup> Romans 8.26-27: 'Likewise, the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but that very Spirit intercedes with sighs too deep for words. And God, who searches the heart, knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God.'

<sup>192</sup> Galatians 4.6: 'And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, "Abba! Father!"'

<sup>193</sup> John 14.16-18: 'And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate, to be with you forever. This is the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him or knows him. You know him, because he abides with you, and he will be in you. I will not leave you orphaned; I am coming to you.'

<sup>194</sup> John 14.26: 'But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you.'

<sup>195</sup> John 15.26: 'When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who comes from the Father, he will testify on my behalf.'

*Inhabitation itself: inasmuch as a person has the Holy Spirit for their imperfect or perfect benefit: the knowledge and love of an intimate friend. See [Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae] 1, q. 43, a. 3 c. Compare cohabitation.*

(d) Is the secondary effect, which is immediately produced by willing, *gratia gratum faciens*, sanctifying grace?

One secondary effect is immediately produced by willing, namely the transformation in the end-which or the end by which; the other secondary effect is not immediately produced but is a consequence, that is, the pursuit and enjoyment of the end.

Thus, through *gratia gratum faciens* a person is elevated to a supernatural end to be attained proportionately; this is a transformation regarding the end-by-which.

(e) Can the uncreated and created gifts be separated?

The uncreated gift is the intimate divine love as terminating in the just. The created gift is that by which this same love terminates in the just. Just as love as terminating and that by which the love terminates cannot be separated, so the uncreated and created gifts cannot be separated.

---

<sup>196</sup> John 16.7-15: ‘Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Advocate will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you. And when he comes, he will prove the world wrong about sin and righteousness and judgment: about sin, because they do not believe in me; about righteousness, because I am going to the Father and you will see me no longer; about judgment, because the ruler of this world has been condemned. I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he hears, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, because he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine. For this reason I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you.’

Hence, note how many principles are simultaneously verified in *gratia gratum faciens*.

Whatever is said of God contingently is said by extrinsic denomination.

Those whom God loves he does not find pleasing but makes pleasing.

Therefore sanctifying grace is by the same token that by which an uncreated gift is given, that by which God renders us pleasing to him, that by which God equips us with principles that are proportionate to a supernatural end.

[Page 54]

(f) Is the Holy Spirit said to be given properly or by appropriation?

‘Properly’ here means that the Spirit is given but neither the Father nor the Son.

‘By appropriation’ means that the Spirit is given and the Father and the Son are likewise given.

Further, the Spirit is given by way of God’s intimate personal love.

Divine love can be considered in two ways: essentially and notionally.

In essential love, the Father, Son, and Spirit equally give and are given.

In notional love, the Father and the Son love [each other], and the Spirit is this very love that proceeds from both; and so ‘Gift’ is the proper name of the Holy Spirit.<sup>197</sup> Hence in this love the Father and the Son give and are not given, while the Spirit is given and does not give.

But under both aspects of divine love, a divine person is the effective principle of *gratia gratum faciens* inasmuch as that person gives; he is a constitutive [principle] of the uncreated gift inasmuch he is given.

(g) Is the above a good explanation of the uncreated gift of God?

(a) From a consideration of the deficiencies in other theories.

---

<sup>197</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 38, aa. 1 and 2.

Those who explain this gift as a special presence are explaining indwelling rather than the gift.

To be sure, God is present in a special way where he produces a supernatural effect; but it is one thing to produce a finite effect, and another to give the gift of oneself.

Those who explain the uncreated gift in terms of supernatural knowledge and love, whether habitual or actual, focus more on the gift than on indwelling. One who is absent can be very well known and loved; and the presence of a likeness is not the presence of the gift that is God.

(b') From St Thomas.

Although St Thomas especially insists on God's supernatural knowledge and love (*Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 8, a. 3 c.; q. 43, a. 3), this teaching is not to be understood apart from the context but by including it. But Thomas teaches that 'Gift' is the proper name of the Holy Spirit (ibid. q. 38, aa. 1 and 2) and that indwelling is by way of *gratia gratum faciens* (ibid. q. 43, a. 3). See *Supra I Sententiarum*, d. 14, qq. 1 and 2; d. 18, aa. 1 and 2; but on the contrary, *Summa contra Gentiles IV*, c. 21.

Besides, Pius XII, quoting St Thomas, mentions first the unfathomable presence of God, and then speaks of the imperfect enjoyment of God through knowledge and love.<sup>198</sup> *This nexus is probably added – 'uncreated gift = basis of indwelling.'*

---

<sup>198</sup> [Perhaps a reference to the following text (in English translation) from *Mystici Corporis Christi*: 'It must also be borne in mind that there is question here of a hidden mystery, which during this earthly exile can only be dimly seen through a veil, and which no human words can express. The divine persons are said to indwell inasmuch as they are present to beings endowed with intelligence in a way that lies beyond human comprehension, and in a unique and very intimate manner which transcends all created nature, these creatures enter into relationship with them through knowledge

[Page 55]

(c') From the solution of objections.

(i) There is only a moral union here; for it is a union based on willing and the willed.

[Answer] That it is any sort of union based on willing and the willed, we deny.

It is a union that is a consequence of intimate, and indeed divine intimate love, which is really identical with the divine substance and the one who renders pleasing those whom he loves.

(ii) The common teaching of theologians is that the Holy Spirit is said to be the uncreated gift by appropriation.

[Answer] Inasmuch as they are rejecting the opinion of Petavius, we agree.

Inasmuch as they reject the teaching of St Thomas that 'Gift' is the personal name of the Holy Spirit,<sup>199</sup> we disagree. We feel that the objectors have not paid sufficiently attention to these articles.

(iii) The objector rejoins: 'Gift' is the proper name of the Spirit from eternity; but the Spirit is given through grace in time.

[Answer] That the Spirit is properly said to be *given* on the basis of the eternal processions without a real extrinsic term, we deny. But that he is properly said to be given *to us* on the basis of these same processions together with a real extrinsic term, we agree.<sup>200</sup>

13. In what way is participation in the divine nature had through sanctifying grace?

---

and love'; citing *Summa theologiae* 1, q. 43, a. 3 in support. For the Latin, see *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943) 231-32.]

<sup>199</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1, q. 38, aa. 1 and 2.

<sup>200</sup> See *Supra I Sententiarum*, d. 14, qq. 1 and 2; d. 18, aa. 1 and 2.



(a) In the first way, according to the more common opinion.

Through sanctifying grace we have the remote intrinsic principle proportionate to operations by which we attain God as he is in himself; but to have such a principle is to have a share or participation in the divine nature; therefore ...

(b) In another way, according to some of the Fathers (EP 766, 770, 780, 1071, 2107; *Summa theologiae*, 1, q. 38, a. 1 c., ‘participants of the divine Word and of proceeding Love.’)

Through sanctifying grace we have the uncreated gift, the divine nature itself, communicated to us as a gift.

14. In what way is adoptive filiation had through sanctifying grace?

(a) In the first way, according to the more common opinion.

We have filiation inasmuch as we are participants in the divine nature, that is, inasmuch as we have the remote intrinsic proportionate principle...

Filiation is adoptive when it is had by a created person.

(b) In another way, according to some of the Fathers (EP 407, 766, 788, 813, 2106).

We have adoptive filiation inasmuch as the Spirit of Christ is given to us and dwells in us and assimilates us to the Son through the grace of the Son.

Romans 8.15; Galatians 4.6.

*Objection:* According to Romans 8.23, ‘...we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption,’ adoptive filiation is not had.

[Answer] That it is not had perfectly, we grant; that it is not had imperfectly, we deny.

It is had without grace, Romans 9.4, ‘... to them [the Israelites] belong the adoption,’ as a type or prefigurement, we grant; as an actual fact, that they have it *per se*,

we deny; that they have it *per accidens* (in so far as the Israelites have grace), we concede.

That the second opinion is that of Lessius, we deny. Lessius's only error was that he held justification to be separable from adoptive filiation. Lennerz, *De gratia redemptoris*, 124-25, note 130; Lange, *De gratia*, §455, pp. 342-43.<sup>201</sup>

---

201 [See above p. 7, note 40 regarding the evidence which suggests that that Lonergan either did not complete this document or that there are some pages missing from the typescript.]