

Loneragan on the Historical Causality of Christ: An Interpretation of 'The Redemption: A Supplement to De Verbo Incarnato'

John Volk
Marquette University

Recommended Citation

Volk, John, "Loneragan on the Historical Causality of Christ: An Interpretation of 'The Redemption: A Supplement to De Verbo Incarnato'" (2012). *Dissertations (2009 -)*. Paper 189.
http://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/189

LONERGAN ON THE HISTORICAL CAUSALITY OF CHRIST:
AN INTERPRETATION OF *THE REDEMPTION*:
A SUPPLEMENT TO DE VERBO INCARNATO

by

John Volk, B.S., MBA, M.Div.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 2012

ABSTRACT
LONERGAN ON THE HISTORICAL CAUSALITY OF CHRIST:
AN INTERPRETATION OF *THE REDEMPTION*:
A SUPPLEMENT TO DE VERBO INCARNATO

John Volk, B.S., MBA, M.Div.

Marquette University, 2012

In 1958, the Canadian Jesuit theologian Bernard Lonergan (1904-1984) completed a draft of a major text on redemption. He stated that the text was to be an addition to his book *De Verbo Incarnato*, with the purpose of explaining the historical causality of Christ. The Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto, has produced a preliminary English translation titled *The Redemption: A Supplement to De Verbo Incarnato*. To date, there has been no interpretation of this text. This dissertation aims at making a contribution towards the remedy of this lacuna in Lonergan studies. The dissertation interprets Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ, through an interpretation of his text.

The dissertation employs the methodology of what Lonergan named the "hermeneutical circle:" the meaning of the whole is grasped through the parts, and the parts through the whole. In this dissertation, each chapter is interpreted in the wider context of the whole. Each chapter is also interpreted in the order presented in Lonergan's text, since that text is organized according to what Lonergan, following Aquinas, calls the *ordo disciplinae* or *ordo doctrinae*, the order of learning and teaching, the ideal mode of explaining systematic understanding.

Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ follows from his understanding of history itself, where the fundamental unit is culture and the fundamental nature of human causality is social. Lonergan understands culture through a set of terms and relations he names the "human good of order." This order is an expression of cultural meanings and values, whether for good or evil. The historical causality of Christ involves a proper causal series in which God's redemptive agency is mediated into human history, through Christ and his members, to transform cultural evil into good by transforming cultural meanings and values. The principal meaning and value is the "Law of the Cross." According to the divine plan, this law is the governing principle of salvation history. Since human causality is fundamentally social, the historical causality of Christ is mediated through others who understand this law and judge it as worthy to be chosen.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

John Volk, B.S., MBA, M.Div.

The first persons I want to acknowledge are my family. I am particularly grateful to my parents, Leo and Betsey Volk, who have always supported my desire to learn, and never questioned my change of direction in life when I broke the news that I wanted to leave the secure world of technology to study theology, to pursue yet another degree. There is no way I would be here without their support.

I thank my good friend Laura Henning Zavaleta, who coaxed me into volunteering in youth ministry at St. Jude Parish in Redmond, Washington. She will never know how much influence she had in bringing me into ministry. I thank my pastor and mentor, Dr. Victoria Ries, of St. Catherine Parish in Seattle. I am grateful for her support, her advice in applying to doctoral programs, and providing the opportunity to intern at St. Catherine's. From Seattle University, I offer special thanks to Fr. Patrick Howell, S.J., Fr. Paul Janowiak, S.J., and visiting professor Fr. John Markey, O.P. With Dr. Ries, each encouraged me to continue my studies. Each supported me in applying to programs. I am very grateful for their support and friendship.

At Seattle University there were a number of students who helped me in many ways. In particular, I wish to thank Susan Payne and Claudia Petursson. Both provided support, especially at difficult times in my studies, and prior to that when I was anxiously awaiting word on acceptance. During these times, I borrowed their faith. I am forever thankful.

I am very grateful to my local faith community in Milwaukee, Three Holy Women Parish. It has become a home away from home. I wish to thank Fr. Brian Mason and Fr. Tim Kitzke, whom I have come to know not only as great pastors, but dear friends. I have made other friends here in Milwaukee whom I have had the privilege to share my faith with, and who exemplify the city's Midwestern hospitality: Dave Blackwell, Joe LeSac and family, and Karl Barth. A special thanks to Karl for proof-reading portions of the dissertation. I also am extremely thankful for the friendships with fellow graduate students at Marquette, especially members of the Lonergan Society, and in particular Jeremy Blackwood who helped develop my interest in Lonergan.

I wish to thank my dissertation committee, Fr. Bryan Massingale, Dr. Wanda Zemler-Cizewski, Dr. Ralph Del Colle, and my director, Fr. Robert Doran, S.J. Each member was also on my doctoral exams committee. Whenever I asked for help, whenever I asked for a meeting, whenever I dropped by, there was always a 'yes' from each member of my committee, always a spirit of receptivity and a willingness to help, despite all their other duties. I thank Fr. Massingale for his class on Catholic Social Thought, and his skill at bridging systematic theology and practical theology. I thank Dr. Zemler-Cizewski for her class on St. Thomas Aquinas, and in particular for her encouragement in class, as well as in my exam preparation, to first read and understand what St. Thomas says himself, before reading what others say he said. I thank Dr. Del Colle for his classes in Christology and Pneumatology, for his volunteering to chair my doctoral exams, and for helping me appreciate the achievements and precision of the Scholastic tradition, an appreciation which only grew as I studied Bernard Lonergan. I thank all of them for their accessibility and their willingness to serve.

I am extremely grateful and honored to have worked with Fr. Robert Doran. He has been an outstanding dissertation director. I think of Fr. Doran as a role-model for the vocation of a systematic theologian, for the type of scholar I wish to be, where systematic theology is viewed also as a praxis to the degree it promotes the changing of the meanings and values of a culture such that the human situation more closely approximates the reign of God. I do not have space here to note all of the ways Fr. Doran has helped me during my time at Marquette. I cannot imagine a more authentic person and scholar to best represent and advance the thought of Bernard Lonergan. He is always gracious, always humble. As I wrestled with Lonergan's thought, Fr. Doran always looked first to what I had gotten right, not to what I had gotten wrong. I have no doubt this is also true for his other students. By his very example, Fr. Doran made me want to study more and more the thought of Bernard Lonergan.

Finally, I thank God. When I decided to pursue a doctorate in systematic theology, my reason was simple. I wanted to serve the Church through this ministry. Ever since that decision, things have worked out, despite my doubts, despite periods where I lacked trust, where I could not see the 'plan.' Yet the plan could not have unfolded better, and fact it was not my planning at all. I give God all the credit, all the glory. I thank God for leading me to this school, for leading me to Bernard Lonergan, for leading me to the gracious and committed faculty members who served on my committee, to new friends and a new parish who have been my local family, and for leading me to a tremendous director in Fr. Robert Doran.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Purpose of the Study	1
1.2 The Date, Purpose, and Structure of the <i>Supplement</i>	5
1.2.1 The Date.....	5
1.2.2 Purpose.....	7
1.2.3 Structure.....	8
1.3 Lonergan on Redemption: A Brief Review of His Contributions	10
1.3.1 <i>Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis</i> (1935).....	10
1.3.2 Chapter 20 of <i>Insight</i> (1953).....	13
1.3.3 <i>De ratione convenientiae</i> (1954)	16
1.3.4 The Lecture on Redemption (1958).....	19
1.3.5 Theses 15-17 of <i>De Verbo Incarnato</i>	21
1.4 The History of Research on the <i>Supplement</i>	24
1.5 Method and Outline of the Study.....	25
CHAPTER 2: GOOD AND EVIL.....	28
2.1 Introduction.....	28
2.2 A Brief Description of Articles 1 – 8.....	30
2.2.1 Article 1: On the Good in General.....	30
2.2.2 Article 2: The Human Good of Order.....	32
2.2.3 Article 3: Communication: Signs and Symbols.....	35
2.2.4 Article 4: The Comparison of Goods.....	36
2.2.5 Article 5: Evil.....	39
2.2.6 Article 6: From Evil, Good	40
2.2.7 Article 7: Human Powerlessness	41
2.2.8 Article 8: Original Sin.....	43
2.3 Lonergan’s Starting Point	43
2.4 The Human Good of Order and Historical Progress.....	48

2.4.1	The General Structure of the Human Good of Order	49
2.4.2	Historical Progress in the Human Good of Order.....	51
	2.4.2.1 The Intrinsic Principle of Progress	52
	2.4.2.2 The Social Dynamic of Progress.....	53
2.5	The Human Good of Order and Historical Decline	59
	2.5.1 Evil in the General Structure of the Human Good of Order	60
	2.5.2 Historical Decline in the Human Good of Order	61
	2.5.2.1 The Intrinsic Principle of Decline.....	62
	2.5.2.2 The Social Dynamic of Decline.....	64
2.6	The Human Good of Order and Restoration.....	70
2.7	Summary.....	72
CHAPTER 3: THE JUSTICE OF GOD		74
3.1	Introduction.....	74
3.2	A Brief Description of Articles 9 – 15.....	75
	3.2.1 Article 9: The Notion of Divine Justice.....	75
	3.2.2 Article 10: The Just Order of Reality.....	78
	3.2.3 Article 11: The Historical Order of Justice.....	82
	3.2.4 Article 12: The Personal Order of Justice.....	83
	3.2.5 Article 13: The Just Will of God.....	84
	3.2.6 Article 14: Voluntarism and Related Errors	86
	3.2.7 Article 15: Recapitulation of the Foregoing	88
3.3	Lonergan’s Understanding of Divine Justice.....	90
	3.3.1 World Order as the Proper Effect of God Produced Through Secondary Causes.....	92
	3.3.2 World Order and Divine Justice	93
	3.3.2.1 Emergent Probability	95
	3.3.2.2 The Directed Dynamism of Emergent Probability	97
	3.3.3 Dispelling Anthropomorphic Understandings of Divine Justice	100
3.4	The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the <i>Supplement</i>	102

3.4.1	Redemption as Harmonious Continuation with the Order of the Universe.....	103
3.4.2	Divine Justice as a Theological Principle	105
3.5	Summary	112
CHAPTER 4: ON THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST		114
4.1	Introduction.....	114
4.2	A Brief Description of Articles 16 – 21	114
4.2.1	Article 16: The Death of Christ	114
4.2.2	Article 17: The Payment of the Price.....	117
4.2.3	Article 18: The New Testament Sacrifice.....	120
4.2.4	Article 19: Meritorious Obedience	120
4.2.5	Article 20: Vicarious Suffering.....	122
4.2.6	Article 21: The Power of the Resurrection	123
4.3	Lonergan on the Means of Redemption.....	124
4.3.1	Lonergan’s Categorizations and Aquinas’s Five Ways	126
4.3.2	The Function of Lonergan’s Article on the Death of Christ.....	127
4.3.3	Some Specific Comments on Lonergan’s Categorizations.....	130
4.4	The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the <i>Supplement</i>	136
4.4.1	Lonergan’s Purpose: Collecting the Teachings on Redemption.....	136
4.4.2	Lonergan’s Method: Doctrines Precede Systematics	137
4.5	Summary	139
CHAPTER 5: THE CROSS OF CHRIST		140
5.1	Introduction.....	140
5.2	A Brief Description of Articles 22 – 25	140
5.2.1	Article 22: The Meaning of the Cross.....	140
5.2.2	Article 23: The Law of the Cross.....	142
5.2.3	Article 24: The Mystery of the Cross	145
5.2.4	Article 25: The Justice of the Cross.....	148

5.3	Lonergan on the Meaning, Law, and Mystery of the Cross.....	151
5.3.1	An Analytical Consideration: The Meaning of the Cross.....	151
5.3.2	A General Consideration: The Law of the Cross.....	157
5.3.3	A Specific Consideration: The Mystery of the Cross	163
5.4	The Justice of the Cross	167
5.5	The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the <i>Supplement</i>	173
5.5.1	Lonergan’s Understanding of the Cross of Christ in Relation to the Teachings of the New Testament.....	173
5.5.2	Lonergan’s Understanding of the Cross of Christ in Relation to the Satisfaction Given by Christ	180
5.5.3	Lonergan’s Understanding of the Cross of Christ in Relation to the Historical Causality of Christ.....	182
5.6	Summary.....	183
CHAPTER 6: THE SATISFACTION GIVEN BY CHRIST		185
6.1	Introduction.....	185
6.2	A Brief Description of Articles 26 – 34.....	186
6.2.1	Article 26: Division of the Question	186
6.2.2	Article 27: The Meaning of Necessity	188
6.2.3	Article 28: The Meaning of Punishment.....	189
6.2.4	Article 29: The Punishment of Christ	191
6.2.5	Article 30: The Transference of Punishment to Christ	195
6.2.6	Article 31: The Sacramental Analogy.....	197
6.2.7	Article 32: The Sorrows of Christ.....	199
6.2.8	Article 33: The Satisfaction Given by Christ.....	200
6.2.9	Article 34: The Superabundant Satisfaction Given by Christ.....	202
6.3	Lonergan’s Understanding of the Doctrine of Christ’s Satisfaction.....	203
6.3.1	The Integration of <i>Satisfactio</i> and <i>Poena</i>	205
6.3.2	Christ’s <i>Poena</i> Understood in terms of Fittingness, not Necessity	207
6.3.3	The Intelligible Context to Interpret the <i>Poena</i> Associated with Christ’s Redemptive Work	210
6.3.4	The Analogy to Understand Christ’s Satisfaction	221
6.4	The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the <i>Supplement</i>	227

6.5	Summary	230
CHAPTER 7: THE WORK OF CHRIST IN HISTORY		231
7.1	Introduction.....	231
7.2	A Brief Description of Articles 35 – 45.....	231
7.2.1	Article 35: The Work of Christ.....	231
7.2.2	Article 36: Agents Acting Through Intellect	233
7.2.3	Article 37: The Social Agent	235
7.2.4	Article 38: The Historical Agent.....	236
7.2.5	Article 39: Christ the Agent.....	237
7.2.6	Article 40: Christ the Exemplar	238
7.2.7	Article 41: Christ the Head	240
7.2.8	Article 42: Christ the Historical Agent	242
7.2.9	Article 43: The Mediator in Heaven	245
7.2.10	Article 44: The Purpose of the Incarnation.....	246
7.2.11	Article 45: Why the God-man?.....	248
7.3	Lonergan’s General Understanding of Historical Causality	251
7.3.1	History.....	251
7.3.2	Causality	256
7.3.3	Historical Causality.....	259
7.4	The Historical Causality of Christ: Preliminary Remarks	263
7.5	The Historical Causality of Christ: Final Causality	267
7.5.1	References to the Secondary End of Redemption.....	267
7.5.2	Toward a Synthesis	269
7.5.3	Final Causality and Christ’s Intentionality	274
7.6	The Historical Causality of Christ: Christ’s Objective Work in History.....	280
7.7	The Historical Causality of Christ: Christ’s Objective Work Applied to the Members.....	282
7.8	The Historical Causality of Christ: Christ’s Work Mediated through the Members	287
7.8.1	Preliminary Remarks	287
7.8.2	Christ’s Efficient Causality as Historical Agent.....	288
7.8.3	Christ’s Efficient Causality as Ongoing Mediator.....	301

7.8.4	Christ's Exemplary Causality	303
7.9	Summary	309
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS		311
8.1	The <i>Supplement's</i> Relation to <i>De Verbo Incarnato</i> : A Hypothesis	311
8.2	The Question of the Historical Causality of Christ.....	315
8.2.1	The Origin of Lonergan's Question.....	315
8.2.2	The Nature of Lonergan's Question	318
8.2.3	Lonergan's Approach to the Answer	320
8.2.4	Essential Elements in Lonergan's Answer	325
8.3	The Practical Orientation of the <i>Supplement</i>	334
BIBLIOGRAPHY		339

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Purpose of the Study

The Canadian Jesuit theologian Bernard J.F. Lonergan (1904-1984) is regarded by many as one of the greatest philosophical and theological minds of the twentieth century. He is best known from his works *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (1957)¹ and *Method in Theology* (1972).² His historical scholarship on the thought of Thomas Aquinas is represented in two groundbreaking and perhaps definitive interpretations of Aquinas,³ making Lonergan one of the world's foremost Thomist scholars. His literary output extends far beyond these works, including a handful of texts in Christology.

Among these texts is an unpublished Latin manuscript written during his years at the Gregorian University.⁴ He did not give a title to this work. In early circulation it was known from the opening pages as *De bono et malo*, or simply *De bono*.⁵

¹ Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, vol. 3 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992). Originally published in 1957 (London: Longmans, Green, & Co.). Hereafter cited as *Insight*.

² Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972). Hereafter cited as *Method*.

³ Robert M. Doran, S.J., "Lonergan: An Appreciation," in *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Vernon Gregson (New York: Paulist, 1988), 2. Doran references the following works: Bernard Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, ed. J. Patout Burns (New York: Herder and Herder; London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1971); *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, ed. David B. Burrell, C.S.C. (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967). Each has subsequently been republished as part of the *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 1 (2000) and vol. 2 (1997), respectively.

⁴ Lonergan taught at the Gregorian University from 1953 to 1965. The autograph Latin typescript of the manuscript is found in File 657 in the archives of the Lonergan Research Institute with the label "Bono et Malo etc. 179 pp," and File 674 with the label "De Opere Christi (art. 35-44)." The former contains the first five chapters of the work. The latter contains the sixth and final chapter. The six chapters of the Latin manuscript can also be found on www.bernardlonergan.com at 25300DTL060, 25310DTL060, 25320DTL060, 25330DTL060, 25340DTL060, and 25460DTL060, respectively.

⁵ Frederick E. Crowe, S.J., *Christ and History: The Christology of Bernard Lonergan from 1935 to 1982* (Ottawa: Novalis, 2005), 102.

Lonerger handed this text over to Frederick Crowe in August 1972, stating that the text was to be an addition to his book *De Verbo Incarnato*⁶ with the purpose of explaining the “historical causality” of Christ.⁷ The work was never added to the book.

The Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto, has produced an unpublished English translation of *De bono* titled *The Redemption: A Supplement to De Verbo Incarnato*.⁸ The University of Toronto Press, in collaboration with the Lonergan Research Institute, plans to publish this text as volume 9 of the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (CWL), under the general editorship of Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe.

This dissertation is driven by the following question: What is Bernard Lonergan’s understanding of the historical causality of Christ in the *Supplement*? My purpose is to understand Lonergan’s understanding. As such this dissertation is an interpretation of the *Supplement*.

The following question naturally arises: why a need to interpret the *Supplement*? The rationale assumes that the task of interpreting Lonergan’s thought should precede the tasks of developing and implementing his thought.⁹ There has been some research on specific sections of the *Supplement*, but not a full interpretation.

⁶ Bernard Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, Third edition (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1964). Hereafter cited in text as *DVI*. Any references to *DVI* will rely on Charles Hefling’s unpublished English translation, *The Incarnate Word* (Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute, 2006).

⁷ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 100.

⁸ Bernard Lonergan, *The Redemption: A Supplement to De Verbo Incarnato*, unpublished English translation of *De bono*, trans. Michael G. Shields, S.J. (Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute, 2000). Hereafter cited in text as *Supplement*. I will rely on Shields’s translation in citations from the *Supplement*. Page numbers will reference both the original Latin text and Shields’s translation. Lonergan’s original Latin text will be referenced as *De bono et malo*, abbreviated *DBM*. Lonergan numbered the first 179 pages (Chapters 1 to 4). From page 180 on I will add an asterisk (*180, *181, etc.). Shields’s English translation will be referenced as the *Supplement*.

⁹ Frederick Crowe, who along with Robert Doran is the general co-editor of the *CWL*, makes a compelling argument for the ongoing task of interpreting Lonergan as a preliminary step in developing and implementing Lonergan’s thought. See Frederick E. Crowe, “The Task of Interpreting Lonergan,” in *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, ed. Michael Vertin (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 145.

Furthermore, Lonergan's early theological writings, including the *Supplement*, were written in Latin, a barrier for many contemporary theologians. Only in recent years have English translations been made available.¹⁰ Complicating this problem is the fact that neither *DVI* nor the *Supplement* has been published in English, though both are scheduled for publication in separate volumes of the *CWL*. Finally, the *Supplement*, as with Lonergan's theological writings in general, is less known than either *Insight* or *Method*. Although *Insight* and *Method* have tremendous implications for developing the categories Lonergan envisioned for a contemporary systematic theology, neither was intended to understand explicit theological doctrines.

My motivation for interpreting the *Supplement* is based on a deep interest in Lonergan's theology of redemption. In *DVI*, he identifies the intrinsic intelligibility of redemption as the "Law of the Cross."¹¹ In the *Supplement* Lonergan not only develops the notion of the law of the cross, but he also develops an understanding of how Christ, as historical agent, moves others through their intellect and will to embrace this law.

I stumbled across a description of Lonergan's law of the cross accidentally. In 2005 the pastoral director at my local parish handed me a copy of an article by Joseph Komonchak, titled "The Violence of the Cross: A Mystery, not a Punishment."¹² Komonchak argued that the mystery of the cross was not a necessity, not a punishment from God, but a *mystery*: "The reign of sin and death was absorbed by his [Christ's] love and forgiveness, a frightful evil was transformed into a transcendent good, an execution

¹⁰ For example, Lonergan's Latin treatise on a systematic Trinitarian theology, *De Deo trino, Pars systematica*, has recently been published in English. See Bernard Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, vol. 12 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, trans. Michael Shields (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).

¹¹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 576.

¹² Joseph Komonchak, "The Violence of the Cross: A Mystery, not a Punishment," *Commonweal* 132 (Jan 28, 2005), 19-22.

became a self-sacrifice.”¹³ He went on to say that this understanding is what Bernard Lonergan called “the law of the cross.” I had known Lonergan’s name in association with *Insight* and *Method*, but until then I had no knowledge of his theological writings, and certainly no knowledge of the “law of the cross.” I found the argument compelling, sending me on a journey to learn more about Lonergan’s soteriology.

The reason the pastoral director of my parish handed me this article is that she knew I was deeply interested in a particular theological question: how do we understand the salvific significance of Christ’s passion and death? The cross is the primary visual symbol of Christianity. Yet the literal meaning of the symbol recalls an ancient method of torturing and executing undesirables with maximum degradation and humiliation, meant not only to kill, but to send a political message. Crucifixion was a symbolic act with a clear and frightening meaning.¹⁴

The sad history of crucifixion circles back to the question: how do we understand the salvific significance of Christ’s passion and death? Like others, I was exposed to many interpretations of the cross. Some I found problematic, particularly theories tending to understand Christ’s passion along the lines of “satispassion” or “penal substitution.” Since that time, through study of Lonergan’s theology of redemption, I am hopeful that Lonergan offers the Church a systematic theology of a very difficult doctrine while avoiding what he himself would consider problematic interpretations of Christ’s passion. And he does so while remaining faithful to the Leonine injunction *vetera novis*

¹³ Komonchak, “The Violence of the Cross,” 22.

¹⁴ N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 543. On the history of crucifixion see Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, trans. John Bowden from the German “*Mors turpissima crucis: Die Kreuzigung in der antiken Welt und die ‘Torheit’ des ‘Wortes vom Kreuz,’*” (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).

augere et perficere – to enlarge and enrich the old with the new.¹⁵ Lonergan adopted this injunction as a central inspiration for much of his life’s work.¹⁶ His adoption of the injunction is exemplified in his effort to reconcile the permanence of the meaning of dogmas affirmed in the constitution, *Dei Filius*,¹⁷ promulgated by the First Vatican Council, with historicity characterizing human thought and action.

In brief, the rationale for an interpretation is a means toward an end. The end is to develop and implement Lonergan’s thought. The mission of the Lonergan Research Institute is to preserve, promote, develop, and implement the work of Bernard Lonergan.¹⁸ My hope is that this interpretation contributes to this mission.

1.2 The Date, Purpose, and Structure of the *Supplement*

1.2.1 The Date

When Lonergan handed the text to Frederick Crowe in 1972, Lonergan stated that the text dated to 1963-1964. However, in at least three letters from Rome during the period 1956 to 1958, Lonergan discussed progress on the manuscript. Crowe states:

From 1956 to 1958, in at least three letters from Rome, Lonergan spoke of a major work he was preparing. On June 12, 1956, he wrote that he was planning a work on redemption. On November 17, 1957, he reported that he had started work on it in that academic year. On May 25, 1958, he wrote: ‘I have got 6 chapters (45 articles) on the redemption pretty well done. May be able to bring manuscript to Halifax’ (he was to spend the summer in that city.)¹⁹

¹⁵ Pope Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris* (1879), #24.

¹⁶ Robert M. Doran, S.J., *What is Systematic Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 63.

¹⁷ Henry Denzinger, *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, English translation of *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, Thirtieth Edition, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Fitzwilliam, NH: Loreto Publications, 2001), 1800, 1818. See also Henry Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, ed. A. Schönmetzer (Rome: Herder, 1997), 3020, 3043; See also J. Neuner, S.J. and J. Dupuis, S.J., *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*, ed. Jacques Dupuis (New York: Alba House, 2001), 136, 139. Hereafter these three texts referenced as DB, DS, and ND, respectively.

¹⁸ Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, x.

¹⁹ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 100.

Based on these letters, the dating of 1963-1964 is problematic.²⁰ The letter of May 25, 1958, provides convincing evidence that the *Supplement* was essentially completed in 1958. Whether Lonergan brought the manuscript to Halifax is unknown. His main work in Halifax during the summer of 1958 would have been the lectures on *Insight*, subsequently published as *Understanding and Being*.²¹

We can only speculate on why Lonergan mentioned 1963-1964 for the dating of the manuscript. He may not have fully known the contents of the folder he handed over to Crowe. Or perhaps ca. 1963 he began to edit the work of 1958. Crowe notes that the manuscript does show evidence of an unfinished state: for example, the lack of numbering of pages after page 179.²²

Another theory is that Lonergan completed chapter 6 of the *Supplement* sometime between 1960 and 1964. The evidence is based on the fact that there is a section of the 1964 edition of *DVI* which is lacking in the 1960 edition. The section is titled “vita humana et historica” (human, historical life) and according to Crowe it corresponds closely with material found in chapter 6 of the *Supplement*.²³ Perhaps after Lonergan had written *DVI* he may have thought to incorporate material from the *Supplement*.

It is thus possible that Lonergan completed chapter 6 between 1960 and 1964, and then introduced the section “vita humana et historica” into the 1964 edition of *DVI*. This is only a hypothesis which tries to reconcile Lonergan’s own statement against the May 1958 letter stating that he had completed six chapters. However, for the purpose of this

²⁰ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 101.

²¹ Bernard Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, eds. E.A. Morelli and M.D. Morelli, vol. 5 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

²² Crowe, *Christ and History*, 101.

²³ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 101.

dissertation, I will assume Crowe's hypothesis that the *Supplement* was substantially if not fully completed in 1958.

1.2.2 Purpose

Lonergan's stated purpose was to explain the "historical causality of Christ."²⁴ He once summarized his own lifework as follows: "All my work has been introducing history into Catholic theology."²⁵ Lonergan's desire to introduce history into theology was part of his theological project to embrace shifts to modernity which he considered authentic. One of these shifts was from classicism to critical history. Classicism holds the mistaken view that culture is normative, that there is just one human culture.²⁶ Critical history holds the view that culture must be conceived empirically, and that there are many cultures. Critical history acknowledges the fact of historical process, and seeks a historical perspective that attempts to understand cultural developments in investigating how patterns of living, institutions, and common meanings develop over the course of history. This may be called a historicist viewpoint.²⁷ Lonergan's concern to move from a classicist to a historicist viewpoint influenced his entire philosophical-theological project.

In the first chapter, Lonergan identifies the guiding question of his *Supplement*: how are earthly realities of redemption to be brought together since it is our duty to work with Christ? He quotes Ephesians 1:9-10 as the mystery prompting this question, a

²⁴ Michael G. Shields, S.J. Notes from the translator's introduction to *The Redemption: A Supplement to De Verbo Incarnato*, 2000.

²⁵ R. Eric O'Connor, *Curiosity at the Center of One's Life: Statements and Questions of R. Eric O'Connor*, ed. J. Martin O'Hara (Montreal: Thomas More Institute, 1984), 427.

²⁶ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 124

²⁷ Bernard Lonergan, "Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness," *A Second Collection*, eds. William F.J. Ryan, S.J. and Bernard J. Tyrrell, S.J. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 2.

mystery hidden in God to gather all creation in heaven and earth under one head, Christ. However, Lonergan's question is more limited: his question relates to how *earthly* realities are to be brought together. Lonergan's hope was that a deeper and more fruitful understanding of the answer to this question would underscore how important the great gift of redemption is in addressing contemporary problems, since through God's grace human agents cooperate with God in bringing these earthly realities together. Therefore, although Lonergan's purpose in the *Supplement* was part of his larger project to introduce history into Catholic theology, his desire to embrace historicity was not solely for the purpose of advancing an understanding of the historical causality of Christ. There was also a practical purpose. In the *Supplement*, a more fruitful understanding of redemption, through an understanding of the historical causality of Christ, would hopefully lead to a more fruitful praxis in cooperating with God to address contemporary problems. I will return to this theme in my final chapter.

1.2.3 Structure

The *Supplement* includes six chapters and forty-five articles. The *Supplement* is a rather large text, and the six finished chapters in the English translation come to eighty-thousand words. An abbreviated outline is presented below:

- Chapter 1: Good and Evil (articles 1 – 8)
- Chapter 2: The Justice of God (articles 9 – 15)
- Chapter 3: On the Death and Resurrection of Christ (articles 16 – 21)
- Chapter 4: The Cross of Christ (articles 22 – 25)
- Chapter 5: The Satisfaction Given by Christ (articles 26 – 34)
- Chapter 6: The Work of Christ (articles 35 – 45)

The *Supplement* does not follow the thesis format of *DVI*, even though Lonergan had told Crowe that the work was to be an addition to *DVI*. This is a question I will take

up in the conclusion of the dissertation. The dating of the *Supplement* relative to *DVI* makes Lonergan's comment an enigma. The *Supplement* reads as a standalone text on redemption, not as a supplement to an existing work.

Chapter 1 on "Good and Evil" is essentially a theological anthropology, serving as background information for latter chapters. Chapter 2 on the "Justice of God" is also background material, but rather than an anthropology it is a theology, arguing that the norm of divine justice is divine wisdom. The exercise of divine justice manifested in creation is the creative act proceeding from God's will, but an act following God's wisdom. The effect is the actual order of the universe in all its concrete determinations.

Chapter 3 is simply intended to collect the relevant passages of scripture in order to establish the doctrine of redemption. Lonergan did the same thing in Thesis 15 of *DVI*. The structure exemplifies Lonergan's methodology. He establishes theological truths (doctrines) before he attempts to understand those truths (systematics).

Chapter 4 includes an article on the "Law of the Cross," which is essentially the transformation of evil into good, witnessed in Christ as a fact accomplished, but also addressed as a precept to those who wish to follow Christ. Chapter 4 is very similar in content to Thesis 17 of *DVI*.

Chapter 5 includes treatment of the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction. Lonergan may have chosen to deal with this doctrine in chapter 5 based on a statement he makes at the end of chapter 4. There he ends the chapter stating that in no other way does God draw evil out of good than according to the meaning, the law, the mystery, and the justice of the cross, and that God would not impose this law on others without imposing it on

himself, that is, doing first what he requires of others for the sake of his glory.²⁸ Chapter 5 is very similar in content to Thesis 16 of *DVI*.

Chapter 6 in the Latin manuscript does not have a title. The file from the Lonergan Archives simply begins with Article 35, titled “De Opere Christi.” In the English translation the chapter title is borrowed from the title of the first article, so chapter 6 in the English translation is titled “The Work of Christ.” Chapter 6 represents the point where Lonergan explicitly addresses the fundamental question of the *Supplement*: the historical causality of Christ.

My purpose in this section has been to provide a brief introduction to the *Supplement*. As part of this introduction, it is of help to situate the *Supplement* in the context of Lonergan’s other contributions on redemption. I will be referencing these other works in my interpretation. I provide a brief review of each in the next section.

1.3 Lonergan on Redemption: A Brief Review of His Contributions

1.3.1 *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis* (1935)²⁹

Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis is an essay written in April of 1935. As required by the Jesuits, Lonergan needed four years of theological studies. These years were done at the Gregorian University from 1933 to 1937. The *Pantōn* essay was a student essay written during this period.

The title and topic is taken from Ephesians 1:10. The term *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis* is one part of a seven-part title, which in its totality reads *Pantōn*

²⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 179 [*Supplement*, 74].

²⁹ Bernard Lonergan, ‘*Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis* [The Restoration of All Things],’ *METHOD: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 9:2 (October 1991), 139-172. The autograph typescript is in the archives at the Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto, File 713.

Anakephalaiōsis / A Theory of Human Solidarity / A Metaphysics for the Interpretation of St. Paul / A Theology for the Social Order, / Catholic Action, / And the Kingship of Christ, / *In incipient outline*. The phrase “A Theology for...” governs grammatically the next three lines, so the last three lines in the title refer sequentially to a “Theology for the Social Order,” a “Theology for Catholic Action,” and a “Theology for the Kingship of Christ.” The essay includes an introduction, followed by six parts.³⁰

The basic purpose of the essay is to suggest that a metaphysics is the key to understanding the Pauline conception of Christ as the *pantōn anakephalaiōsis*. Lonergan states that “It is from the basis of a metaphysical conception of man, one in nature and operation, working through a material to an intelligible plurality in a transient dynamism in which no man is more than an instrumental cause and no causation fails to affect all men, that we attempt to interpret St. Paul.”³¹ Lonergan states that since human operation is necessarily instrumental, then there is a particular significance to leadership, “to be the first agent in human history.”³² Adam, pre-moved by Eve, pre-moved by the serpent, set up the reign of sin. Christ, the new Adam, set up the kingdom of God.³³ In other words, pre-movement, whether from Adam or Christ, results in a solidary chain of causation in which each instrument transfers the motion received from those before to those that will follow. Christ originates what Lonergan calls the “absolute *Geist* of dogma” into the organism of humanity. The “absolute *Geist* of dogma” is divinely revealed truth.³⁴

³⁰ 1. Liberty as a disjunctive determination, 2. The historical determination of intellect, 3. The unity of human operation, 4. The synthesis of human operation, 5. The unity of man in the ontological ground of his being, 6. *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*.

³¹ Lonergan, *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*, 143.

³² Lonergan, *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*, 155.

³³ Lonergan, *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*, 153.

³⁴ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 34

In this essay, Lonergan understood that matter individuates human persons, but the *idea* is the basis of human unity, whether economically, culturally, politically, or religiously. When there is decline, reasonableness of the idea is not to blame, but sin, which is the refusal to follow reason. Christ, as the new head of humanity, originates the idea that will reunify what sin has torn asunder. “The unity of man achieved by intellect has to be a unity in truth, if it is to be stable. Peace fundamentally is this unity in truth and only phenomenally is it ‘order with tranquility.’”³⁵ The only truth that can unify is the absolute *Geist* of dogma, and this originates with Christ.

Lonergan’s argument depends on a metaphysics of human solidarity, and his metaphysics of human solidarity is based on his view that human beings are one universal nature in terms of *what* we are, in virtue of our form, but many in terms of material differentiation. This is a philosophical argument. The same argument could be made theologically, based on revelation that we are made in the image and likeness of God.

Furthermore, no human intellect is an island. What we think is governed by the historical situation. And the historical situation, at any moment in time, is a product of the achievements and errors of the past. The point here is that there is a solidarity to human thought, a unity of human intellects, whether in achievement or error. This unity of intellect results in what Lonergan calls an “effective” uniformity of wills.³⁶ Why is the *pantōn anakephalaiōsis* possible in the first place? Because humans are simply not individuals. Humanity is an organism, where each person is an instrumental cause. The

³⁵ Lonergan, *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*, 145.

³⁶ Lonergan, *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*, 147. What Lonergan means by ‘effective’ uniformity is that since the will is not *a priori* determined, nevertheless there will be a statistical uniformity to the operations of the will, based on the unity of intellect.

principle of promotion, whether from Adam or Christ, transforms these instrumental causes into a solidary chain of causation.³⁷

Since the essay is fundamentally concerned with the work of Christ, we can categorize this as one of Lonergan's contributions to a theology of redemption. In Crowe's commentary, he states that the body of the essay is "through and through a study of the historical causality of Christ."³⁸ Thus the *Supplement* was not Lonergan's first contribution to an understanding of the historical causality of Christ. He addressed the question as early as 1935.

1.3.2 Chapter 20 of *Insight* (1953)

There is a heuristic structure for *anticipating* the answer to a question whenever the object of inquiry admits antecedent determinations.³⁹ In chapter 20 of *Insight*, Lonergan develops a heuristic structure for the solution to the problem of evil. His heuristic structure includes thirty-one points.

In chapter 20, he does not explicitly use the word "redemption" but speaks of God's "solution to the problem of evil." Charles Hefling argues that other writings make it clear that redemption is what he is talking about.⁴⁰ For example, in a paper of 1973, Lonergan refers to *Insight's* "rather theological analysis of human history," conceived as three approximations. The first is progress, resulting from intelligent and reasonable human acts. The second is decline, resulting from unintelligent and unreasonable human acts. The third is a redemptive process resulting from God's gift of his grace and the

³⁷ Lonergan, *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*, 142.

³⁸ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 31.

³⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

⁴⁰ Charles Hefling, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement: Lonergan on Christ's Satisfaction," in *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 10 (1992), 53.

manifestation of his love in Christ Jesus. “The whole idea was presented in chapter twenty of *Insight*.”⁴¹ Here Lonergan’s statement confirms two points. First, what he means by a “solution to the problem of evil” is redemption. Second, the structure of history, as presented in chapter 20, can be understood as a triad of progress, decline, and redemption.⁴² In fact, at one point in the composition of the material that would become chapter 20 of *Insight*, Lonergan gave the title “The Structure of History.”⁴³ This structure is not to be understood in a sequential sense. The vectors of progress, decline, and redemption are always operative in history.

For Lonergan, the foundational antecedent determinations with the greatest influence on a heuristic structure to the solution of the problem of evil are (1) that there is an intelligible unity of the actual world order; (2) that this intelligible unity is a product of God’s wisdom, goodness, and power; and (3) since there are no divine afterthoughts, a solution to the problem of evil will be in harmonious continuation with the actual, concrete order of this universe.⁴⁴ Since there are no divine afterthoughts, the existing world order, as we currently understand it, *already has the potential for the solution*. To state otherwise would be to suggest that God thinks as we do. Thus the solution will be “within the intelligibility of the actual world order” or otherwise stated in “harmonious continuation” of the existing order.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the solution will be one, since there is one God, one world order, and one problem that is both individual and social. This

⁴¹ Bernard Lonergan, “*Insight Revisited*,” *A Second Collection*, 272.

⁴² This triad of progress-decline-redemption appears frequently in Lonergan’s works, dating back to the 1930s. Sometimes the terminology is different, but the fundamental meaning is the same. For example, in the essay “Analytic Concept of History,” the triad is presented as 1) The Ideal Line of History, 2) Decline, and 3) Renaissance. See Bernard Lonergan, “Analytic Concept of History,” *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 11:1 (1993): 5-35. Whatever terminology Lonergan uses, the triad is basically the historization of the theological categories of nature, sin, and grace.

⁴³ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 235, n. 4. See *CWL*, vol. 3, 805, note *a*.

⁴⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 717.

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

solution will be universally accessible. The problem is not restricted to any persons of a particular class or time, and the solution has to meet this reality.⁴⁶

There is not space here to cover all thirty-one points in Lonergan's heuristic structure. However, of central importance is what he calls "new conjugate forms" required in the human intellect, will, and sensitivity.⁴⁷ A conjugate form is essentially a "habit," as understood by Aquinas. These habits will be supernatural: faith, hope, and charity. These habits allow the human intellect and will to apprehend and cooperate with God's solution to the problem of evil. But what of human sensitivity? Lonergan says that although the solution will be implemented primarily in our intellect and will through the habits of faith, hope, and charity, the solution must also penetrate to the sensitive level of human living, since the exercise of human intelligence presupposes "a suitable flow of sensitive and imaginative presentations."⁴⁸ In other words, the solution must capture our sensitivity and intersubjectivity. Lonergan names this aspect of the solution *mystery*, since mystery is not only a symbol of the uncomprehended, not only a sign of what is grasped, but a psychic force that "sweeps living human bodies, linked in charity, to the joyful, courageous, wholehearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by a world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended."⁴⁹

Finally, we should note the importance of *Insight* for its value as a heuristic which can guide some of the questions in our interpretation of the *Supplement*. In the epilogue to *Insight*, Lonergan stated that in regard to any individual who has embraced God's

⁴⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

⁴⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

⁴⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 744.

⁴⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 745.

solution to the problem of evil, there is to be added the consideration of “cumulative historical development.”⁵⁰ How might one develop this historical aspect? He suggests this aspect has a peculiar relevance to the treatise on the mystical body of Christ, and that this treatise would be incomplete if it fails to draw upon a theory of history.⁵¹ Statements such as this give us a clue into the thought of Lonergan on the intersection of redemption and history, aside from what he says in the *Supplement*. All of Lonergan’s contributions on redemption, and particularly *Insight*, can serve as a heuristic to ask the right questions in our interpretation of the *Supplement*. To this end, when we come to his final chapter, I will explicitly interpret how Lonergan understands history itself as a preliminary question before I attempt to interpret his understanding of Christ’s historical causality presented in that chapter.

1.3.3 *De ratione convenientiae* (1954)⁵²

De ratione convenientiae was Lonergan’s first writing in Christology at the Gregorian. As was the custom of the time, Lonergan used a manual in the courses he taught. At the Gregorian he began using the manual of Charles Boyer.⁵³ *De ratione convenientiae* was intended as a supplement to Boyer’s manual. Eventually Lonergan wrote his own Christology manual, *DVI*, first published in 1960.

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 762.

⁵¹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 763.

⁵² Bernard Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae eiusque radice, de excellentia ordinis, de signis rationis systematice et universaliter ordinatis, denique de convenientia, contingentia, et fine incarnationis*. Supplementary notes for students, Gregorian University. The autograph typescript is in the archives at the Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto, File 519, A2355. The manuscript can also be found on www.bernardlonergan.com at 23550DTL050. Quotations from the text will be from the unpublished English translation, *The Notion of Fittingness: The Application of Theological Method to the Question of the Purpose of the Incarnation*, trans. Michael G. Shields, S.J. (Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute). Page numbers will reference the Latin manuscript. *De ratione convenientiae* will be published in vol. 19 of the *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*.

⁵³ Carolus Boyer, S.J., *De Verbo incarnato*, 2nd ed., *Ad usum auditorum* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1952).

The text is known from the three words beginning the title: *De ratione convenientiae*, translated as “The Notion of Fittingness.”⁵⁴ The text is divided into six parts: (1) The Notion of Fittingness, (2) The Root of Fittingness, (3) The Excellence of Order, (4) The Conceptually Distinguished Formalities, (5) The Fittingness of the Incarnation, (6) The Necessity of the Incarnation, and (7) The Purpose of the Incarnation.

De ratione convenientiae addresses the traditional scholastic question concerning the purpose of the Incarnation. In the text, Lonergan argues that the Incarnation is the “principle of the restoration of order,”⁵⁵ first and foremost “for the sake of the order of the universe, and indeed for the sake of this order according to all its concrete details, and in a special way as an order disrupted by sin and needing to be repaired by the mercy of God.”⁵⁶

The notion of “fittingness” is integral to Lonergan’s argument for the purpose of the Incarnation. This explains why he begins with the notion and root of fittingness itself. The text, as the title indicates, is concerned with how theologians apply method to the question of the purpose of the Incarnation. Having given a number of reasons why the Incarnation was not “necessary,” following the tradition of Aquinas, Lonergan gives a brief exhortation to the proper theological method for addressing the question:

From the foregoing [that is, the argument that the Incarnation was not necessary] it is clear how important it is for a theologian to have a good grasp of the notion of fittingness. For since fittingness implies intelligibility in the proper sense and yet an intelligibility that is in no way necessary, a theologian can inquire into the appropriate reasons for things and understand them without in any way infringing upon God’s freedom and the gratuitousness of the supernatural order.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ I am referring to the title of the unpublished English translation provided by the Lonergan Research Institute. An alternative translation could be “On the Meaning of Fittingness” as translated by Frederick Crowe. See Crowe, *Christ and History*, 65.

⁵⁵ Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 16.

⁵⁶ Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 18.

⁵⁷ Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 18.

Section 5, on the Fittingness of the Incarnation, is the longest section of the manuscript. In Crowe's commentary, he notes that this relatively long section "might be called a theology of history in the style of chapter 20 of *Insight*."⁵⁸ In the section Lonergan discusses three principles which govern the entire movement of human history: our intellectual nature, our defectable human will, and the help of a merciful God.⁵⁹ The three principles correspond to the triad of progress-decline-redemption, Lonergan's basic structure of history, which he elaborated in chapter 20 of *Insight*. Furthermore, Lonergan lists four elements of the solution to the problem of the reign of sin: (1) a revelation accepted through faith in God, (2) hope of a life to come, (3) charity, and (4) mystery. These four elements were previously listed by Lonergan in his heuristic for a solution to the problem of evil in chapter 20 of *Insight*. The correlation is not surprising. Lonergan finished *Insight* in 1953, though it was not published until 1957. *De ratione convenientiae* would have been composed only a short time later, after Lonergan finished *Insight* and headed to Rome.⁶⁰

In terms of chronology and thought, *De ratione convenientiae* may be viewed as an intermediate work between the *Pantōn* essay of 1935 and the *Supplement* of 1958:

This *opusculum* [*De ratione convenientiae*] has some importance for the mediating role it might play in Lonergan's thought, namely, between 1935 and the unfinished work on historical causality in the work I am calling *de bono*...The mediation found in chronology matches that found in thought. The dialectic of history and the restoration of world order through Christ are in continuity with the themes of the *pantōn* paper on one side (1935) and with the more systematic treatment of *de bono* on the other (1958 – as I shall argue). In between we have *de ratione convenientiae* (1954) with its three-tiered structure of history...⁶¹

⁵⁸ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 66.

⁵⁹ Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 9.

⁶⁰ Lonergan worked on *Insight* from 1949 to 1953 while teaching at the Jesuit Seminary in Toronto. In 1952 he became aware that he would be reassigned to the Gregorian University in Rome in 1953. He decided to 'round off' his work on *Insight* before going to Rome. *Insight* however was not published until 1957. See Lonergan, "Insight Revisited," *A Second Collection*, 268.

⁶¹ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 68.

1.3.4 The Lecture on Redemption (1958)

On September 25, 1958, Lonergan gave a lecture on redemption as part of a course titled “The God of Christian Teaching” at the Thomas More Institute in Montreal.⁶² Assuming the *Supplement* was completed in May of 1958, this lecture represents his next contribution on redemption from a chronological perspective.

The lecture outlines some general features of the intelligibility of redemption. As with any intelligibility, the intelligibility of redemption is “some act of the mind, some act of understanding.”⁶³ *What* is grasped when one understands is named an intelligibility.

Lonergan lists five aspects in the intelligibility of redemption: (1) while the redemption is intelligible, it is not a necessity, since intelligibility is not the same as necessity; (2) the intelligibility is a dynamic intelligibility, meaning that it is not a matter of deductive thought, but rather dialectical thought: the fundamental element in the drama of redemption is the reversal of roles described in the New Testament, where the fundamental reversal is that death, the penalty of sin, has through Christ become the means of redemption; (3) the intelligibility is an incarnate intelligibility, which means that it is not abstract; (4) the intelligibility is a complex intelligibility, where “complex” denotes that the intelligibility of redemption must take into account the category of sin, which in itself is unintelligible; and (5) the intelligibility is a multiple intelligibility.

⁶² Transcribed and first published in *Bernard Lonergan: 3 Lectures*, edited with introduction by R. Eric O’Connor (Montreal: Thomas More Institute), 1-28. For the latest edition see Bernard Lonergan, “The Redemption,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1958-1964*, vol. 6 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 3-28.

⁶³ Lonergan, “The Redemption,” 8.

The fifth point on “multiple intelligibility” needs clarification. What Lonergan means can be clarified by understanding his appropriation of Aquinas, specifically q. 48, articles 1 – 4, 6, in the *tertia pars* of the *Summa Theologiae*. In this series of articles, Aquinas explains how Christ’s passion brings about our salvation. Aquinas does not attempt to explain this in a single formula. He is satisfied to explain it under five different aspects: 1) by way of merit, 2) by way of satisfaction, 3) by way of sacrifice, 4) by way of redemption, and 5) by way of efficient causality.⁶⁴ Charles Hefling rightly notes that Aquinas’s five aspects are not simply disconnected *sententiae*, “but neither do they have a clearly intelligible unity.”⁶⁵

During this lecture in 1958, Lonergan cautioned against forcing the mystery of redemption into a single, unified viewpoint. He acknowledged the legitimacy of Aquinas’s approach. However, in an ironic twist, in the last section of the lecture he then suggests how one might approach a unified view.⁶⁶ In the published transcription of the lecture, an editorial note explains that Lonergan’s caution against a unified view is not a contradiction with his own attempt at that unified view.⁶⁷ Lonergan inherited Aquinas’s “multiple intelligibility.” But Lonergan’s own habitual orientation was always to strive for a unified understanding of redemption.

In the lecture he states that the fundamental category for a unified view is the category of *mystery*. Here *mystery* is not a truth that we cannot adequately understand in this life, but mystery in the sense of the New Testament narrative: the secret counsel of

⁶⁴ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* (hereafter *ST*), *Tertia Pars*, q. 48, aa. 1-4, 6.

⁶⁵ Charles Hefling, “Lonergan’s *Cur Deus Homo*: Revisiting the ‘Law of the Cross,’” in *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, S.J.*, ed. John D. Dadosky (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2009), 163.

⁶⁶ Lonergan, “The Redemption,” *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1958-1964*, 24.

⁶⁷ Lonergan, “The Redemption,” *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1958-1964*, 14, n. 26. Hefling states that this long editorial note is anonymous, but he is of the opinion that its manner and content strongly suggest Crowe’s authorship. See Hefling, “Lonergan’s *Cur Deus Homo*,” 163, n. 13.

God. His clue to a unified view of redemption is to notice how the New Testament relates the “secret counsel of God” to a number of antitheses: the comparison of the first Adam and second Adam, the transformation of death into new life and the means of salvation, the transition from an old covenant to a new covenant. Lonergan would indeed provide his own unified understanding of redemption, what he called the “Law of the Cross.” He provided this in chapter 4 of the *Supplement*, and in Thesis 17 of *DVI*.

1.3.5 Theses 15-17 of *De Verbo Incarnato*

DVI was originally published in 1960, with new editions in 1961 and 1964. Other than the *Supplement*, Lonergan’s most extensive treatment of redemption is found in Theses 15-17 in *DVI*, the last section collectively titled “Redemption.”

The purpose of Thesis 15 is to establish the certitude of the doctrine of redemption by appealing to the New Testament. Thesis 15 is not concerned with systematic understanding. The thesis states that redemption denotes not only an end but also a mediation on the part of Christ’s suffering, death, and resurrection. Lonergan categorizes this mediation in terms of (1) a price that has been paid, (2) Christ the Mediator’s vicarious suffering and death for sinners and on account of sins, (3) the sacrifice offered by our High Priest in his own blood, (4) meritorious obedience, and (5) the power of the risen Lord and the eternal Priest’s intercession.

In a scholion near the end of Thesis 15, Lonergan recalls that Aquinas listed five modes or effects of how Christ’s passion brings about salvation: 1) by way of merit, 2) by way of satisfaction, 3) by way of sacrifice, 4) by way of redemption (price paid, ransom),

and 5) by way of efficient causality.⁶⁸ Lonergan correlates each of Aquinas's articles to one of his own categories in Thesis 15.

At the end of the thesis, Lonergan states that the several modes and effects of redemption are "so deeply settled in Catholic thought that it is scarcely necessary to add to what the Angelic Doctor wrote. When it comes to satisfaction, however, opinions differ. Accordingly we present next a separate thesis on it."⁶⁹

Thesis 16 is Lonergan's systematic speculation on the meaning of Christ's satisfaction.⁷⁰ Lonergan does incorporate the fact of "punishment" into his understanding of Christ's satisfaction, but not in the context of retributive justice. He argues that the context is one of pardon sought and granted. In this context, Christ's satisfaction is his voluntary taking on of suffering and death to express his detestation and sorrow over the sins of the human race, resulting in the forgiveness of sin and reconciliation between God and sinners. Thus Christ's satisfaction was *vicarious*, and his motivation was charity.

Since Lonergan holds that systematic understanding of the mysteries of faith is imperfect and analogical, he seeks out the proper analogy. For Lonergan, the proper analogy to grasp the intelligibility of Christ's satisfaction is the sacrament of penance, first suggested by the Council of Trent. However, Trent did not develop the analogy. Lonergan considers that the intelligible context to understand Christ's satisfaction has more similarity to interpersonal relationships than commercial transactions, so he invites the reader to see the reasonableness of using the analogy of the sacrament of penance to understand the intelligibility of Christ's satisfaction. This is why Lonergan understands

⁶⁸ *ST*, III, q. 48, aa. 1-4, 6.

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 484.

⁷⁰ In Thesis 16, Lonergan included a theological note that Christ's satisfaction was presumed though not strictly defined by the Council of Trent. See Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 488.

Christ's satisfaction as an expression of the interior disposition of "detestation and sorrow." The language is straight out of Trent's teaching on the sacrament of penance, specifically on the nature of contrition.⁷¹

Thesis 16 is a systematic theology, but only with respect to the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction. It is not yet the "unified view" of redemption Lonergan is moving towards. That will come in the next thesis.

Thesis 17 is Lonergan's "unified" view of the intelligibility of redemption. In the Lonergan community, his thesis is commonly known as the "Law of the Cross" based on the phrase at the end of the thesis. Thesis 17 formally states:

This is why the Son of God became man, suffered, died, and was resurrected: because divine wisdom has ordained and divine goodness has willed not to do away with the evils of the human race through power, but to convert those evils into a supreme good according to the just and mysterious law of the cross.⁷²

Lonergan gave the title "Understanding the Mystery" to Thesis 17. In Hefling's unpublished translation, the subtitle "Law of the Cross" has been added because Lonergan often referred to his thesis in that way.⁷³ He tended to downplay his Latin theology, but he considered this thesis a valid achievement.⁷⁴ He identified the law of the cross as the "intrinsic intelligibility of redemption."⁷⁵ Lonergan himself, in a lecture given to the Canon Law Society of America, identified his thesis on the *lex crucis* as the strictly theological component of the dynamic structure of human history.⁷⁶

⁷¹ DB 897, DS 1676, ND 1622.

⁷² Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 532.

⁷³ See note 1 of Thesis 17, Hefling's translation.

⁷⁴ Charles Hefling, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement: Lonergan on Christ's Satisfaction," *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 10 (1992).

⁷⁵ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 576.

⁷⁶ Bernard Lonergan, "Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness," *Second Collection*, 7.

The law of the cross is a principle of transformation in which evils are transformed into a supreme good. This supreme good is a new *community*. The supreme good is the “whole Christ, head and members, in this life as well as in the life to come, in all their concrete determinations and relations.”⁷⁷ The law of the cross is a law embodied and revealed in Christ, but it is also a precept addressed to Christian disciples. In summary, Thesis 17 amounts to Lonergan’s systematic, unified intelligibility of redemption. The law of the cross is without doubt the most well-known and most widely researched aspect of Lonergan’s soteriology.

1.4 The History of Research on the *Supplement*

There has not yet been a complete interpretation of the *Supplement*. Perhaps the closest we have is a chapter devoted to the *Supplement* by Frederick Crowe in *Christ and History*.⁷⁸ The scope of Crowe’s project in this book did not allow him to give a full interpretation of Lonergan’s *Supplement*.

Bernard Arputhasamy studied the *Supplement* in order to explicate the fundamental meaning of Lonergan’s notion of the “Law of the Cross.”⁷⁹ Although Arputhasamy’s principal text was the *Supplement*, his research focused only on the law of the cross discussed in chapter 4.

In the most recent dissertation on Lonergan’s theology of redemption, Mark Miller also offers an interpretation of Lonergan.⁸⁰ The goal of his dissertation was to

⁷⁷ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 553.

⁷⁸ Crowe, *Christ and History*, chapter 9.

⁷⁹ Bernard Hyacinth Arputhasamy, S.J., “Redemption: Understanding Lonergan's Fundamental Meaning of the Law of the Cross as the Transformation of Evil into Good,” Th.M., Regis College, Toronto, 2005.

⁸⁰ Mark T. Miller, “Why the Passion? Bernard Lonergan on the Cross as Communication,” PhD diss., Boston College, 2008.

interpret Lonergan's understanding of how the passion of Jesus Christ is salvific. However, Miller does not treat the *Supplement*.

Charles Hefling has interpreted a section of the *Supplement*, specifically an interpretation of article 45, chapter 6, where Lonergan takes up Anselm's question, *Cur Deus Homo?* He presented the essay at the 35th annual Lonergan Workshop at Boston College in June 2008. The essay was subsequently published in the *Festschrift* honoring Robert Doran.⁸¹

1.5 Method and Outline of the Study

Methodologically, my research is an interpretation of Lonergan, where *interpretation* is understood within the theological method of Bernard Lonergan himself. For Lonergan, theological method is divided into eight functional specialties: research, interpretation, history, dialectic, foundations, doctrines, systematics, and communications.⁸² Interpretation has as its own proper end to understand what was meant in the material one is interpreting. The task of interpretation is thus to communicate what was meant. The intent is to grasp "meaning in its proper historical context, in accord with its proper mode and level of thought and expression, in the light of circumstances and intention of the writer....its product is the commentary or monograph."⁸³

Within Lonergan's functional specialties, systematics and interpretation both aim at understanding. The purpose of systematics is to seek the imperfect and analogical

⁸¹ Charles Hefling, "Lonergan's *Cur Deus Homo*: Revisiting the 'Law of the Cross,'" in *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, S.J.*, ed. John D. Damosky (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2009).

⁸² For a concise description of Lonergan's functional specialties, see *Method in Theology*, 125-145.

⁸³ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 127.

understanding of the mysteries of faith already judged to be true through faith. Where systematics seeks to understand the mysteries of faith (expressed in doctrines), interpretation seeks to understand what others have understood. My study of the *Supplement*, although it involves systematic reflection, is *not* aiming to develop a systematic theology of redemption. My intent is to understand Lonergan's understanding. Since interpretation presupposes research, my work is primarily in the first two functional specialties, research and interpretation.

Based on Lonergan's description of the functional specialty interpretation,⁸⁴ my approach will seek to understand Lonergan by (1) understanding the purpose and context in which he wrote the *Supplement*, (2) understanding the text itself, where the whole of the text is understood through its parts, and the parts are understood through the whole,⁸⁵ and (3) understanding the author himself, first and foremost through the *Supplement*, but also by making connections to his other writings that are judged, in my opinion, as relevant to interpreting his understanding of the historical causality of Christ. Close consideration will be given to Lonergan's contributions to a theology of redemption, as well as his writings dealing with causality and/or history.

The dissertation will follow the order of the *Supplement*. An interpretation is a communication of meaning to a reader. Following Lonergan's order facilitates this communication. Lonergan began his *Supplement* as he did because it followed the pattern of what he, following Aquinas, called the *ordo disciplinae* or *ordo doctrinae*, the order of learning and teaching. This order is a manner of presentation that postpones solutions that presuppose knowledge of other solutions. As such, the next chapter will

⁸⁴ For Lonergan's understanding of interpretation, see *Method in Theology*, 127, 153-173.

⁸⁵ Lonergan names this dynamic between parts and whole the "hermeneutical circle." See *Method in Theology*, 159

interpret the first chapter of the *Supplement*. Each subsequent chapter correlates to a specific chapter in the *Supplement*, following Lonergan's order. In the conclusion, I will briefly summarize my interpretation of the fundamental themes in Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ. I will include there a hypothesis of the *Supplement's* relation to *De Verbo Incarnato*, as well as a brief interpretation of the practical orientation of the *Supplement* and how this orientation sheds light on a contributing factor relating to Lonergan's motivation to write the text.

CHAPTER 2: GOOD AND EVIL

2.1 Introduction

Our purpose here is to interpret the first chapter of the *Supplement*, titled “Good and Evil.”¹ The first chapter of the *Supplement* is divided into eight articles: (1) On the Good in General; (2) The Human Good of Order; (3) Communication: Signs and Symbols; (4) The Comparison of Goods; (5) Evil; (6) From Evil, Good; (7) Human Powerlessness; and (8) Original Sin.

Lonergan’s intent to understand the historical causality of Christ has its biblical roots in the Pauline conception of the *pantōn anakephalaiōsis* (Eph. 1:9-10). Chapter 1 includes two introductory paragraphs prior to the first article.

To us has been revealed the hidden plan of God's will, ‘to gather all creation both in heaven and on earth under one head, Christ’ (Ephesians 1.9-10). While it is hardly surprising that we here below have little inkling about how heavenly things might be gathered in Christ, it would seem to be a rather more serious matter if we were to neglect the question of how earthly realities are to be brought together, especially since it is our duty to work with ‘the one who holds the whole building together and makes it grow into a sacred temple in the Lord’ (Ephesians 2.21).

Accordingly, we have decided that careful consideration must be given to inquiring, first, about the nature of the good, how the human good is located especially in order, by what law the human good of order is corrupted by sin, and finally what human resources there are for restoring the human good of order. If we have well understood these things, we shall have a deeper and more fruitful understanding of how important in addressing any and all of our contemporary problems is the great gift that God our Father has bestowed upon us in the Holy Spirit through our Lord Jesus Christ crucified and risen.²

¹ “Caput Primum. DE BONO ET MALO,” *DBM*, 1-65 [*Supplement*, 1-27].

² “Notum nobis factum est divinae voluntatis sacramentum ‘omnia in Christo instaurare sive quae in caelis sive quae in terris sunt in ipso’ (Eph 1, 9.10). Quod si his in terris parum perspicimus quemadmodum caelestia in Christo instaurantur, haud forte mirandum est. Sed gravius esse videtur si pariter praetermittimus quemadmodum instaurantur ipsa terrestria, cum nostri sit collaborare ut omnis aedificatio constructa crescat in templum sanctum in Domino (Eph 2, 21). Quam ob causam diligenter imprimis considerandum esse duximus quale sit bonum, quemadmodum humanum bonum praecipue in ordine ponatur, qua lege humanum ordinis bonum peccato corrumpatur, quaenam denique sit humana potentia ad humanum ordinis bonum restaurandum. Haec enim si perspecta habuerimus, et plenius et fructuosius intelligemus, quanti momenti sit in omnibus et singulis hodiernae vitae problematibus magnum illud Dei Patris beneficium, quod per Dominum nostrum crucifixum et resurrectum in sancto Spiritu accepimus.” *DBM*, 1 [*Supplement*, 1].

Lonergan's strategy is to consider good and evil in terms of three movements: how the human good is located especially in order, how the human good of order is corrupted by evil, and the potential for restoring the human good of order. Readers familiar with Lonergan's interest in history may immediately identify this as a correlation to his theological analysis of history, commonly articulated as a threefold approximation of progress, decline, and redemption.³ The first approximation, progress, assumes that human beings always do what is intelligent and reasonable. The second approximation, decline, acknowledge the fact of sin, that human beings are biased and so do what is unintelligent and unreasonable. The third approximation is the redemptive process from God's gift of his grace to individuals and from the manifestation of his love in Christ Jesus.⁴ Lonergan presented this whole idea in chapter 20 of *Insight* where he developed his heuristic structure of the solution to the problem of evil.

Any *single* approximation in Lonergan's theological analysis of history does not explain reality in the concrete, actual sense. Each approximation is an abstraction of a particular aspect of reality. Reality is explained when all three are considered together. Now Lonergan's threefold approximation is essentially a transposition of the theological categories of nature, sin, and grace into a historical context, resulting in an anthropology that distinguishes, yet combines, two components of concrete human reality: a constant

³ The roots of Lonergan's theological analysis of history go back to the 1930s. Borrowing from Newton's planetary theory which included three approximations to explain the actual movement of planets, Lonergan developed a theological analysis of human history, based on the three approximations of progress, decline, and redemption. See Bernard Lonergan, "Insight Revisited," *Second Collection*, 271-272. The caveat here is that the *Supplement's* inquiry into "what human resources there are for restoring the human good of order" does not correspond perfectly to redemption understood in the supernatural sense. Since Lonergan will explicitly consider the doctrine of redemption in chapters 3-6, it makes sense that he would not fully explore redemption in this first chapter.

⁴ Lonergan, "Insight Revisited," 272.

human nature and a variable human history. “Nature is given man at birth. Historicity is what man makes of man.”⁵

The present chapter is essentially organized according to the three approximations of progress, decline, and restoration, albeit our treatment of restoration will not correspond to a treatment of the doctrine of redemption, for the reasons previously stated.⁶ Furthermore, we include a section to interpret how this chapter functions as a starting point for the *Supplement*. In that section one of our aims is to briefly interpret the function of Lonergan’s first chapter in the wider context of the *Supplement*. In citations from Lonergan’s text, I include page references to the original Latin and the English translation. The former will be cited as *De bono et malo* (abbreviated *DBM*). The latter will be cited as the *Supplement*. Lonergan numbered the first 179 pages of *DBM*. References to *DBM*, from page 180 on, will include an asterisk.

2.2 A Brief Description of Articles 1 - 8

2.2.1 Article 1: On the Good in General⁷

The first article is a metaphysical consideration of the good. Lonergan makes seven major points: (1) all good is being; (2) good denotes something concrete; (3) good denotes all things; (4) since only God is good by essence, all other things are good by participation; (5) since only God is good by essence, we can only understand, conceive, and know the good imperfectly and analogically; (6) there are two ways of considering created good: particular goods and good of order. The former refers to things desired.

⁵ Bernard Lonergan “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” *A Third Collection, Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe, S.J. (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 170.

⁶ See note 3.

⁷ “Articulus I. De Bono in Genere,” *DBM*, 2-6 [*Supplement*, 1-3].

The latter refers to the concrete dynamic whole which includes the desire, the desirer, the means of attainment, and enjoyment of the good obtained; (7) there are three ways of considering the good of order: (a) abstract; (b) schematic, typical, and hypothetical; (c) actual. The actual order is the one divine wisdom infallibly knows, divine goodness has effectively chosen, and divine power irresistibly implements.⁸ Lonergan's first three points are all logical deductions from the metaphysical axiom that "'Good' and 'being' are convertible terms..."⁹ The next two are based on the doctrine that only God is good by essence. Lonergan's source for these first five points is likely Aquinas.¹⁰

Lonergan concludes the article with three doctrines from Aquinas: (1) divine wisdom orders all things, the divine decree wills all things, and divine power effects *one* world order;¹¹ (2) the purpose of the universe is the good existing in the universe, and this good is the order of the universe itself;¹² (3) the universe as a whole is a more perfect participation and reflection of divine goodness than any individual creature.¹³

⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 2-5 [*Supplement*, 2-3].

⁹ "Nam ens et bonum convertuntur;" *DBM*, 2 [*Supplement*, 1]. Evidently the Latin phrase *ens et bonum convertuntur* (being and good are convertible) became a standard phrase in the thirteenth century, although various authors gave different interpretations and formulations. See Jorge J. E. Gracia, "Evil and Transcendentality of Goodness: Suárez's Solution to the Problem of Positive Evils," in *Being and Goodness: The Concept of the Good in Metaphysics and Philosophical Theology*, ed. Scott MacDonald (Cornell University: Cornell University Press, 1991), 152.

¹⁰ In the epilogue to *Insight*, Lonergan states that he had spent "years reaching up to the mind of Aquinas..." See *Insight*, 769. He was referring to the eleven years of his investigations into the thought of Thomas, first on *gratia operans* (the topic of his dissertation) and second on his investigation into Thomas's thought on Trinitarian theory, resulting in the series of *verbum* articles published in *Theological Studies* in the 1940s, subsequently published as *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*. Aquinas's doctrine on the convertibility of being and good is found in *ST I*, q. 5, a. 1. Being and good are really the same, differing only in idea. Goodness presents the aspect of desirableness (*rationem appetibilis*) of being, whereas being *qua* being does not. Thomas's doctrine that only God is good by essence is found in *ST I*, q. 6, a. 3.

¹¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 6 [*Supplement*, 3]. *ST I*, q. 47, a. 3 c.

¹² Lonergan, *DBM*, 6 [*Supplement*, 3]. *ST I*, q. 103, a. 2 ad 3m.

¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 6 [*Supplement*, 3]. *ST I*, q. 47, a. 1 c.

2.2.2 Article 2: The Human Good of Order¹⁴

The second article shifts focus to the human good. The article is divided into three subsections: (1) the good of order in human affairs, (2) how the human good of order progresses, and (3) the meaning of “higher culture.”

The Good of Order in Human Affairs: Human beings are born into an existing good of order, but through their reason and will they establish and improve their own good of order through historical process.¹⁵ They do this because they desire particular goods in a recurrent manner. Working individually, human beings cannot establish a good of order. So they form societies. Through collaboration and cooperation they establish a human good of order that provides particular goods in a recurrent manner.¹⁶ The human good of order includes the family, the economy, and the polity.¹⁷

How the Human Good of Order Progresses: When a critical history analyzes the good of order in human societies, across time and across space, we discover great diversity. This diversity reveals the fact of progress. For Lonergan the cause of progress is not found so much in external circumstances as in intellectual development.¹⁸ The human intellect is always critiquing the situation and imagining new possibilities. If a situation is improved, the cycle begins anew. So there is a circular movement to

¹⁴ “Articulus II. De Bono Ordinis Humano,” *DBM*, 6-17 [*Supplement*, 3-8].

¹⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 6 [*Supplement*, 3-4].

¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 7 [*Supplement*, 4].

¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 7 [*Supplement*, 4]. Here Lonergan does not mention the technological order, but he includes this a bit later in the *Supplement* in the section on “higher culture,” *DBM* 12 [*Supplement*, 6]. In general, Lonergan divides the external human good into domestic matters, technology, economy, and polity.

¹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 8 [*Supplement*, 5].

progress. “There is no intrinsic reason why this progressive cycle should end, since the mind by its very nature is said to be that which can make and become all things.”¹⁹

Lonergan identifies two aspects of the human good of order: (1) A *general structure* independent of time and place. Always and everywhere people desire a flow of particular goods, they collaborate to create an order to make this possible, and this collaboration creates interpersonal relationships; (2) An *intrinsic principle of change*; improvements continually take place as the result of insights and communal decisions.²⁰

This intrinsic principle of change is Aristotle’s insight that human nature is “that which can make and become all things.”²¹ If this principle is understood, factors that distinguish primitive cultures from higher cultures can be explained genetically.²² “If such genetic explanation is valid, we may readily grasp both the importance of an historical understanding of reality and the nature of what is called ‘human solidarity.’”²³

A historical understanding of reality, based on genetic explanation, grasps a general theorem that the human good of order has been built up gradually through history from the insights and communal decisions of human beings. Human solidarity reveals that the human good of order is an immense accumulation of insights, discoveries, and decisions of the past. Virtually everything we learn is through this good of order.²⁴

¹⁹ “Neque huic motui circulari atque progressivo intrinsecus quidam imponitur finis, cum ipsa sua natura intellectus dicatur quo sit omnia facere et fieri.” *DBM*, 9 [*Supplement*, 5]. In the Latin text Lonergan does not give a citation for this statement. Aristotle made the statement in *De Anima*. In the unpublished English translation, Shields has added a footnote referencing *De Anima*, 430a 14-15.

²⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 9-10 [*Supplement*, 5]. Note: Lonergan is explaining *one* factor of social change, progress. In a later article he will consider the decline of the social order due to evil.

²¹ “...quo sit omnia facere et fieri...” *DBM*, 10 [*Supplement*, 5].

²² Lonergan, *DBM*, 10 [*Supplement*, 5].

²³ “Quod si valet genetica eiusmodi explicatio, statim concludi potest tum quanti momenti sit historica rerum intelligentia tum in quonam consistat humana quae dicitur solidaritas.” *DBM*, 10 [*Supplement*, 5].

²⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 11 [*Supplement*, 6].

The Meaning of Higher Culture: In this section Lonergan distinguishes a third aspect of the human good of order, the cultural good. The cultural good is grounded in four innate human desires: (1) the natural desire to understand, (2) the natural desire for rectitude and for moral consistency between reason and will, (3) the natural desire for happiness, and (4) the natural desire for immortality. In addition to these innate desires, human nature includes a “remarkable elevation of feeling” (*mira illa sentimentorum elevatio*) and a “polymorphous sensibility” (*sensibilitatis plasticitas*) revealing us to be embodied spirits more than animals who have the use of reason.²⁵ The cultural good is an “internal” good of order, so Lonergan qualifies that the human good of order he has been describing thus far is the “external good of order” (*bonum humanum exterius*).²⁶

Human beings are motivated to satisfy their innate desires. They can proceed via two routes: (1) the mystical route of withdrawal, or (2) engagement with society. The latter has two stages: primitive society and a more highly developed culture.²⁷

Primitive cultures are not inferior to higher cultures. Both seek particular goods. Both develop a good of order. Both exhibit a concern with spiritual realities. Both use signs. Higher cultures, however, reflect on their signs. This reflection develops into a technical elaboration of signs in the fields of grammar, rhetoric, logic, semantics, and criteriology. This allows natural intellectual desire to acquire accurate knowledge of

²⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 12 [*Supplement*, 6].

²⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 12 [*Supplement*, 6]. The Latin text suggests that this could also be translated as “external human good.”

²⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 13 [*Supplement*, 6]. At times Lonergan uses the term “higher culture” (*cultura superior*) to refer to more highly developed cultures. Lonergan gives no source for the term *cultura superior*. A likely source is Christopher Dawson’s *The Age of the Gods*, which Lonergan read in 1930. The term “higher culture” is a specific term employed by Dawson to analyze cultural development. See Dawson, *The Age of the Gods: A Study of the Origins of Culture in Prehistoric Europe and the Ancient East* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1933), xiii, *passim*. First published in 1928.

natural realities, and analogical knowledge of spiritual realities.²⁸ Without the technical elaboration of signs, there would be little or no sharing of insights required for cultural progress. Since the principal distinguishing factor of higher culture is the reflection on signs, Lonergan states that higher culture resides in the intellect and will. As such, higher culture, due to its superior power, influences all the judgments and choices through which the external good of order develops.²⁹ Lonergan ends the article noting that down through the ages, cultural development is often obscured by great evils.³⁰

2.2.3 Article 3: Communication: Signs and Symbols³¹

Without the power and efficacy of signs all collaborative effort, all tradition, and all progress would disappear.³² Lonergan identifies four fundamental principles in the nature of signs: (1) concretion, (2) conformity, (3) information, and (4) mediation.

Concretion refers to the concrete nature of signification: signs are communicated from one person to another.³³ Conformity refers to a connection in sensibilities between persons who communicate.³⁴ There are degrees of conformity. Some signs communicate knowledge. Others evoke sympathy, compassion, or involvement. Information refers to a conformity between persons in their mutual understanding, judgment, and desires. When these three are operative, the community is said to be of “one mind and heart” (*animam et cor unum*) and virtually certain to will and choose the same things.³⁵

²⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 14-15 [*Supplement*, 7].

²⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 16-17 [*Supplement*, 8].

³⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 17 [*Supplement*, 8].

³¹ “Articulus III. De Signis,” *DBM*, 18-23 [*Supplement*, 8-10].

³² Lonergan, *DBM*, 18 [*Supplement*, 8].

³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 18 [*Supplement*, 8].

³⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 19 [*Supplement*, 8].

³⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 20 [*Supplement*, 9].

Mediation refers to mediums of communication. The human body is foremost and tends to be immediate. Verbal and written communications are mediated.³⁶

Lonergan ends the article describing a far more perfect kind of sign: God's Word-made-flesh. Through his flesh Christ communicates what belongs to his human nature and his divine person. Christ's signs also comprise the elements of concreteness, conformity, information, and mediation, but they differ by reason of their pre-eminent dignity. Whatever the human spirit can do, Christ can do more effectively. Thus Christ's signs and all other signs are related analogically. However, both possess instrumentality for advancing the external good of order as well as interior development of the mind and the steadfastness of the will. But whereas human signs bring about an earthly commonwealth, the mystery of the incarnate Word establishes, promotes and brings to fulfillment the kingdom of God.³⁷

2.2.4 Article 4: The Comparison of Goods³⁸

Lonergan begins with a Thomistic doctrine that God can do absolutely everything that does not involve an internal contradiction.³⁹ It is the function of divine wisdom to set things in order. As such, there are as many possible orders of reality (or worlds) as

³⁶ Readers may see an equivalence here to Lonergan's distinction between the world of immediacy (the world of an infant, for example) and a larger world mediated by meaning. See Lonergan, "Existenz and Aggiornamento," *Collection*, vol. 4 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 224-225; "Dimensions of Meaning," *Collection*, 232-233; *Method in Theology*, 76-77.

³⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 23 [*Supplement*, 10].

³⁸ "Articulus IV. De Comparatione Bonorum," *DBM*, 24-28 [*Supplement*, 10-12].

³⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 24 [*Supplement*, 10]. There is no reference to Aquinas, but the principle is found in *ST*, I, q. 25, a. 3. This doctrine is significant in Lonergan's systematic theology. He mentions the doctrine in a number of other works. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 653; *De Verbo Incarnato*, 513, 554; *De ratione convenientiae*, 3; "The Natural Desire to See God," *Collection*, 88; "Lecture 1: Philosophy of God," *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1965-1980*, vol. 17 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 166. The *Supplement* itself includes at least five additional references: *DBM*, 78, 93, 112, 168, *185 [*Supplement*, 32, 38, 46, 69, 77].

required for the ordering of all possible beings. And since the end of creation is to manifest divine goodness, wisdom cannot fall short of attaining its end. Any possible world is so “sagaciously ordered by divine wisdom” (*sollerter per divinam sapientiam*) that it may be chosen by divine goodness as a manifestation of this goodness.⁴⁰

Lonergan uses the metaphysical elements of potency, form, and act to designate the order of created good. The potential element is in any possible being. The formal element is the wise ordering of things. The actual element, or value, is its suitability to an end and worthiness to be chosen. Whatever is found in created good is necessarily present in human goods, so human goods can also be divided according to the potential, formal, and actual elements. The potential element is particular goods. The formal element is the external good of order. The actual element, value, is the cultural good.⁴¹ There is a hierarchy among these three levels.⁴² The external good of order is superior to particular goods since it enables particular goods to be had in a continuous fashion. Cultural good is superior to the external good of order. Cultural good aims at wisdom and goodness, and through values directs the external good of order toward progress.

Human beings are originated goods, created by God. But since we are made in the image and likeness of God, by virtue of our imagination, intelligence, and choice we participate in the divine perfection to the degree that we are also originators of goods. This corresponds to the notion of personal value in *Method*.⁴³

⁴⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 24 [*Supplement*, 11].

⁴¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 24 [*Supplement*, 11].

⁴² Lonergan, *DBM*, 25 [*Supplement*, 11]. This hierarchy anticipates what later in *Method in Theology* will be the first three levels in Lonergan’s “scale of values.” See *Method in Theology*, 31-32.

⁴³ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 32. The person as originator of good would also seem to correspond to Lonergan’s notion of ethical value in the 1959 Cincinnati lectures on the philosophy of education, given at Xavier University in August of that year. A transcription has been published as *Topics in Education*. See Bernard Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, vol.10 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 37-38.

In so far as we strive to maintain and improve the cultural good, we desire

(a) a human imagination that can represent accurately what intelligence conceives as good, (b) skills and knowledge to wisely order particular goods and also spiritual goods, and (c) human wisdom and goodness that knows and wills better orders. Wisdom and goodness are to be preferred to the others based on their intrinsic dignity and consequences. The wiser and better we are, the more perfectly we express the image of the triune God. Due to intrinsic excellence of wisdom and goodness, there is an interior order in the human person where our sensitive part is subordinated to reason, and reason subordinated to God.⁴⁴ This interior order is of utmost value.⁴⁵ The interior order corresponds to the notion of religious value in *Method*.⁴⁶ We are not left to our natural powers to attain our end, the divine goodness itself: “in the actual state of things it is by the infused gifts of grace and by these alone that we are set aright and in good order, constituted adopted sons of God and temples of the Holy Spirit, with personal access to God the Father.”⁴⁷

Lonergan concludes the article emphasizing the importance of interpersonal relationships. Interpersonal relationships have the most bearing on the collaboration and cooperation that preserves and develops the external good of order and the cultural good. But Lonergan makes a distinction. There are interpersonal relationships among human beings, and then there are interpersonal relationships between human beings and God.

⁴⁴ It is reasonable to conclude that Lonergan’s source for this interior order is Aquinas, based on an editorial comment in *Topics in Education*. In the Cincinnati lectures Lonergan refers to this interior order and an editorial note reads: “Lonergan added that these are the terms employed in the Augustinian and Thomist account of justification, of the state of sanctifying grace, and he [Lonergan] referred to Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 1-2, q. 113, a. 1.” See *Topics in Education*, 38, n. 33.

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 24-27 [*Supplement*, 10-12].

⁴⁶ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 32.

⁴⁷ “... in actuali tamen rerum statu ex infusis gratiae donis iisque solis ita rectus ordinatusque homo efficitur, ut filius Dei adoptivus constitutus, et Spiritus sancti templum existens, accessum personalem ad Deum Patrem habeat.” *DBM*, 28 [*Supplement*, 12].

The latter preserve and perfect the cultural good through sanctifying grace. Through actual graces we exercise and develop within ourselves the image of the triune God.⁴⁸

2.2.5 Article 5: Evil⁴⁹

Lonergan begins with the metaphysical principle that evil is the opposite of the good. Since good signifies being, then evil has no positive reality.⁵⁰ Because evil is the opposite of good, then evil is divided into originating and originated evil. Originated evil includes particular evils, the evil of order, and cultural evil.⁵¹ The evil of order denotes a steady series of particular evils, a breakdown in action and coordination, blocking of coordination through crime or incompetent institutions, and breakdown in personal relationships. Cultural evil leads people from spiritual concerns to exclusively material concerns and undermines the unity of minds and hearts by imposing on society an outward uniformity by force, economic deprivation, or insidious psychological means.⁵²

Originating evil is the cause of all originated evils. Originating evil is linked to any deficiencies in imagination, intelligence, and rational freedom.⁵³ Among these deficiencies, the worst is the failure of that which is best, rational consciousness.⁵⁴

As with progress, there is a circular movement in the phenomenon of decline.⁵⁵

The failure of rational freedom corrupts the external situation and the corrupt external

⁴⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 28 [*Supplement*, 12].

⁴⁹ "Articulus V. De Malo," *DBM*, 29-42 [*Supplement*, 13-17].

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 29 [*Supplement*, 13].

⁵¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 29 [*Supplement*, 13].

⁵² Lonergan, *DBM*, 29-30 [*Supplement*, 13].

⁵³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 30 [*Supplement*, 13].

⁵⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 33 [*Supplement*, 14]. Here Lonergan switches from the previous term *rationalem libertatem* (rational freedom) to *rationalis conscientia* (rational consciousness). In each case he is referring to the cognitional activities of (1) rational comparison of the orders understood by intelligence, (2) a judgment of value (evaluation) which discerns that one order is preferred to the others in terms of its suitability to the end and worthiness to be chosen, and (3) decision (choice) to effect the implementation of the order judged as preferred.

situation influences the intellect. Since the corrupt situation is absurd, the intellect cannot find intelligibility in the situation. Intelligence, finding no intelligibility, substitutes one unintelligible situation for another. The intellect itself becomes infected and in turn prevents rational freedom from acting on the situation.

Decline in the external good of order does not leave cultural good untainted. Culture and life, theory and praxis, the ideal and the real, become alien to each other. Culture adapts to life, theory to praxis, and the ideal is dismissed as a dream or a myth.⁵⁶ “Just like the external good of order, cultural good also is subject both to the law of decline and the law of progress.”⁵⁷ Worst among the damage done to the cultural good is cultural aberration that confuses evil for good, true for false, and hides its own corruption. Cultural evil can spread its corruption through a society, disseminating falsity under the guise of truth.⁵⁸

2.2.6 Article 6: From Evil, Good⁵⁹

In the world there is a potency to bring good out of evil. This potency is grounded in our changeable material nature.⁶⁰ From a materialistic perspective, good is brought forth from evil in that renewal occurs through the process of death and birth.⁶¹

However, there is restoration in a truer sense when our experience of particular evils reveals to us what a better order might be and directs us to improve the external good of order and promote the cultural good. But promoting the cultural good and

⁵⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 36 [*Supplement*, 15].

⁵⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 38 [*Supplement*, 16].

⁵⁷ “Non minus quam exterius ordinis bonum, bonum etiam culturale tam legi regressus quam progressus legi subicitur.” *DBM*, 39 [*Supplement*, 16].

⁵⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 39 [*Supplement*, 16].

⁵⁹ “Articulus VI. E malis bonum,” *DBM*, 43-49 [*Supplement*, 18-20].

⁶⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18].

⁶¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18].

transforming cultural evils are two different things. Lonergan states that cultural evils call for a heaven-sent redeemer.⁶² Another way of stating this is that reflection in itself, triggered by the individual or social experience of particular evils, cannot endow us with wisdom and goodness.⁶³ We recall that for Lonergan cultural good aims at wisdom and goodness, which would explain why he judges that our own resources are not sufficient to endow us with wisdom and goodness since this would involve the transformation of cultural evil. In short, we are powerless to overcome cultural evil by our own resources. This is the emphasis in which Lonergan ends the article, preparing us for the next article on human powerlessness.

2.2.7 Article 7: Human Powerlessness⁶⁴

Our experience of particular evils leads us to improve the external good of order, and our experience of the evils of order disposes us to reflection on cultural good, while leaving us powerless to overcome cultural evil.⁶⁵ Thus Lonergan begins the seventh article by summarizing the conclusion of the sixth article. When cultural evils are not eradicated, the external human good of order is in constant decline, and ultimately the human good is totally extinguished. The reign of sin leads to death (Rom 5:21).⁶⁶

There are four root causes of our powerlessness: (1) darkness of intellect, (2) weakness of will, (3) the objective difficulty of good, and (4) alienation from God.

Darkness of Intellect: Darkness of intellect is a failure of intelligence to discern what is truly good. If the intellect does not know what is truly good, the will is not able

⁶² Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18].

⁶³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 48 [*Supplement*, 19].

⁶⁴ “Articulus VII. De impotentia humana,” *DBM*, 50-64 [*Supplement*, 21-26].

⁶⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 50 [*Supplement*, 21].

⁶⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 50 [*Supplement*, 21].

to choose the good. This darkness hinders good and spreads evil, though it may occur without subjective guilt. The solution is *learning*. However, people are not motivated to learn unless they want to because of a perceived practical advantage. Many people are so totally caught up in practical matters that the absurdity of corrupt situations is rationalized. Learning that does not square with the absurdity is pushed aside. Lonergan states it is no wonder Vatican I taught the relative necessity of divine revelation.⁶⁷

Weakness of Will: There is a distinction between the will itself, and the willingness to act. Human freedom is the essential ability to will or not to will. But between will and act there are habits and dispositions, developed through experience, which form the character of our will.⁶⁸ The weakness of will boils down to the difficulty in developing the character of one's willingness. The difficulty is exacerbated because darkness of the intellect and weakness of the will conspire to strengthen each other.⁶⁹

Objective Difficulty of the Good: Over time the social proliferation of evils means that we are going to suffer, and this suffering is not easily tolerated. We incline toward sin because we shrink from suffering. The way leading from evil, that breaks the vicious circle, is the way of the cross. Refusing to shrink from suffering denies that the absurd is absurd and therefore to be endured, resulting in an increase in evils.⁷⁰

Alienation from God. This is idolatrous thought and action: thinking and acting that we ourselves are the First Cause, and correspondingly denying that we are instruments of God to do the good intended by God.⁷¹

⁶⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 53 [*Supplement*, 22].

⁶⁸ In *Insight* this equates to "willingness." See *Insight*, 646.

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 54-59 [*Supplement*, 22-24].

⁷⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 60-61 [*Supplement*, 25].

⁷¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 63 [*Supplement*, 25-26].

2.2.8 Article 8: Original Sin⁷²

This is the briefest article in the chapter, one page in the Latin text. The root causes of human powerlessness all flow from original sin. What people can do and may even want to do, they are unable to do. Human impotence reveals humanity's need for redemption.⁷³

2.3 Lonergan's Starting Point

At the beginning of the first chapter Lonergan states that the hidden plan of God's will has been revealed, to gather all creation both in heaven and on earth under one head, Christ (Eph. 1:9-10). Lonergan's question is how *earthly* realities are to be brought together. The restriction of the question to earthly realities is consistent with his statement to Fr. Crowe that the *Supplement* had the purpose of explaining the historical causality of Christ. Lonergan then decides that a careful consideration must be given to how the human good is put in order, how the human good of order is corrupted by sin, and what human resources are available for restoring the human good of order.

It is quite evident that Lonergan considers earthly realities through the category of the good, and that his focus is specifically the human good of order. As such, the first chapter is essentially an anthropology. Lonergan's view of the human good of order is not a static view. It is a historical view. The human good of order progresses and declines through historical process. As well, human resources can restore the human good of order, but only to a certain extent.

⁷² "Articulus VIII. DE PECCATO ORIGINALI," *DBM*, 65 [*Supplement*, 26-27].

⁷³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 65 [*Supplement*, 26].

Why does Lonergan understand earthly realities through the category of the human good of order? To answer this we begin by recalling the ending of the first article. Lonergan cites three doctrines of Aquinas. The first is that the order of the universe is one, ordered by divine wisdom, chosen by divine will, and effected by divine power. The second states that the purpose of the universe is the good of the order of the universe itself. The third states that the universe as a whole is a more perfect participation in divine goodness than any individual creature.⁷⁴

These Thomistic doctrines suggest that *order* plays a significant role in Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ. The suggestion is confirmed when we look ahead to the sixth chapter of the *Supplement* to discover his interpretation of the purpose or end of the Incarnation, and the means toward this end. The end of the Incarnation is redemption, but Lonergan distinguishes a primary and secondary end. The primary end is the divine goodness itself. The secondary end is restoration of the fallen order of the universe. The secondary end is also called the external glory of God, or the order of the universe which is the most excellent thing in creation.⁷⁵ This secondary end, according to Scripture, is also the Body of Christ, head and members, as all things in heaven and on earth are brought together and reconciled in

⁷⁴ Readers familiar with the *Summa Theologiae* may be aware of a difficulty in the statement that Thomas considered the order of the universe a greater good than any individual creature. Thomas also stated that the conversion of one sinner is a greater good than the whole of nature (*ST*, I-II, q. 113, a. 9). Lonergan is aware of this difficulty, but he obviously did not find a sufficient reason to discuss this in the *Supplement*. He specifically treated this difficulty in an earlier text, *De ratione convenientiae*. In that text, Lonergan's reply to the apparent contradiction is an agreement that the good of the supernatural order is indeed greater than the good of the natural order; however, the good of the order of the universe in the *present* order of things includes both. See Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 6-7.

⁷⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *282 [*Supplement*, 120].

Christ (Eph 1:10; Col 1:20).⁷⁶ Lonergan also understands the Body of Christ as a good of order, but in this case a supernatural good of order.⁷⁷

The means by which Christ brings about this secondary end is not an eschatological, apocalyptic transformation of the human good of order. In the sixth chapter Lonergan will consider the historical agency of Christ, and there Lonergan will state that the effect of Christ's historical action as a whole is the *total human good of order*, both external and cultural, past, present, and future.⁷⁸ In other words, the work of Christ is a historical process.

The reason Christ's work is a historical process, rather than an apocalyptic event, is based on two fundamental principles. First, although we have been justified by Christ, we have not yet wholly appropriated salvation.⁷⁹ Redemption is an ongoing, historical process requiring human cooperation. This is not absolutely necessary, but it is fitting.⁸⁰ Lonergan holds to the same position in *The Triune God: Systematics*: "The end of the divine missions is not attained without cooperation of human beings: 'He who created you without you will not justify you without you.'"⁸¹ His understanding of our cooperation with God should not be interpreted merely as the cooperation to attain individual salvation. We are called to cooperate with God not merely for our individual salvation, but because the human good that divine wisdom has ordered and divine power has chosen comes into existence through human beings who understand, judge, and

⁷⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *282 [*Supplement*, 120].

⁷⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *278 [*Supplement*, 118].

⁷⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *268 [*Supplement*, 114].

⁷⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *230 [*Supplement*, 97].

⁸⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 170 [*Supplement*, 70].

⁸¹ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 485.

agree.⁸² Thus there is a social aspect of salvation, a social agency if you will. But social agency reveals historical agency:

Well now! The very fact that many are linked together so as to be able to have a common understanding and agreement about the same thing is already a good of order. Hence human beings need a good of order before they either actuate this same good and so preserve it or change it for the better or for the worse. This means that a social agent becomes an historical agent.⁸³

What Lonergan is getting at here is that our notion of history is not merely a hindsight that discerns transitions from one state to another. History itself is a constitutive element of the human good of order. The human good and human history are intimately related in Lonergan's thought. In fact, in *Topics in Education* he states that his notion of the human good is *interconvertible* with his notion of the structure of history.⁸⁴ Lonergan's structure of history is the threefold dialectic of progress, decline, and redemption we discussed in the introduction. For Lonergan, the human good is a history, "a concrete, cumulative process resulting from developing human apprehension and human choices that may be good or evil. And that concrete, developing process is what the human good in this life is..."⁸⁵

The second principle, explained in his second chapter on the justice of God, is that God directs the common course of things in history through secondary causality in accordance with the nature of things and the laws of nature.⁸⁶ This theological presupposition rules out as unfitting a redemption brought about by destroying the corrupted good and replacing it with something completely new. In God's redemptive

⁸² Lonergan, *DBM*, *246 [*Supplement*, 104].

⁸³ "Age vero! Hoc ipsum quod multi ita consociantur ut idem intelligere et circa idem consentire possunt, iam aliquod ordinis bonum est. Et ideo ordinis bono ante indigent homines quam vel actuando idem bonum conservant vel mutando idem bonum sive perficiunt sive corrumpunt. Quod si perspicitur, ab agente sociali ad agens historicum transitur." *DBM*, *242 [*Supplement*, 102-103].

⁸⁴ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 24.

⁸⁵ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 33.

⁸⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 74-77 [*Supplement*, 31].

plan, the human good is not destroyed, but rather transformed in harmony with the world order which actually exists. To deny this would be to suggest that God's wisdom, which orders the universe to every last detail, did not foresee the need for redemption. For Lonergan, this type of thinking amounts to an anthropomorphic blunder. Divine wisdom does not learn by experience, or by trial and error. In one immediate intuition, divine wisdom foresees, orders, and commissions all things from the beginning of eternity.⁸⁷

In brief, the function of the first chapter in the wider context of the *Supplement* is to define what the problem is that the historical causality of Christ is meant to address, and to setup a general framework to understand how the historical causality of Christ addresses this situation. Both the problem and the solution are understood by Lonergan in terms of their socio-historical dimensions, using the basic category of the human good of order. The human good of order is Lonergan's fundamental category to understand history itself. We will interpret, in more detail, his general theory of history when we come to his final chapter. For now, what is essential to grasp is that Lonergan's historical consideration of the human good is a fundamental presupposition behind his understanding of the secondary end of redemption and the means by which Christ brings this end about through historical process.

It is reasonable that Lonergan would begin the *Supplement* with this presupposition. Following Aquinas, he holds that systematic understanding should proceed according to the *ordo disciplinae* or *ordo doctrinae*.⁸⁸ This first chapter is

⁸⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 77 [*Supplement*, 31]. As Lonergan states in *Insight*, there are no divine afterthoughts. The existing world order, as we currently understand it, already has the potential for the transformation of evil into good. See *Insight*, 717.

⁸⁸ See *Method in Theology*, 345-346. See also Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 9.

consistent with this methodology. This first chapter is essentially a historical-minded anthropology, functioning as background material for the Christology of chapters 3-6.

2.4 The Human Good of Order and Historical Progress

The human good of order is the good in the context of human affairs. Lonergan's structure of the human good of order is: (1) particular goods desired by persons; (2) the external good of order, a concrete dynamic whole that structures human life such that particular goods can be acquired on a continuous and secure basis; and (3) the cultural good, which is principally an internal aspect of the human good of order aiming at wisdom and goodness, and constituted by values residing in the hearts and minds of the members of a society.

The cultural good, through the apprehension and judgment of values, influences the emergence and development of the external good of order. The external good of order arranges particular goods in a systematic way. Lonergan equates the external good of order with system, which "stands to particular goods as a dynamic artificial form to the materials put in order by design."⁸⁹ What Lonergan means here can be understood through an example he used during the 1957 Lectures on Mathematical Logic and Existentialism:

What is an artificial form? Well, if you put bricks and stone and wood together in a certain way you get a house. But a house is not bricks or wood or stone. It is the order *imposed* upon bricks and wood and stone.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ "...quod ad bona particularia comparatur sicut forma artificialis et dinamica ad materialia arte ordinata." Lonergan, *DBM*, 25 [*Supplement*, 11].

⁹⁰ Bernard Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic*, vol. 18 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Philip J. McShane (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 31 [emphasis mine].

Thus a dynamic artificial form is not a natural form, but rather a form, an intelligibility, imposed upon materials by intelligence. When Lonergan states that a “house is not bricks or wood or stone,” he is suggesting that a random pile of these materials is not an intelligible unity. It is merely a coincidental aggregate of materials in which there is some unity based on spatial juxtaposition. But a house is not merely spatial juxtaposition of materials. A house exhibits an *intelligible* unity due to the artificial dynamic form arranging the materials. By analogy, the external good of order is an intelligible unity imposed on materials by intelligence.

In the second article, Lonergan distinguished two aspects in the human good of order: (1) a *general* structure which exhibits uniformity and constancy despite place and time, and (2) historical progress. We will consider each of these separately.

2.4.1 The General Structure of the Human Good of Order

In the second article Lonergan identified an aspect of the structure of the human good of order which he termed the “general structure” of the human good of order:

In its general structure it [the human good of order] exhibits a certain uniformity and constancy in the fact that *always and everywhere* people seek a continuous and secure flow of particular goods, that *always and everywhere* they pursue this series through coordinated operations, that *always and everywhere* their collaboration gives rise to both external public institutions and interior habits of mind, and that *always and everywhere* the division of goods, collaborative effort, common institutions, and these interior habits themselves give rise to interpersonal relationships.⁹¹

In describing the general structure, Lonergan’s repeated phrase “always and everywhere” (*semper et ubique*) reveals an anticipation of what later in 1959 he would

⁹¹ “Nam secundum generalem quamdam structuram seu formam unum quodammodo atque constans invenitur, cum semper et ubique continuam certamque bonorum particularium seriem homines quaerant, cum semper et ubique per coordinatas operationes hanc seriem assequantur, cum semper et ubique ipsa haec cooperatio et instituta externa et publica et internos habitus inducat, cum semper et ubique relationes interpersonales ex bonis divisio, ex collaboratione, ex institutis communibus, ex ipsis internis habitibus orientur.” *DBM*, 9 [emphasis mine] [*Supplement*, 5].

call an “invariant structure” of the human good. In her doctoral dissertation, M. Shawn Copeland studied the genetic development of the idea of the human good in the thought of Bernard Lonergan.⁹² Copeland notes that Lonergan made a first and second articulation of the human good in the 1950s. The first was in the 1951 essay “The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World.”⁹³ The second was in *Topics in Education*.⁹⁴

Topics in Education reveals a development in Lonergan’s thought contrasted to the 1951 essay. In the former, Lonergan identified the human good as having an *invariant structure*, a notion he had not previously identified in either *Insight* or the 1951 essay.⁹⁵ Lonergan identified three levels of this invariant structure: (1) the particular good, (2) the good of order, and (3) value.⁹⁶ Copeland explains what Lonergan means by invariant structure:

By “invariant structure” Lonergan means that which is true about the human good at any place or time. It will be helpful to think of an invariant structure as an implicit definition. Implicit definitions are relational structures, the terms are fixed by the relations. The concrete meaning can be whatever satisfies the exigencies of the terms and their relations; that meaning is grounded in direct insights into the objects of inquiry. As an implicit definition of a society, the invariant structure of the human good identifies and specifies the basic terms and relations – particular goods, the good of order, value.⁹⁷

Lonergan’s notion of the “general structure” of the human good of order is equivalent to what he later terms an invariant structure, and it should be interpreted as an implicit definition as Copeland describes. An implicit definition does *not* designate

⁹² M. Shawn Copeland, “A Genetic Study of the Idea of the Human Good in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan,” Ph.D. dissertation (Boston: Boston College, 1991).

⁹³ Copeland, 152. Copeland notes that this essay was written while Lonergan was working on *Insight*, and material in the essay on the levels of the good is found in chapter 18 of *Insight*. However, it is impossible to know whether the essay pre-dates Chapter 18 of *Insight*, or vice-versa. See Copeland, 201, n.6.

⁹⁴ If we assume that the *Supplement* in draft form was completed in May 1958, a highly probable hypothesis, then the *Supplement* includes this expansion of Lonergan’s horizon later articulated in *Topics in Education*.

⁹⁵ Copeland, 157.

⁹⁶ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 33.

⁹⁷ Copeland, 160.

content. An implicit definition designates a relationship between terms, where the relations are settled by the terms, and the terms settled by the relations.⁹⁸ Thus the general structure of the human good of order does not specify any specific particular goods, or any specific good of order, or any specific set of values. Nevertheless, the general structure is not merely descriptive. It is explanatory. It grasps the intelligible relations between the three levels of the human good of order.

As an implicit definition, Lonergan's general structure is also a *heuristic structure*. There is a heuristic structure for anticipating the answer to a question whenever the object of inquiry admits antecedent determinations.⁹⁹ As such, a heuristic structure anticipates the intelligibility of the unknown, and guides inquiry toward knowing the unknown.¹⁰⁰ Lonergan's general structure of the human good of order thus admits antecedent determinations: at any place or time, there will be persons desiring particular goods, a good of order to secure the flow of particular goods, and a cultural good whose values influence the emergence and development of the good of order.

2.4.2 Historical Progress in the Human Good of Order

What does Lonergan mean by historical progress? For Lonergan, progress is a *cumulative* improvement in the human good of order through history. It is not just one step forward, but the accumulation of many steps forward.¹⁰¹ The notion of progress acknowledges that improvement is from one situation to another. As a result of people's

⁹⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 417.

⁹⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

¹⁰⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 68.

¹⁰¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 9-10 [*Supplement 5*].

insights and decisions, an initial situation is improved, and a later situation takes shape.¹⁰²

The later situation then becomes the initial situation for a new progressive cycle.

Progress is not improvement *ex nihilo*. This is consistent with Lonergan's notion of progress in *Insight*: progress is a cumulative process.¹⁰³ In the following subsections we will interpret Lonergan's notion of progress according to two themes operative in his thought: (a) the intrinsic principle of progress, and (b) the social dynamic of progress.

2.4.2.1 The Intrinsic Principle of Progress

Lonergan stated that the reason for the great variety and diversity across societies is found not so much in external circumstances as in the internal factor of intellectual development.¹⁰⁴ The *Supplement* uncovers two principles of intellectual development. One is individual, the other social. The individual principle is Aristotle's insight that human intellect is that which can make and become all things.¹⁰⁵ In my interpretation of Lonergan, this individual principle is logically prior to the social principle, and as such it is the intrinsic principle, the ultimate ground if you will, of historical process. My interpretation is based on Lonergan's statement that this intrinsic principle of change is within human nature itself.¹⁰⁶ This intrinsic principle is the natural desire to understand that will not be satisfied until we know God through his essence.¹⁰⁷ Lonergan listed this first among the four innate desires of human nature.

¹⁰² Lonergan, *DBM*, 16 [*Supplement* 8].

¹⁰³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 8

¹⁰⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 8 [*Supplement*, 5].

¹⁰⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 10 [*Supplement*, 5].

¹⁰⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 10 [*Supplement*, 5].

¹⁰⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 12 [*Supplement*, 6]. Lonergan cites the teaching of Thomas: *ST I*, q. 12, a. 1; I-II, q. 3, a. 8; *Summa Contra Gentiles*, 3, 25-63.

This innate desire to understand, that will not be satisfied until we know God through his essence, is what in *Insight* is identified as the spontaneous nature of human inquiry, which Lonergan describes as the pure, detached, disinterested, unrestricted desire to know.¹⁰⁸ This desire to know is manifested in questions for intelligence (*what? why? how?*) and questions for reflection (*is it so?*). For Lonergan, this desire is the ultimate ground of progress in the human good of order.

The spontaneous inquiry of human nature leads to the spontaneous accumulation of insights within the individual. Questions are followed by insights, which lead to further questions based on the incompleteness of previous insights. Lonergan calls this pattern the “self-correcting process of learning.”¹⁰⁹ When given free reign, the pure desire to know will unfold in a cascade of questions for intelligence and reflection, leading to an accumulation of insights, which is learning. But learning is not merely an individual affair. There is also a social dynamic to learning, in other words a social dynamic of intellectual development.

2.4.2.2 The Social Dynamic of Progress

Lonergan explains that human beings are spontaneously motivated to collaborate and cooperate so that they may all have a steady, secure access to particular goods.¹¹⁰ The reason is that individuals, on their own, do not have the resources to create the good of order that would satisfy their desires. So they are motivated to help satisfy the desires of others, and collectively everyone’s desires are met. The external good of order results.

¹⁰⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 5, 9, 28-29, 34, 97, 245-247, 372-375.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 197.

¹¹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 7 [*Supplement*, 4].

In my interpretation, the social dynamic of progress is equivalent to the social dynamic of intellectual development. It is the pure desire to know operative in the social context. It is the desire of human beings to collaborate and cooperate to improve. One improves one's lot by helping to improve theirs. Lonergan describes this social dynamic as a circular movement. The concrete social situation influences a person's intellect. The intellect, restless as it is, influences the will to devise something new. Discoveries are made which beget new ideas. Persuasion among members of the society produces agreement to introduce new ways of doing things and new ways of collaborative effort. The external situation improves. Human intellect critiques the new situation, and the cycle begins anew. There is no reason why this cycle should end.¹¹¹

This circular process, over time, equates to a cumulative social acquisition of insights. This leads to another important aspect of the social dynamic of progress, which Lonergan names "human solidarity."¹¹² For Lonergan, human solidarity recognizes that the human good of order is an immense and carefully preserved accumulation of human discoveries. Since each of us is born into an existing good of order, we learn virtually everything from this common fund of human discovery.¹¹³

Lonergan's notion of human solidarity reflects the social dimension of intellectual development, in other words the social nature of learning. Again, we have recourse to

¹¹¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 9 [*Supplement*, 5].

¹¹² Human solidarity carries specific meanings in contemporary Catholic Social Teaching (*CST*). In *CST*, solidarity is a social principle and a moral virtue. As a social principle, solidarity recognizes the bonds of interdependence between individuals and peoples based on the intrinsic social nature of the human person. As a moral virtue, solidarity refers to a "[F]irm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good. That is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are all really responsible for all." Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Washington DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004), 85. Solidarity understood as a moral virtue was only solidified in the late 1980s during the papacy of John Paul II. The definition adopted by the *Compendium* was appropriated from *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 38 (1988).

¹¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 11 [*Supplement*, 6].

Insight for some helpful thoughts to interpret what Lonergan is getting at. Human beings, through their collaboration and cooperation, are also naturally inclined to communicate and share their insights. In other words, teaching goes hand in hand with learning. Although Lonergan made this statement in the context of discussing common sense knowledge, it also applies to theoretical knowledge.¹¹⁴ The spontaneous collaboration and communication of knowledge is the communal development of intelligence.

In my interpretation, Lonergan's understanding of human solidarity is an expansion of his notion of "belief." He has spoken of belief in a number of works, but chapter 20 of *Insight* has perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of the topic.¹¹⁵ Belief is the reception of reliably communicated knowledge, as distinct from immanently generated knowledge. The latter is knowledge acquired through one's own cognitional acts of experiencing, understanding, and judgment. However, the vast majority of any person's knowledge comes through belief. Lonergan said that "Ninety-eight percent of what a genius knows, he believes."¹¹⁶ Each successive generation benefits from the knowledge of previous generations.¹¹⁷ Belief is a constitutive component of human solidarity, but it is only one element. His notion of human solidarity describes a common fund of human discovery beyond the discovery of knowledge. However, by analogy, his notion of belief can be used to understand his broader notion of human solidarity.

Finally we need to mention the role that emergent probability plays in Lonergan's analysis of human development.¹¹⁸ It is highly probable that this notion was operative in

¹¹⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 197.

¹¹⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 725-740. See also "Belief: Today's Issue," *Second Collection*, 87-99; *Method in Theology*, 41-47; "Natural Right and Historical Mindedness," *Third Collection*, 181.

¹¹⁶ Bernard Lonergan, "An Interview with Fr. Bernard Lonergan, S.J.," *Second Collection*, 219.

¹¹⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 726.

¹¹⁸ Emergent probability is explained in *Insight*, 144-161.

his thought when he wrote the *Supplement*, though he did not make explicit reference to the term. Emergent probability is Lonergan's worldview to explain the emergence and survival of new intelligible unities, according to classical and statistical laws.¹¹⁹ But for our purpose we only intend to note the role of emergent probability in human development, since human affairs also fall under the dominion of emergent probability.¹²⁰ But intelligence introduces a new factor. Human beings, depending on their intellectual development, can take the initiative in bringing about the material and social conditions that make schemes of recurrence not just possible, but actual. In this fashion "man becomes for man the executor of the emergent probability in human affairs."¹²¹ The greater the degree that societies understand emergent probability, the greater the degree they can direct history in the trajectory of progress.

Next we need to consider another factor in the social dynamic of progress, and this is the cultural good. In order to interpret Lonergan's understanding of the cultural good, and how the cultural good directs historical progress, it is helpful if we identify a few major aspects of Lonergan's understanding of the cultural good.

First, the cultural good is primarily the social path of human beings striving to satisfy their innate desires, as opposed to the mystical path of withdrawal. The interior life is rooted in the four natural desires Lonergan described in the second article: (1) the natural desire to understand, (2) the natural desire for rectitude and for moral consistency between reason and will, (3) the natural desire for happiness, and (4) the natural desire for immortality. As such, Lonergan associates the cultural good to *interior*

¹¹⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 151.

¹²⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 235.

¹²¹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 252.

development.¹²² Alternately he speaks of these innate desires as spiritual needs, and the cultural good as the means that leads people from material to spiritual concerns.¹²³ The cultural good is rooted deeply in human nature.

Second, there is a distinction between primitive cultures and advanced cultures. In the unpublished English translation there is the statement that culture has two stages: “...that of a primitive society and that of a more highly developed culture.”¹²⁴ I do not interpret this as suggesting that primitive society lacks culture. Lonergan’s general structure of the human good of order implies that always and everywhere there is a third level of the human good, whether the society is primitive or more advanced. And elsewhere he has explicitly stated that even primitive societies have culture in the true sense of the word.¹²⁵ Lonergan’s point in the *Supplement* is to emphasize the fact that cultures develop, and his means of doing so is to contrast primitive and higher cultures. The primary difference between primitive cultures and advanced cultures is that the latter reflect on their signs. The technical elaboration of signs is itself a cultural good, and because it needs nothing external apart from signs it can be easily preserved and transported to other places.¹²⁶

Third, the cultural good involves a relationship between values, wisdom, and goodness. Value is the good suitable to an end and worthy to be chosen.¹²⁷ Furthermore,

¹²² Lonergan, *DBM*, 16, 30, 37, 39, 50 [*Supplement*, 8, 13, 16, 16, 21].

¹²³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 30 [*Supplement*, 13].

¹²⁴ “...primitivorum nempe et exultiorum hominum.” *DBM*, 13 [*Supplement*, 6]. Although Lonergan states that cultures advance through two stages, from primitive to more advanced, we should not interpret this as automatic. Elsewhere he has stated that some primitive cultures may not develop at all.

¹²⁵ See Bernard Lonergan, *The Triune God: Doctrines*, vol. 11 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 200-201.

¹²⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 17, [*Supplement*, 7].

¹²⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 24 [*Supplement*, 11]. In *Insight*, value is the aspect of the good that emerges on the level of reflection and judgment, deliberation and choice. So value is the good as a possible object of

Loneragan's repeated emphasis on wisdom and goodness and the manner he relates these to the cultural good implies that the cultural good ultimately aims at wisdom and goodness, and wisdom and goodness are to be preferred to all other goods.¹²⁸ As such, wisdom and goodness are required to discern values, to discern what is worthy to be chosen. Lonergan conceives wisdom in the tradition of Aquinas, which is to say that it is the function of wisdom to set things in order.¹²⁹ So human wisdom would not only discern what is good, but would also set about ordering those goods worthy to be chosen.

Fourth, although Lonergan's understanding of the cultural good emphasizes interior development, he makes a distinction between two kinds of cultural good. One kind originates from the innate desires. The other is concerned with the tasks of daily living.¹³⁰ In my interpretation these two kinds of cultural good correspond to the two dimensions of culture distinguished by Robert Doran:

Moreover, culture is distinguished into the two dimensions of the everyday set of meanings and values informing a given way of life, and the reflexive level arising from scientific, scholarly, philosophic, and theological understanding of the everyday.¹³¹

The "later" Lonergan defined culture as a set of meanings and values informing a common way of life.¹³² In the *Supplement*, the category of "meaning" in Lonergan's notion of culture is not explicitly brought out. The *Supplement* identifies the reflexive

rational choice. The notion of value in *Insight* is consistent with the notion in the *Supplement*. See Lonergan, *Insight*, 624.

¹²⁸ In article 4 on the comparison of goods, Lonergan states that cultural good aims at wisdom and goodness, *DBM*, 25 [*Supplement*, 11]. In the same article he states that wisdom and goodness, because of their consequences and intrinsic dignity, are to be preferred to all other goods, *DBM*, 26 [*Supplement*, 12]. This interpretation is also implied in article 7 (Human Powerlessness) where Lonergan states that cultural evils corrupt cultural good, preventing wisdom from distinguishing between good and evil, and virtue from rejecting the evil and choosing the good, *DBM*, 59 [*Supplement*, 24]. The context of Lonergan's statement suggests that wisdom and goodness are required to discern, order, and choose the good.

¹²⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 24, [*Supplement*, 10]. Lonergan does not reference Thomas, but Lonergan's notion of wisdom corresponds to Thomas's description of wisdom in *ST II-II*, q. 45, a. 1. Thomas appropriated this notion of wisdom from Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, I, 2. See *ST II-II*, q. 45, a. 5.

¹³⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 37, [*Supplement*, 16].

¹³¹ Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 174.

¹³² Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 301.

level Doran mentions, as well as the values informing a way of life. I would argue however that the aspect of meaning is implicit in Lonergan's understanding of culture in the *Supplement* given the strong emphasis on the relationship between the cultural good and development of the interior, spiritual life.

We can summarize these four points as follows. The cultural good enriches our interior life, and the interior life influences all the judgments and choices by which the external good of order develops.¹³³ The values of a culture influence how that culture's external good of order is put together and progresses. The values will identify good truly worthy of being chosen to the degree that the culture fosters the development of wisdom and goodness in its members, for it is wisdom and goodness that discern, order, and implement values. Furthermore, any culture, primitive or advanced, uses signs to regulate the external good of order. But those cultures which reflect on their signs have the ability to develop and communicate theoretical insights in pure science, psychology, economics, political science, and history, and this capability gives rise to a superior power to develop the external good of order.¹³⁴

2.5 The Human Good of Order and Historical Decline

In the previous section we considered the human good of order, and historical process, in the context of Lonergan's first approximation in his structure of history. This approximation assumes that human beings act intelligently and reasonably. On its own, this one approximation does not account for reality. Lonergan's second approximation accounts for the fact of evil and the resulting historical decline of the human good.

¹³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 16-17 [*Supplement*, 8].

¹³⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 16-17 [*Supplement*, 8].

The human good of order is not apart from evil. In the fifth article we noted that Lonergan conceived evil as having no positive reality. This basic definition of evil is Thomas's position: evil is the absence of the good.¹³⁵ Since evil is the opposite of the good, then there is an opposite of the human good of order, in other words a "structure" of evil comprised of particular evils, the evil of order, and cultural evil. In the next two subsections we will consider two aspects of this structure of evil: (1) evil as part of the general structure of the human good of order, and (2) historical decline in the human good of order.

2.5.1 Evil in the General Structure of the Human Good of Order

In the *Supplement*, Lonergan identifies a general structure of the human good, which we considered in the previous section. Based on Lonergan's understanding of the human good in the 1959 Cincinnati lectures, we interpreted that this general structure is equivalent to what Lonergan would later call an invariant structure in the 1959 lectures. Now even though good is not apart from evil, in the *Supplement* Lonergan does not explicitly state that evil is part of the "general" structure of the human good of order. In my interpretation, this is implied and perhaps so obvious Lonergan did not need to state it. But he does state this explicitly in the 1959 Cincinnati lectures:

We have discussed some preliminaries on the good, the invariant structure of the human good as object, and certain general features of that structure...Now we can make what we have said a bit clearer and more concrete if we consider evil, the negation of the good. Just as there is a whole series of aspects to the invariant structure of the good, so there is a whole series of opposite aspects that are evil.¹³⁶

¹³⁵ *ST I*, q. 48, a. 1.

¹³⁶ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 43.

In the 1959 Cincinnati lectures Lonergan goes on to identify these evils as particular evils, organized evils, and negation of value.¹³⁷ These correspond to what Lonergan in the *Supplement* identifies as originated evil: particular evils, the evil of order, and cultural evil.

When originated evil is interpreted as part of the general structure of the human good of order, then originated evil can be considered as an implicit definition. In this sense no specific particular evils, no specific evil of order, and no specific cultural evil is identified. Even though the cause of evil is not intelligible, there is an intelligible relation between the terms designated in originated evil. Cultural evils lead to corruptions in the external good of order resulting in the evil of order, and the evil of order leads to particular evils. Again, the specifics will vary with place and time. And as a heuristic, we can anticipate that in any society there will be particular evils, evils of order, and cultural evils. In brief, the consideration of evil, as Lonergan stated in the 1959 Cincinnati lectures, fills out the invariant structure of the human good to make it clearer and more concrete. In effect, what this does is take into account Lonergan's second approximation in this theological analysis of history. As each approximation is added, we come closer to reality.

2.5.2 Historical Decline in the Human Good of Order

As the external good of order and the cultural good are subject to the law of progress, they are also subject to the law of decline. In the following subsections we will interpret Lonergan's understanding of decline according to two themes operative in

¹³⁷ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 43-48.

Lonergan's thought: (a) the intrinsic principle of decline, and (b) the social dynamic of decline.

2.5.2.1 The Intrinsic Principle of Decline

Lonergan's article on human powerlessness makes it rather clear that the root cause, the intrinsic principle of decline in human history, is human impotence with regard to the good.¹³⁸ This impotence has four causes: (1) darkness of intellect, (2) weakness of will, (3) the objective difficulty of good, and (4) alienation from God. Lonergan's understanding of human powerlessness is not so much based on acts of sin *per se*, but on the inclination to sin that we cannot overcome through our own natural resources. The inclination to sin does not imply that we are unable to do any good, but rather than we cannot avoid sin for any sustained period of time, even though we intend the good. Intention is one thing, but performance is another.¹³⁹ Lonergan made the same point in

Topics in Education:

According to the theologians, there is proof that man in this life without divine grace cannot long avoid grievous sin. That incapacity to avoid sin without grace is moral impotence.¹⁴⁰

In the last article on original sin Lonergan traces the causes of our powerlessness to original sin. This is not surprising given Lonergan's identification of "darkness of intellect" and "weakness of will" as two of the four root causes of human powerlessness.¹⁴¹ Thus Lonergan's understanding of human powerlessness is a theology

¹³⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 50 [*Supplement*, 21]. Lonergan had previously treated the notion of moral impotence in *Insight*. See Lonergan, *Insight*, 650-653.

¹³⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 58 [*Supplement*, 24].

¹⁴⁰ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 64.

¹⁴¹ In a later work Lonergan notes that the Christian tradition lists darkness of intellect and weakness of will among the effects of original sin. See Lonergan, "Healing and Creating in History," *A Third Collection*, 101-102; See also *Grace and Freedom*, 16. In *Grace and Freedom* darkness of intellect and weakness of

of original sin, an explanation in line with traditional Catholic doctrine. Due to original sin, and despite baptism, there remains in human nature an inclination to sin.¹⁴²

Failures of rational freedom are an unavoidable consequence of impotence. It is true that Lonergan includes the failure of rational freedom in the larger notion of “originating evil” which itself includes failures of imagination and intelligence. However, based on Lonergan’s description of originating evil, as well as the effect of the failure of rational freedom on the other two faculties, in my interpretation the failure of rational freedom should be linked with human powerlessness as the intrinsic principle of historical decline. Inclination to sin is a fact of human nature, but it is only in actual sins that decline becomes a historical reality. For Lonergan, rational freedom is the best of the human faculties, and he states that the worst corruption is the corruption of that which is best.¹⁴³ This failure of rational freedom has no reason. There is no “why” to explain the failure, otherwise it would not be a failure of rational freedom. This explanation corresponds to what later in the *Supplement* Lonergan will name the “evil of guilt” or “evil of sin.”¹⁴⁴

With regard to the conquering of evil, we must distinguish between the evil of guilt, or sin, and the consequent evil of punishment. The evil of guilt is the lack of reasonableness within the rational consciousness of a rational creature. The evil of punishment includes the evil consequences of sin...¹⁴⁵

Lonergan’s later distinction between *malum culpae* and *malum poenae* is equivalent to his distinction in *Insight* between “basic sin” and “moral evil.” “Basic sin”

will be listed as effects of fallen human nature. Reference is made to Artur Landgraf, ‘Die Erkenntnis der heiligmachenden Gnade in der Frühscholastik,’ *Scholastik* 3 (1928), 29-39.

¹⁴² Catechism of the Catholic Church #1264; DB 792, DS1515, ND 512.

¹⁴³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 33 [*Supplement*, 14].

¹⁴⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 147 [*Supplement*, 60].

¹⁴⁵ “Circa ipsum malum vincendum, distingui oportet inter malum culpae et consequens malum poenae. Malum enim culpae est defectus rationalitatis intra ipsam rationalem conscientiam creaturae rationalis. Malum autem poenae includit omne malum consequens sive intra ipsum peccatorem, sive in actione eius exteriori, sive in situatione humana in peius mutata, sive in retributione iusta propter culpam inflictam.” *DBM*, 147 [*Supplement*, 60].

is the failure of free will to choose a moral obligatory course of action, or on the other hand, a failure to reject a morally reprehensible course of action. “Moral evil” refers to the evil consequences of basic sin. Moral evil increases the temptation to sin, in both the person and his or her social milieu.¹⁴⁶ This distinction in *Insight*, as well as in the *Supplement*, can ultimately be traced to Lonergan’s appropriation of Aquinas. For Aquinas, in voluntary matters evil is divided into fault (*culpa*) or pain/punishment (*poena*).¹⁴⁷ The translation of the Latin term *poena* as “pain” or “punishment” (or “penalty”) can distort the Scholastic meaning, given how the English word “punishment” is typically understood in contemporary language. The Latin *poena* simply means a deprivation of some human good. But *poena* is always a result of *culpa*.¹⁴⁸

In summary, moral impotence or human powerlessness refers to the human inclination to sin, a result of original sin. The inclination to sin will ultimately be realized in acts of basic sin, which in this first chapter of the *Supplement* are described as failures of rational freedom. Later in the *Supplement* Lonergan will use the term *malum culpae* (evil of sin). When we take into account failures of imagination and intelligence, we now have Lonergan’s notion of “originating evil.” In my interpretation, “originating evil” is best understood as a social dynamic of decline that proceeds from individual failures of rational consciousness. We will turn to this next.

2.5.2.2 The Social Dynamic of Decline

The ideal line of intellectual development, both individually and socially, was discussed in the section on how the human good of order progresses. This is Lonergan’s

¹⁴⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 689.

¹⁴⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 147 [*Supplement*, 60]. Lonergan includes a reference to *ST I*, q. 48, a. 5.

¹⁴⁸ Charles Hefling, “A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement: Lonergan on Christ’s Satisfaction,” 57.

first approximation in his structure of history, that is, what history would look like if all human persons acted reasonably and responsibly. But the actual world includes failures in intellectual development, and this is what Lonergan means by “originating evils.” Human beings are originating evils to the extent that there is a failure or deficiency of “imagination” (*imaginationem*), “mind” (*intelligentiam*), or “rational freedom” (*rationalem libertatem*).¹⁴⁹ I interpret *intelligentiam* to imply what *Insight* would consider the two basic cognitional operations of intelligence, namely understanding and judgment.

It is clear that “originating evil” in this first chapter of the *Supplement* includes, yet has a broader meaning than the “evil of sin” (*malum culpae*). I suggest the reason is based on the manner Lonergan chooses to explain the human situation in this first chapter. The human situation is the human good of order understood in its historical context. Since Lonergan’s historical-minded anthropology understands human beings as originator of goods, then if evil is the opposite of good we logically arrive at the notion of originating evil.

Furthermore, if Lonergan were to limit originating evil to original sin or *malum culpae*, he would be technically correct, but this would lack the explanatory power he is aiming for. Lonergan’s notion of originating evil has a fuller explanatory power to explain the social dynamic of historical decline because, like intellectual development, it accounts for the circular movement between sin and evil. The failure of rational freedom corrupts the external, social situation, and this in turn feeds back into the subject, inclining the subject to further sin. So Lonergan’s notion of originating evil includes a

¹⁴⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 30 [*Supplement*, 13].

social dynamic, just as his understanding of intellectual development includes a social dynamic.

It may help us to understand this social dynamic if we consider Lonergan's notions of bias developed in *Insight*. In *Insight*, Lonergan states that the principle of decline is *bias*.¹⁵⁰ His notion of bias is well-known among scholars who have appropriated his thought to develop a contemporary theology of sin, particularly social sin.¹⁵¹ Let us briefly review Lonergan's four notions of bias.

Dramatic bias is primarily an unconscious flight from understanding which inhibits insights from emerging into consciousness because the insights do not confirm an existing viewpoint and behavior.¹⁵² The result is a scotosis, a blind spot in understanding. Individual bias is egoism that chooses the good of the individual over the common good. The individual brushes aside further questions or insights which would suggest a moral course of action favoring the greater good. Individual bias is not totally unaware of its self-deception.¹⁵³ Group bias is similar to individual bias, but its intent is to preserve and promote the interests of a dominant group, at the expense of other groups.¹⁵⁴ General bias raises commonsense knowledge to ultimacy. Theoretical knowledge is dismissed as irrelevant.¹⁵⁵ General bias is the idolatry of commonsense knowledge, and can infect every member of society.

The *Supplement* does not explicitly use the language of "bias" to explain originating evil. Lonergan chose to use different language. Nevertheless, his

¹⁵⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 260.

¹⁵¹ Mark O'Keefe, *What Are They Saying about Social Sin?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 76-84.

¹⁵² For a description of dramatic bias, see *Insight* 214-215.

¹⁵³ For a description of individual bias, see *Insight* 244-247.

¹⁵⁴ For a description of group bias, see *Insight* 247-250.

¹⁵⁵ For a description of general bias, see *Insight* 250-257.

understanding of bias seems equivalent to his understanding of “originating evil.” I base the judgment on two reasons.

First, both bias and originating evil cannot simply be equated with *malum culpae*. Both have a broader meaning. Bias, like originating evil, is a result of sin *and* an inclination to further sin. My judgment that bias is a result of sin and a further cause of sin is based on Lonergan’s statements in *Topics in Education*, *DVI*, and the *Supplement*. In the first two, Lonergan describes bias as a result of sin and a further cause of sin.¹⁵⁶ In the *Supplement*, the judgment is implicit based on the mutually reinforcing dynamic which Lonergan established between originating evil and originated evil. This circular movement begins with the failure of rational freedom:

If that which is judge and master of all the others is corrupted, it follows necessarily that the others will be corrupted. Indeed, the very mainspring of progress is thus turned into something regressive and destructive...Now if the choice of the will is irrational and absurd, so is the consequent action; and if the action is irrational and absurd, the change in the objective situation will be no less irrational and absurd...The power of the intellect is surely very great, since the intellect is that which is able to make and become all things. But its power is not so great that it can actually understand that which is absurd... From all this it is clear that that circular movement by which the external situation influences the intellect which in turn influences the will to act upon that situation can be not only progressive but also regressive... But to the degree to which the absurd creeps in, love is replaced by hatred, virtue by vice, good institutions by instruments of wickedness, cooperation by strife, diligence by inertia, abundance by want, and the universal power of the mind by intellectual impotence.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ In *Topics in Education* Lonergan states that bias is considered a result of sin *and* a further cause of sin. See *Topics in Education*, 60. In *De Verbo Incarnato*, Lonergan states that “...bias is found both in the individual, inasmuch as sins give birth to vices and vices lead to further sins, and also in human society, when sins corrupt human situations and in corrupt situations the drag towards sin is extremely forceful. See *Insight*, chapters 7, 18, and 20.” See *De Verbo Incarnato*, 554.

¹⁵⁷ “At si caeterorum iudex dominusque corrumpatur, corrumpantur caetera necesse est. Imo, ipsa profectus ratio atque vis in vim quamdam regressivam atque destructivam convertitur...Quod si irrationalis et absurda est voluntatis electio, pariter irrationalis atque absurda est consequens actio; si irrationalis et absurda est actio, haud minus irrationalis atque absurda est obiectivae situationis mutatio...Maxima sane est vis intellectualis, cum potens sit omnia facere et fieri; tanta tamen non est ut absurdum actu intelligat...His igitur perspectis, non solum progressivum sed etiam regressivum esse constat motum illum circularem, quo situatio in intelligentiam, intelligentia in voluntatem, voluntas in actionem, actio denique in situationem mutandam agit...Sed quatenus subrepat absurdum, eatenus amor in odium, virtutes in vitia, instituta in instrumenta nequitiae, coordinatio in pugnam, operatio in inertiam, bonorum profluvium in egestatem, ipsiusque intellectus ad omnia potentia in impotentiam transit.” *DBM* 34-36 [*Supplement*, 15-16].

If bias results from sin as originated evil results from originating evil, then it would seem we can correlate Lonergan's notions of bias to his understanding of originated evil. Originated evils include particular evils, the evil of order, or cultural evil. Our use of bias to interpret originated evils will be limited to individual, group, and general bias because our focus here is on the social dynamic of decline. The source of individual, group, and general bias results from a social dynamic, an aberration in social attitudes ultimately traced to the dialectical tension between spontaneous human intersubjectivity and an intelligently designed social order.¹⁵⁸ Both individual and group bias are evils of order because, as originated evil, they allow and even promote the gain of individuals and groups at the expense of others. These represent corruptions of the external good of order (that is, our social structures). Examples of group bias, embedded in our social structures, include sexism and racism.

On the other hand, general bias is cultural evil. In the article on evil, Lonergan distinguishes two types of cultural good. One is conceived and developed by the natural desire for understanding, uprightness, true happiness, and immortality. The other is patterned after the concrete circumstances of human living, where theory and praxis are hardly distinguished.¹⁵⁹ When culture is infected with evil, the culture does not sufficiently recognize the value of theory. Culture adapts theory to praxis, and theory is essentially rendered impotent for cultural transformation:

So long as this initial irrationality remains, people will travel along another less arduous road, so that culture becomes adapted to life, theory to praxis, and that ideal itself dismissed as a mere myth, or but a dream.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 243-244. The intelligently designed social order would equate to our external good of order.

¹⁵⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 37 [*Supplement*, 16].

¹⁶⁰ "Stante primo irrationali, aliam minusque arduam incedunt homines viam, et cultura vitae accomodetur, theoria praxi adaptetur, et ipsum ideale quasi mythus vel somnium reputetur." *DBM*, 38 [*Supplement*, 16].

This corresponds to Lonergan's thought in *Insight* on the characteristic of general bias. General bias sacrifices theory to praxis because it sees no value in reaching abstract or universal knowledge.¹⁶¹ If we interpret cultural evil as general bias, we can understand Lonergan to mean that rational consciousness elevates common sense to such a degree as effectively regulating other forms of knowledge to irrelevancy. Rationalization of the absurd becomes a byproduct: culture is adapted to the way things already are and theory is adapted to praxis. Ultimately, the effect of cultural evil or general bias is that it renders a culture impotent to direct history. Where emergent probability was society's ally in directing progress, general bias renders this cooperation impotent:

The challenge of history is for man progressively to restrict the realm of chance or fate or destiny and progressively to enlarge the realm of conscious grasp and deliberate choice. Common sense accepts the challenge, but it does so only partially. It needs to be guided but it is incompetent to choose its guide. It becomes involved in incoherent enterprises. It is subjected to disasters that no one expects, that remain unexplained after their occurrence, that can be explained only on the level of scientific or philosophical thought, that even when explained can be prevented from recurring only by subordinating common sense to a higher specialization of human intelligence.¹⁶²

In short, common sense on its own is not up to the task of directing history toward progress because common sense is unequal to human science in the task of thinking on the level of history.¹⁶³ The solution, which in *Insight* is named "cosmopolis," would have common sense yield to human science. This is not to downplay the value of common sense, of practicality. In fact, as Lonergan states, it is a "withdrawal from practicality to save practicality."¹⁶⁴

What is more alarming is the cultural aberration which results from cultural evil. When the external good of order breaks down, it reveals its corruption. But cultural evil

¹⁶¹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 251.

¹⁶² Lonergan, *Insight*, 253.

¹⁶³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 253.

¹⁶⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 266.

hides its corruption. It spreads the false under the guise of truth, and less rational individuals may even be drawn to such evil.¹⁶⁵ Lonergan makes an equivalent judgment in *Insight*.¹⁶⁶ This is why it is so difficult to cure general bias or cultural evils, and this is why in *Insight* Lonergan associates general bias to the longer cycle of decline.

2.6 The Human Good of Order and Restoration

Our term “restoration” includes restoration in the natural sense. However, it also includes restoration in the supernatural sense. In the *Supplement*, Lonergan’s discussion of restoration through human resources is contained in the sixth article (From Evil, Good). In this article Lonergan establishes the possibility of restoration. The ground of this possibility is that a changeable material creature can be renewed from evil and restored to good.¹⁶⁷ But the focus of the article is on restoration through human resources, and the recognition of its limits. Lonergan emphasizes “renewal” and “restoration” in the human good of order, but he does not explicitly refer to “redemption” (*redemptio*).¹⁶⁸ He does, however, state that cultural evils call for a heaven-sent redeemer (*redemptorem divinitus*).¹⁶⁹

Lonergan’s understanding of restoration in the sixth article carries a wider meaning than redemption typically understood. His notion of restoration is natural *or*

¹⁶⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 39 [*Supplement*, 16-17].

¹⁶⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 260.

¹⁶⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18]. Lonergan’s reference to a changeable material creature may be thought of in terms of the distinction between (1) central potency, form, and act, and (2) conjugate potency, form, and act. The metaphysical principle of unity (and continuity) in a material creature is central form. The metaphysical principle of change is an aggregate of conjugate forms. See *Insight*, 460-463, 535.

¹⁶⁸ Lonergan’s vocabulary includes the terms “renewed” (*renovari*), “restored” (*restaurari*), “renewal” (*renovationem*), “renaissance,” (*renascatur*), and “restoration” (*restauratio*). Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18].

¹⁶⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18]. In fact the first chapter makes only one explicit reference to the word “redemption.” It is found in article 8 (Original Sin) where Lonergan refers to our need for redemption (*redemptio*). See *DBM*, 65 [*Supplement*, 26].

supernatural. Either way, restoration is not an obliteration of individuals or society. It is bringing good out of evil. This wider meaning of redemption is consistent with Lonergan's discussion of redemption in *Topics in Education*.¹⁷⁰ Restoration through strictly human resources occurs when our experience of particular evils reveals what good order is and leads us to design a more effective external good of order and promotes the cultural good.¹⁷¹ But human resources on their own cannot overcome cultural evil. Cultural evils call for a heaven-sent redeemer.

Although Lonergan will explicitly consider redemption in chapters 3-6, this first chapter of the *Supplement* includes scattered references to supernatural restoration, corresponding to Lonergan's third approximation in his theological view of history.

One example is in the third article (Communication: Signs and Symbols). Lonergan speaks of the most perfect kind of sign, God's Word-made-Flesh, who through his divine person and human nature communicates through signs as an instrument for advancing human life in all its aspects.¹⁷²

Another example is in the fourth article. Lonergan identifies personal relationships as having the most bearing on the collaboration and cooperation that preserves and develops the good of order and the cultural good. Personal relationships are grounded on a certain degree of understanding and agreement, or in other words a certain coming together in one mind and heart. Personal relationships are the foundation of cooperation. If human beings make their own history, then personal relationships must be at the very heart of historical process. In fact, later in the *Supplement* Lonergan will

¹⁷⁰ There he discusses the third differential, redemption, as (1) a break with the past, (2) redemption as "new soil," (3) redemption as revolution, and (4) redemption in Christ Jesus. See Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 65-66.

¹⁷¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18].

¹⁷² Lonergan, *DBM*, 23 [*Supplement*, 10].

state that “...understanding and agreement is the foundation of all human cooperation--in fact, virtually the whole of what is properly human causality.”¹⁷³ But in terms of the personal relationships constitutive of the cultural good, Lonergan describes these relationships as being perfected, and receiving their efficacy, from sanctifying grace.¹⁷⁴ Lonergan’s point here, since it is found in the fourth article on the comparison of goods, is to explain that the cultural good, though superior to the good of order, is not the ultimate value. The ultimate value is God’s value which enters into humanity through grace, transforming our own values. When we take into account God’s gift of grace, cultural good is now subordinate to what later in *Method* will be called religious value. The gift of grace has the greatest influence in the hierarchy of the human good, and this grace develops interpersonal relationships, between God and us, and between ourselves. Interpersonal relationships are integral to Lonergan’s understanding of the historical drama of redemption.¹⁷⁵

2.7 Summary

In this first chapter Lonergan has made the first step in articulating his presuppositions, the framework if you will for his Christology. The first chapter develops a notion of the human good of order as a three-tiered structure of particular goods, an external good of order, and culture good. This human good of order undergoes

¹⁷³ “...qua in intelligentia atque consensu fundatur omnis cooperatio humana, imo fere tota propria humana causalitas.” Lonergan, *DBM*, *236 [Supplement, 100]. In a separate text he states that interpersonal relations claim a “certain priority” in the human good of order. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 495.

¹⁷⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 28 [Supplement, 12].

¹⁷⁵ In *The Triune God: Systematics*, Lonergan states that the end of a divine mission is carried out not so much that works be done as new personal relations be initiated and strengthened. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 485. In the same chapter he goes on to state that interpersonal relations claim “a certain priority” in the human good of order since the proximate end of the divine missions is a good of order which is the Kingdom of God, the Body of Christ. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 495-497.

progress, decline, and restoration. With respect to restoration, human resources can transform some evils into good, but not cultural evils. Cultural evils reveal our need for a supernatural restoration.

This first chapter of the *Supplement*, concerned as it is with the human good of order, is primarily an anthropology. But it is a historical-minded anthropology. This does not rule out the validity of a universal human nature. A historical-minded anthropology is a higher synthesis. Lonergan once stated that “A contemporary ontology would distinguish between two components in the concrete human reality: on the one hand, a constant human nature; on the other hand, a variable human historicity. Nature is given man at birth. Historicity is what man makes of man.”¹⁷⁶ Both are valid, and both are included in Lonergan’s anthropology which serves as a context for his understanding of redemption and the historical causality of Christ. The *Supplement’s* second chapter, on the Justice of God, builds on and fills out the framework. We will turn to this next.

¹⁷⁶ Lonergan, “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” *A Third Collection*, 170.

CHAPTER 3: THE JUSTICE OF GOD

3.1 Introduction

Our purpose here is to interpret the second chapter of the *Supplement* titled “The Justice of God.”¹ The chapter includes articles 9-15 of the *Supplement*: (9) The Notion of Divine Justice, (10) The Just Order of Reality, (11) The Historical Order of Justice, (12) The Personal Order of Justice, (13) The Just Will of God, (14) Voluntarism and Related Errors, and (15) Recapitulation of the Foregoing.

The chapter begins with a brief introduction:

The word ‘justice’ conjures up thoughts of law codes and lawyers, judges and juries, prisons and prison-guards, hangmen and gallows. Immersed as we are in things of sense, the more strongly a thing impinges upon our senses and moves our feelings, the more true and real we consider it to be.

But such a notion, or rather general impression, of justice is quite inadequate in dealing with the justice of God. What the Apostle Paul calls “the manifold wisdom of God” (Eph 3:10) must be understood as being at the same time the law of God's justice. In itself it is simple and infinite, but so long as we are in this life we cannot contemplate it as it is. We must proceed, rather, by way of analogy from our knowledge of created things to form some notion, however imperfect, of infinite perfection.

Not all created things are equally helpful to us in this endeavor. In this chapter, therefore, we shall move step by step from a consideration of order in the world, of the actual human condition, and of God's personal justice, while leaving room for the further development of this idea which in the next chapter can and must be made in treating of the Incarnate Word.²

¹ “Caput Alterum. DE IUSTITIA DEI,” *DBM*, 66-117 [*Supplement*, 27-48].

² “Qui iustitiam dicit, codices cogitat iurisque consultos, iudices et tribunalia, carceres et custodes, carnifices atque patibula. Sensibilibus enim immersi, eo magis unumquodque verum et reale ducimus, quo facilius sensus nostros afficit et efficacius affectum nostrum commovet.

At ipsa haec iustitiae non tam notio quam impressio minime sufficit ubi de Dei iustitia agitur. Quam enim dixit Apostolus multiformem Dei sapientiam (Eph 3, 10), eamdem divinae iustitiae legem perspici oportet. Neque eam et simplicem et infinitam, quamdiu peregrinamur a Domino, contemplari possumus, sed e rebus creatis secundum analogiam procedere debemus, ut imperfectam quamdam infinitae perfectionis notionem formemus.

Quem in finem non pariter inserviunt omnes et quaelibet creaturae. Pedetentim ergo hoc capite ita ex rerum ordine, ex conditione humana historica, ex iudicio Dei personali, rationem divinae iustitiae quaerimus, ut ulteriorem eiusdem rationis perfectionem minime excludamus quae tertio capite in Verbo Dei carne facto perspici possit atque debeat.” *DBM*, 66 [*Supplement*, 27].

3.2 A Brief Description of Articles 9 – 15

3.2.1 Article 9: The Notion of Divine Justice³

Since we can only know God’s justice by analogy,⁴ Lonergan begins with a consideration of which divisions of human justice are appropriate analogies for understanding divine justice. Human justice is divided into commutative, legal, distributive, and social justice. Lonergan then explains the meaning of these terms:

Justice implies a rightness of order, and order brings a multiplicity of things together into a unity and whole. When many things taken separately are in right order among themselves, there is commutative justice; when the many individuals are duly subordinated to the unity and whole, there is legal justice; when the unity and whole is correctly related to the many individuals, there is distributive justice; and if the whole order itself is performing properly, there is social justice--though this latter division is somewhat disputed.⁵

³ “Articulus IX. DE NOTIONE DIVINAE IUSTITIAE,” *DBM*, 67-69 [*Supplement*, 27-29].

⁴ Throughout Lonergan’s career, despite development in his vision of the whole of theology which came with his development of functional specializations, systematic theology for Lonergan always remained the imperfect, analogical, obscure, but extremely fruitful understanding of the mysteries of faith. Lonergan appropriated this understanding from the First Vatican Council (DB 1796, DS 3016, ND 132). See Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 7-8. See also Robert Doran, “The First Chapter of *De Deo Trino, Pars Systematica: The Issues*,” *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 18 (2000), 39.

⁵ “Nam iustitia quamdam ordinis rectitudinem dicit. Per ordinem autem e multis efficitur unum quoddam et totum. Quatenus ergo multa et singula recte inter se ordinantur, commutativa est iustitia; quatenus eadem multa uni et toti recte subordinantur, legalis est iustitia; quatenus unum totumque ad multa et singula recte se habet, distributiva est iustitia; quatenus denique ipse ordo rite proficit, disputata et quarta iustitia socialis est.” *DBM*, 67 [*Supplement*, 27]. Lonergan does not give a reason why the division of social justice is “somewhat disputed.” But may I offer a context to situate his statement. In contrast to commutative, distributive, and legal justice, which have a long history in the Catholic tradition (appropriated from Aristotelian ethics), the term “social justice” was only introduced into the parlance of Catholic social ethics by the Italian theologian Luigi Taparelli D’Azeglio in the mid-1800s, evidently to “replace Thomas Aquinas’s term legal justice and general justice, which were in danger of being misconstrued in the modern context.” See Christine Firer Hinze, “Commentary on *Quadragesimo anno* (After Forty Years),” *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations*, ed. Kenneth R. Himes (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005), 167. The explicit term did not enter official Catholic social teaching until Pius XI’s social encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931). Given the relatively short history of the explicit term “social justice” in Catholic social teaching, it is not surprising that in the late 1950s there would have been debate as to what social justice *means*, that is, whether it is a new division of justice *per se*, or whether it is equivalent to the classical notion of general or legal justice. As Normand Paulhus notes, there is confusion surrounding the term “social justice” in contemporary ethical dialogue. Paulhus made this statement in the mid 1980s, and if true this confusion would have certainly existed in the 1950s. See Normand J. Paulhus, “Uses and Misuses of the Term ‘Social Justice’ in the Roman Catholic Tradition,” *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 15 (1987), 261. On the background and origins of “social justice,” see Brian J. Benestad, “The Catholic Concept of Social Justice: A Historical Perspective,” *Communio* 11 (winter 1984), 364-381.

Since God cannot be subordinate to creatures nor on the same footing with them, Lonergan rules out commutative and legal justice as analogies.⁶ God is however the source and giver of all gifts, and since distributive justice refers to the right ordering of these gifts, distributive justice can be attributed to God.⁷ Finally Lonergan rules out social justice as an analogy, though his argument is more complex:

Finally, since the order among these gifts is in fact the order of the whole created universe, an order which without change includes within itself whatever is conducive to the good of all partial orders, what may be termed ‘social justice’ cannot be attributed to God.⁸

Lonergan then lists a number of theological doctrines regarding the order of the universe, all appropriated from Aquinas. The order of the universe is:

1. An artificial form of the universe by which this world is one.⁹
2. The good of order and intrinsic end of the universe.¹⁰
3. An arrangement or series of causes, referred to as fate.¹¹
4. Evidence for the existence of God.¹²
5. In its unity evidence for the uniqueness of God.¹³
6. In its appropriateness evidence of the distributive justice of God.¹⁴
7. In its goodness the best in all creation, in itself directly intended by God, the cause of all things, and necessarily an idea in the divine mind containing in its unity the ideas of all other created things.¹⁵

Next Lonergan lists a number of theological doctrines on the relationship between possible world orders and divine wisdom, power, justice, and will, as well as a number of theological doctrines related to God’s “idea of order” (*ratio ordinis*):

⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 67 [*Supplement*, 27].

⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 67 [*Supplement*, 27].

⁸ “Quia denique huius donationis ordo nihil est aliud quam ordo totius universi creati, qui immutatus omnem partialis ordinis profectum in se includit, iustitia quae forte socialis dicitur Deo convenire haud potest.” *DBM*, 67 [*Supplement*, 27-28].

⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 47, a. 3. For Lonergan’s meaning of “artificial form,” see section 2.4 in the previous chapter.

¹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 103, a. 2, ad 3m.

¹¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 116, a. 2, 1m; 3 c.

¹² Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 2, a. 3 c.

¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 11, a. 3.

¹⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 1.

¹⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 15, a. 2.

1. Putting things in order is the function of wisdom. Since divine wisdom is infinite, extending to all that divine power can effect,¹⁶ there is in the divine mind not only the idea of the order of the universe, but the ideas of all possible orders, so there is nothing intrinsically possible¹⁷ that God could not most wisely do.¹⁸
2. It is inadmissible that infinite wisdom should order possible realities in such a way as to deny to each thing what properly belongs to it; thus any order conceived by God is most wise and most just.¹⁹
3. Since the object of the will is a good apprehended by the mind, it is impossible for God to will anything not within the purview of his wisdom.²⁰
4. Therefore, as divine wisdom is the law of divine justice, the divine will which follows divine wisdom is necessarily right and just, whether it chooses to create this world, some other world, or no world at all.
5. Inasmuch as God's idea of order sees to it that created things are brought to their due and proper ends, it is called divine providence.²¹
6. Inasmuch as divine providence is carried out by divine will and power, it is called divine governance.²²
7. Inasmuch as the idea of order, containing in an intentional way all things ordered, is related to the things that are ordered, the idea of order is the logical truth of divine knowledge. And inasmuch as the things ordered are related to God's idea of order, this is the ontological truth of things.²³
8. The idea of order as being in the mind of God is the eternal law.²⁴
9. Participation by creatures in the eternal law is natural law.²⁵
10. Inasmuch as everything that exists or happens is ordained by divine wisdom, a reason can be assigned to it; but inasmuch as the whole order is freely chosen by the divine will, the ultimate reason of all things is God's free choice.²⁶

Lonergan concludes the article with a summary:

To sum up: the justice of God in its origin belongs to the divine wisdom, in its exercise to the just choice of a wise order, and in its effects it is found in created things, inasmuch as they are wisely and justly ordered, both among themselves and in relation to their ultimate end, which is God himself.²⁷

¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 25, a. 5.

¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 25, a. 3.

¹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 25, a. 5, 1um.

¹⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 25, a. 5.

²⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 1, 2um.

²¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 22, a. 1.

²² Lonergan, *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 103, a. 6.

²³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 29]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 2.

²⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 29]. Lonergan references *ST*, I-II, q. 91, a. 1.

²⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 29]. Lonergan references *ST*, I-II, q. 91, a. 2.

²⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 29]. Lonergan references *SCG*, III, 97.

²⁷ "Quae cum ita sint, Dei iustitia originaliter quidem ad divinam sapientiam pertinet, actualiter autem ad iustam sapientis ordinis electionem, consequenter autem in rebus invenitur creatis quatenus sapienter iusteque ordinantur tum inter se tum ad finem ultimum qui ipse Deus est." *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 29].

3.2.2 Article 10: The Just Order of Reality²⁸

Lonergan's stated purpose in the article is to understand the order of reality conceived by divine wisdom, chosen by divine will, and effected by divine power.²⁹

Lonergan's understanding of this order is the concurrence of three elements: (1) innate forms and laws, (2) a complex of laws, (3) linked complexes of laws.

Innate Forms and Laws: First, all things have an intrinsic order. This intrinsic order is governed by innate forms and natural laws given to all things:

A natural law is simply a participation in the eternal law by which non-human material creatures spontaneously proceed to their proper activity and end, while human beings are moved not only to act but also to know how they ought to act and to freely choose on the basis of this knowledge.³⁰

A Complex of Laws: Second, certain interrelationships of beings in the order of reality reveal a whole complex (or series) of laws.³¹ Natural laws, considered individually, abstract from concrete reality and thus afford only hypothetical knowledge. A complex of laws is a concatenation of several laws which moves us to a closer understanding of reality:

...so it is one thing to determine what theoretically should occur under the proper conditions and circumstances, but quite another to determine schematically the particular combination or conjunction of factors as a result of which at certain times the proper conditions will be fulfilled and the events forecast will actually happen.³²

²⁸ "Articulus X. DE IUSTO RERUM ORDINES," DBM, 70-79 [*Supplement*, 29-32].

²⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 70 [*Supplement*, 29].

³⁰ "Nihil enim aliud est lex naturalis quam participatio quaedam legis aeternae, unde caeterae quidem res materiales sua sponte in proprium actum finemque procedant, homines autem moveantur, non solum ut faciant, sed etiam ut quid iis faciendum sit cognoscant, et cognitum libere eligant." *DBM*, 70 [*Supplement*, 29].

³¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 70 [*Supplement*, 29]. An example is the complex of laws governing planetary movement. Another example is the complex of laws governing the circulation of moisture on the earth.

³² "...ita in omnibus aliud est determinare quid sub debitis conditionibus atque adiunctis per se fieret, et aliud longe est schematicam illam rerum coniunctionem seu constellationem invenire, unde certis temporum intervallis et impleantur conditiones debita et actu fiant eventus praevisi." *DBM*, 70 [*Supplement*, 29].

Linked Complexes of Laws: Third, although the notion of a complex of laws moves us closer to concrete reality, it is still insufficient. There is not just one complex of laws, but many, and these complexes are interrelated.³³

Lonergan then states that the order of reality, considered as a whole, is itself intended by God and not merely a coincidental byproduct of a linked complex of natures and natural laws. In other words, the order of reality is itself conceived by divine wisdom, down to the smallest detail of each being, in its arrangement with other beings and in relation to its proper end.³⁴

Lonergan admits that we do not have perfect scientific knowledge of this one order of reality and hence we cannot perfectly understand, in terms of natures and laws, how divine wisdom and providence arranges and directs each thing to its proper end.³⁵ But he states that where perfect knowledge is lacking imperfect knowledge is possible by applying certain principles in a general way. Lonergan employs three principles: (1) no created being is capable of unconditioned operation, (2) the common course of things and the order of the universe is the proper effect of God, and (3) the proper effect of God is produced through secondary causes. Let us look at each of these individually.

No created being is capable of unconditioned operation: The operation of any created being is hypothetical. What this means is that the right conditions must be fulfilled for that being to operate in accordance with its nature. But what fulfills the conditions? Ultimately, it is divine providence. Lonergan explains:

³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 72 [*Supplement*, 30]. For example, there is a complex of laws explaining the planetary system. There is a complex of laws explaining the circulation of moisture on the earth. But these complexes are linked, and this linkage has further implications. Without a sun and its planetary system, the earth's moisture would not circulate. Without circulation of moisture there would be no plant life. Without plant life many species of animals would not exist.

³⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 72-73 [*Supplement*, 30].

³⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 73 [*Supplement*, 30].

Hence in the creation and conservation of all things, since the operations of each one are conditioned and hypothetical, there is no proportionate cause per se for a thing to actually operate. If you assert that one thing already operating fulfills the conditions requisite for the operation of another, you are factually correct but you still do not have an explanation of the fact. For it is not a matter of chance that (1) some beings operate in such a way as to fulfill the conditions under which other beings begin to operate; (2) all things are constantly so arranged that none of them is deprived of the assistance of others that are already in operation;³⁶ and (3) from this constant arrangement of things and the complex of laws of nature not only does there result the simple fact of actual operations, but there is produced also that marvelous and beneficent order which we call the common course of things and events. Now if all this does not come about by chance, it is divine providence that sees to it that each being actually operates and that all things are instruments in bringing about the order of the universe.³⁷

The common course of things and the order of the universe is the proper effect of

God: The common course of things and the order of the universe can, ultimately, only be produced by God. It is true that the operations of beings, whether individually or collectively, can fulfill the conditions for the operations of others. But even if beings operating collectively fulfill the conditions for the operations of others, there must have already been an ordering in them prior to their operating. All things, taken together,

³⁶ Here Lonergan includes a note that he is using the term *praemoventium* (translated here “already in operation”) in the Aristotelian, not Bañezian, sense, and refers the reader to *Theological Studies* 3 (1942), 382. That article in *Theological Studies* was one of four articles published between 1941-1942 representing an abbreviated form of his dissertation. His doctoral dissertation was titled *Gratia Operans: A Study of the Speculative Development in the Writings of St. Thomas of Aquin*, completed in May 1940 at the Gregorian University in Rome. The four articles have most recently been published as the first of two works published together in the first volume of the CWL: Bernard Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, vol. 1 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988). CWL 1 also contains Lonergan’s doctoral thesis in its entirety. The Bañezian doctrine of premotion is *natura prius*, a premotion whenever a creature is a cause. The Aristotelian doctrine of premotion is *tempore prius*, a premotion whenever a cause acts in time. See *Grace and Freedom*, 73-75.

³⁷ “Quare in omnibus rebus et creatis et conservatis, cum singularum operatio conditionata atque hypothetica sit, nulla invenitur causa per se et proportionata ut res ulla actu agat. Quod si dicis aliam per aliam iam operantem accipere ut condiciones propriae operationis impleantur, factum sane non ignoras, sed explicationem adhuc omittis. Non enim casu fit ut (1) res aliae ita operentur ut impleantur condiciones sub quibus aliae operari incipiant, (2) omnes res ita iugiter disponantur ut nulla aliarum et praemoventium adiutorio privetur, et (3) ex hac perpetua rerum dispositione legumque naturalium complicatione, non solum merum factum actualis operationis resultet, sed mirus ille atque beneficus efficiatur ordo, quem communem rerum cursum nominemus. Quod si casu non fit, divina providentia facit tum ut singulae res actu agant tum ut omnes ipsum universi ordinem instrumentaliter efficiant.” *DBM*, 74 [*Supplement*, 30-31].

receive from God the arrangement and ordering enabling them to produce a well-ordered common effect.³⁸

The proper effect of God is produced through secondary causes: Lonergan states that beings would be created and conserved in vain if they did not operate, and as he has already established, this operation is not possible without ordering and direction from divine wisdom and providence.³⁹ As ordered and directed by God, beings cannot fail in effecting the common course and order intended by divine wisdom. “Divine goodness or divine justice has no higher rule than divine wisdom itself.”⁴⁰

From the foregoing, Lonergan makes a general statement on the nature of divine justice: (1) the ultimate end to which all things are directed is the manifestation of divine goodness; (2) the means used by divine wisdom is the nature of things and natural laws; (3) divine wisdom does not learn by trial and error, but in one intuition has foreseen, ordered, and commissioned all things from the very beginning of the universe down to the end; and (4) the purpose of this one divine plan is to arrange and connect things in serial or circular patterns of operations, through time and co-temporal, so that the common course of events and the order of the universe results.⁴¹

Lonergan ends by addressing a number of hypothetical questions. I will cite two. First, why the Incarnation? Second, why is the spread of the faith so slow? To these Lonergan states that it is God’s way to act through secondary causes in accordance with their natures. God himself became man that he might be a secondary and proportionate

³⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 74 [*Supplement*, 31].

³⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 76 [*Supplement*, 31].

⁴⁰ “Neque aliam altioremq̄ regulam habet sive divina bonitas sive divina iustitia quam ipsa divina sapientia.” *DBM*, 76 [*Supplement*, 31].

⁴¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 77 [*Supplement*, 31].

cause in restoring all things (Eph. 1:10). And the spread of the faith is slow because the kingdom is proclaimed and propagated through secondary causes, human beings.⁴²

3.2.3 Article 11: The Historical Order of Justice⁴³

Lonergan's purpose in the article is to apply what he has said about the general nature of the order of divine justice to human history. He notes an isomorphism between the three levels of the human good and the three elements in the order of divine justice: (1) a particular good follows the operation of some law of nature; (2) the external good of order is a certain schematic pattern, serial or circular; (3) the cultural good is concerned with spreading and perfecting that interior order by which human beings, in exercising their reason and will, provide for themselves and also, in some way, participate in divine providence.⁴⁴

As evil is also part of human history, evil is not outside the order of divine justice. Since God works through secondary causes, God makes use of human free will, but human free will can incline toward evil. Nevertheless, the fact of evil does not invalidate the order of divine justice. God has arranged the order of this universe such that not only does good result from good, but good may also come out of evil.

Lonergan concludes with a response to a hypothetical objection that the historical order of justice is so general, failing to take into account the personal order of justice, that the historical order of justice might not be just with respect to individuals. Lonergan's response situates human nature (that is, the individual) in the context of human history. An individual's human nature is not absolved from the development that all other

⁴² Lonergan, *DBM*, 78-79 [*Supplement*, 32].

⁴³ "Articulus XI. DE ORDINE IUSTITIAE HISTORICO," *DBM*, 81-84 [*Supplement*, 32-34].

⁴⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 81 [*Supplement*, 33]. Lonergan references *ST*, I-II, q. 81, a. 2.

material creatures must endure through historical process. The whole person, in body, mind, and through relationships, belongs by his or her very nature to the historical process. As such, his or her inclusion within this process and subordination to its laws and order is both wise and just.⁴⁵

3.2.4 Article 12: The Personal Order of Justice⁴⁶

Human beings are part of the historical order of justice in order that they may be taken up into another order. Death will remove each person from the historical order. This removal brings persons to the day of judgment. The personal order of justice is the judgment of our quality of life lived here below, and that judgment will bring reward (*praemietur*) or punishment (*puniatur*).⁴⁷ One's acts, whether good or evil, not only contribute to the objective historical process, but they also self-constitute one to be good or evil. The bulk of the article explains the nature of this self-constitution. While we are living we can change, but death will bring a halt to change.⁴⁸

All our actions can be reduced to good or evil. Good acts consent to the dictates of reason, making oneself an intelligible work. A well-ordered, intelligible individual had made herself or himself a person in whom sense is subordinated to reason, and reason is subordinated to God.⁴⁹ On the other hand, persons who commit evil acts refuse to consent to the dictates of reason. Through evil acts one makes oneself an unintelligible work and withdraws from the intelligible order conceived by divine wisdom. The work

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 84 [*Supplement*, 34].

⁴⁶ "Articulus XII. DE ORDINE IUSTITIAE PERSONALI," *DBM*, 85-92 [*Supplement*, 34-37].

⁴⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 85 [*Supplement*, 34].

⁴⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 86 [*Supplement*, 35].

⁴⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 87 [*Supplement*, 35].

of any person, whether intelligible (good) or absurd (evil), will perdure. This is the ground of the personal order of justice.⁵⁰

Lonergan ends the article noting that the distinction between the objective process of the historical order of justice on the one hand, and the personal order of justice on the other, implies no distinction on the part of God. There is however a basis for the distinction in human affairs. What we make of ourselves in this life, whether good or evil, shall remain in the life to come.⁵¹

3.2.5 Article 13: The Just Will of God⁵²

One may ask why God chose this order of reality and not some other? To this question Lonergan replies that God could have instituted another order, so long as this involved no internal contradiction.⁵³ But as to why God chose this particular order and not some other, Lonergan states that we are up against mystery and inquiry must give way to humble submission. Lonergan refers to the wisdom of St. Augustine: even if God had created a different order, it would still have failed to satisfy our wisdom.⁵⁴ Our duty is simply to acquiesce to God's choice, and our model for such acquiescence is Christ himself:

Just as Christ himself did not ask for another world but in all things submitted his will to his Father's, "becoming obedient unto death, death on the cross" (Phil 2:8), so we also accept this actual order of reality as a command given to us by God our Father.⁵⁵

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 89 [*Supplement*, 36].

⁵¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 92 [*Supplement*, 37].

⁵² "Articulus XIII. DE IUSTA DEI VOLUNTATE," *DBM*, 93-103 [*Supplement*, 37-42].

⁵³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 93 [*Supplement*, 38].

⁵⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 94 [*Supplement*, 38].

⁵⁵ "Sicut enim Christus non alium mundum expetivit sed in omnibus voluntatem suam voluntati Patris subiecit [ref. to *ST*, III, q. 20, a. 1.], factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis, ita et nos hunc actualem rerum ordinem nobis a Deo Patre praeceptum habemus." *DBM*, 94 [*Supplement*, 38].

Following this statement Lonergan makes certain points to dispel anthropomorphic conceptions of God's will. As God knows himself and all other things in one act of understanding, God wills himself and all else in one single volitional act.⁵⁶ We can conclude from this that if one is to speak with strict theological accuracy, one will always say that God wills Christ's atonement because of sin, the forgiveness of sins because of the atonement, reward on account of merit, and punishment on account of sin. It is an anthropomorphic error to express the foregoing in language suggesting that God wills atonement because he hates sin, or that he wills forgiveness of sins because the atonement has placated him, or that he wills reward because meritorious deeds have pleased him, or that he wills punishment because sins have offended him.⁵⁷ Lonergan explains the error and the implications:

The former set of statements affirm the one act in which God wills many things as interrelated; the latter imply a multiplicity of volitional acts on the part of God and sometimes make a created thing the cause and the divine will the effect.

One must not consider this strictness in speaking to be of little importance in the question at hand. When the main objection to the dogma of the redemption is that it is anthropomorphic, no Catholic theologian should provide any sort of handle to this calumny.⁵⁸

Lonergan then takes up a familiar question: since evil does in fact exist in this world, does God will evil? Following Aquinas, Lonergan appeals to the distinction

⁵⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 94 [*Supplement*, 38].

⁵⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 95 [*Supplement*, 39].

⁵⁸ "Illa enim affirmant unam multorum et ordinatorum volitionem. Haec autem et multas divinas volitiones supponunt et interdum creaturam ponunt causam et divinam volitionem effectum. Neve rigorem sermonis in praesenti quaestione parvi momenti iudicaveris. Cum enim praecipue contra dogma redemptionis obiciatur quod anthropomorphicum sit, huic calumniae ansam praebere non debet theologus catholicus." *DBM*, 95-96 [*Supplement*, 39]. Note: here Lonergan speaks of the "dogma" of redemption. However, the Catholic Church has never assigned dogmatic status to any specific definition of what the mystery of redemption means, as for example it did at Chalcedon regarding the ontological constitution of Christ. So we should note that Lonergan is using the word dogma in the broader sense. I interpret what Lonergan means here is not some specific dogmatic formulation of redemption, for which there is none, but simply the dogmatic affirmation of the Nicene Creed that the reason for the Incarnation was *propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem*.

between indirect and direct willingness. God indirectly wills both the evil of punishment and the evil of natural defects because God directly wills the good of personal justice and the good of the order of nature, and these evils are made possible because of God's direct willing of these two goods, respectively.⁵⁹ Since the evil of sin is not connected to any good whatsoever, God neither directly nor indirectly wills the evil of sin.⁶⁰

The remainder of the article attends to a number of hypothetical objections to the theological doctrine that God neither directly nor indirectly wills the evil of sin. Among these objections is that sin should not be permitted by God. Lonergan replies that it is a good thing that there exist rational creatures that are truly free and who can sin, and it is also a good thing for the evil of sin to be transmuted into the goodness of redemption.⁶¹

3.2.6 Article 14: Voluntarism and Related Errors⁶²

There are two kinds of voluntarism: (1) one that is relatively conscious, which praises the role of the will; and (2) one that is relatively unconscious, which ignores the significance of intelligibility and thus exaggerates the role of the will. Lonergan considers the former relatively harmless, but refutes the latter through four arguments.

First, "*the divine will follows the intellect.*"⁶³ Since the object of the will is a good as known, it is thus impossible for God to will anything that is not in his wisdom.⁶⁴ To

⁵⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 96 [*Supplement*, 39].

⁶⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 97 [*Supplement*, 40]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 19, a. 9.

⁶¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 99 [*Supplement*, 40].

⁶² "Articulus XIV. DE VOLUNTARISMO AFFINIBUSQUE ERRORIBUS," *DBM*, 104-111 [*Supplement*, 42-46].

⁶³ "Divinam voluntatem sequi intellectum." *DBM*, 104 [*Supplement*, 42].

⁶⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 104 [*Supplement*, 42]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 1, 2um.

assert that justice depends on the will alone is equivalent to asserting that the divine will does not proceed according to the order of wisdom, which is blasphemy.⁶⁵

Second, “*the order of divine wisdom is not necessary in all things.*”⁶⁶ The intelligible and the necessary are not synonymous.⁶⁷ The former has a wider extension. The fact is most obvious in the redemption. The redemption is intelligible, but not necessary. Voluntarism holds a too superficial understanding of intelligibility, and as such falls into the error of giving primacy to the divine intellect in necessary things and primacy to the divine will in others.

Third, “*the possible and the fitting are not strictly demonstrated.*”⁶⁸ The intelligible is of two kinds: the necessary and the possible. The former is demonstrated by necessary arguments and the latter by accumulating evidence and making the connections among the evidence. The natural and human sciences investigate the possible, not the necessary. Demanding proofs, rather than seeking increasing understanding, repeats the experience of the fourteenth century when the desire for certitude trumped the desire for understanding.⁶⁹

Fourth, “*the order of understanding is not the same as the order of wisdom.*”⁷⁰ Lonergan’s purpose here is to account for the non-intelligible evil of sin. Do we include sins in the order of this universe? If we do, then it would seem God is the author of sin. If we do not, then it would seem that God’s dominion is not universal. Lonergan’s solution distinguishes the order of understanding and the order of wisdom. Intelligence

⁶⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 104 [*Supplement*, 43]. Lonergan references Aquinas, *De Veritate*, q. 23, a. 6.

⁶⁶ “*Ordinem sapientiae divinae non in omnibus necessarium esse.*” *DBM*, 104 [*Supplement*, 43].

⁶⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 105 [*Supplement*, 43]. See also Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 16. For Lonergan, the intelligible that is possible but not necessary is best understood, following Aquinas, according to the notion of “fittingness” (*convenientiae*).

⁶⁸ “*Possibile et conveniens non stricte demonstrari.*” *DBM*, 105 [*Supplement*, 43].

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 106-107 [*Supplement*, 44].

⁷⁰ “*Alium intelligentiae et alium sapientiae esse ordinem.*” *DBM*, 108 [*Supplement*, 44].

seeks to know the intelligible through the process of experiencing, understanding, and judgment. The act of understanding is the pivotal point in this process. The intelligible emerges in the act of understanding. As such, intelligence can put intelligibles into a meaningful order. But intelligence cannot order the non-intelligible (such as the evil of sin) because the act of understanding can only know the intelligible. However, the scope and power of the order of wisdom extends beyond the order of understanding. Wisdom can order the intelligible and the non-intelligible. “It [wisdom] looks to whatever actually exist, even if they ought not to exist and cannot be understood.”⁷¹ The rule of divine justice is not divine intelligence, but divine *wisdom*. As such, God can conceive an order which includes the evil of sin, even though God neither directly nor indirectly wills the evil of sin. As such, God is not the author of sin. But since God chose an order which allows sin, God’s dominion is entirely universal.⁷²

3.2.7 Article 15: Recapitulation of the Foregoing⁷³

This article summarizes major points in the chapter. Lonergan begins by restating what is perhaps the central theological doctrine: the ground and norm of divine justice is divine wisdom.⁷⁴ The exercise of divine justice is God’s free choice, and its effect is the actual concrete order of the universe in all its determinations.⁷⁵

Lonergan then recalls that his method has respected the mystery of divine justice. He has approached divine justice analogically, admitted that our knowledge is imperfect,

⁷¹ “Attendit enim sapiens ad omnia quaecumque de facto sunt, etiamsi esse non debeant, etiamsi intelligi non possint.” *DBM*, 110 [*Supplement*, 45].

⁷² Lonergan, *DBM*, 111 [*Supplement*, 45-46].

⁷³ “Articulus XV. “PRAECEDENTIUM RECAPITULATIO,” *DBM*, 112-117 [*Supplement*, 46-48].

⁷⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 112 [*Supplement*, 46].

⁷⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 112 [*Supplement*, 46].

and has made the point that it is fruitless to inquire into what might have been, into other possible world orders God could have chosen. Our duty is to acquiesce to the choice God has actually made, to adore the holiness of God's will, and to obey God's decrees.⁷⁶

Loneragan also recalls a consistent theme of the chapter: his concern with anthropomorphism. Lonergan acknowledges that at times this is difficult to avoid. There is an inadequacy of all analogy.⁷⁷ With this caution noted, he reviews the advantages of his method. He has reached an understanding of divine justice by attending to the actual order of reality, which in its entirety is the proper effect of God. This is a concrete, not an abstract method of conceiving divine justice. Also, recourse to God's simplicity and immutability minimizes the possibility of anthropomorphism. The distinction between the order of understanding and the order of wisdom allows us to account for everything within the actual world order, including the non-intelligible.⁷⁸

At the end of the article Lonergan introduces a distinction between divine justice on the one hand, and divine goodness, generosity, and mercy on the other. The distinction is considered in three ways: (1) as rooted in God, (2) as rooted in the comparison of created effects, and (3) as rooted in the relationship of God to creatures.

As rooted in God: God is just since he chooses an order of reality conceived by divine wisdom. God is good since he freely pours forth being and good. God is generous since his wisdom orders reality to manifest divine goodness. God is merciful because the ordering to divine goodness is far better than an ordering to created goodness.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 113 [*Supplement*, 46].

⁷⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 113 [*Supplement*, 46].

⁷⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 114-115 [*Supplement*, 46-47].

⁷⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 116 [*Supplement*, 47]. Lonergan references ST, I, q. 21, aa. 1, 3, 4; q. 44, a. 4.

As rooted in the comparison of created effects: The comparison of created effects among themselves is based on the distinction between proportionate and non-proportionate effects. The former issues forth from God's justice, while the latter from God's generosity or mercy.⁸⁰

As rooted in the relationship of God to creatures: This consideration coincides with the first if God is taken as the foundation of the relation, but it coincides with the second if the interrelated effects are taken as the foundation. No new element arises from the conjunction of these two unless a fallacy arises. Unfortunately, the fallacy is not that rare. God assigns an end to every creature. As such, each creature is "owed" a means to the end. The fallacy understands this in a context of God owing something to human beings, rather than a context in which God owes it to himself, for his Name's sake, to fulfill the order of his own justice.⁸¹

Lonergan ends the chapter noting that the cross of Christ reveals another dimension of divine justice:

Finally, as will be shown, a special facet of divine justice appears in the cross of our Lord; but it seems best to defer an explanation of this to Chapter 4.⁸²

3.3 Lonergan's Understanding of Divine Justice

In the tenth article, the "Just Order of Reality," Lonergan makes two key statements on the nature of divine justice. The first statement asserts that the order of the universe is the proper effect of God produced through secondary causes:

⁸⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 116 [*Supplement*, 48]. Lonergan gives the example of the blessing promised to Abraham. The blessing was conferred on the Jews according to God's justice, but upon Gentiles according to God's mercy. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 4, 2um and Rom 15:8-9.

⁸¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 117 [*Supplement*, 48]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 1, 3um and *SCG*, 2, 29, §§1058 ff.

⁸² "Denique tandem, uti postea constabit, specialis quaedam ratio divinae iustitiae in cruce Domini nostri conspicitur; quam tamen suo loco (cap. IV) convenientius exponi videtur." *DBM*, 117 [*Supplement*, 48].

Moreover, since that which is best in all creation is the good of order of the universe, this order must necessarily be in itself directly intended by God, the cause of all things. In the divine mind, therefore, there is the idea of the order of the universe, which idea contains in its unity the ideas of all other created things.⁸³

Moreover - to move a step closer to the notion of divine justice - this common course of things and order of the universe is (1) the proper effect of God, and (2) produced through secondary causes. That effect is said to be proper to God which only God can produce;⁸⁴

The second is Lonergan's general statement on the nature of divine justice:

In the light of all this [Lonergan's prior discussion on the order of the universe], we can make a general statement on the nature of divine justice. First of all, it is universally agreed that the ultimate end to which all things are to be directed is the manifestation of the divine goodness. Secondly, we have determined the means used by divine wisdom to attain this end, namely, the nature of things and the laws of nature or natural laws. Thirdly, it is obvious that divine wisdom does not learn by experience or by trial and error, but rather in one immediate intuition has foreseen, ordered, and commissioned all things from the very first beginnings of the universe right down to the end. Fourthly, we have determined the purpose of this one plan, namely, so to arrange and connect things as to result in either serial or circular patterns of operations, and so to order these patterns both in the course of time and in a co-temporal hierarchic order that the common course of events and order of the universe results.⁸⁵

Three major themes stand out in these two statements. The first is Lonergan's judgment that the common course of things and the order of the universe is the proper effect of God produced through secondary causes. The second is Lonergan's thought on the nature of things, laws of nature, and the common course of events and the order of the universe in which the nature of things and the laws of nature are operative. The third is

⁸³ "Imo, cum optimum in rebus creatis existens sit bonum ordinis universi, fieri non potest ut hic ordo non sit per se et proprie a Deo omnium causa intentus; et ideo menti divinae inest idea ordinis universi, quae caeteras rerum creaturarum ideas in sua unitate includit [ref. to *ST*, I, q. 15, a. 2.]" *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28].

⁸⁴ "Porro, ut propius ad rationem divinae iustitiae accedamus, eiusmodi est communis rerum cursus universique ordo ut (1) sit effectus Deo proprius et (2) per causas secundas producatur. Nam Deo proprius est ille effectus quem Deus solus producere potest;" *DBM*, 74 [*Supplement*, 31].

⁸⁵ "Quae cum ita sint, qualis in genere sit ordo divinae iustitiae, aequaliter dici potest. Nam in primis constat ultimum finem in quem omnia sunt dirigenda esse ipsam divinam bonitatem manifestandam. Deinde, determinatum est medium quo utitur divina sapientia ad hunc finem attingendum, nempe, ipsae rerum naturae atque leges naturales. Tertio, constat divinam sapientiam non usu et experientia addiscere ut ab incepto consilio desistat et alium novumque tentet, sed ab ipsis primis initiis in finem usque omnia uno intuitu perspexisse, ordinasse, approbasse. Quarto denique determinatum est quale sit hoc unum consilium, nempe, ita res disponere atque coniungere ut serialia vel circularia operationum schemata resultent, et ita ipsa schemata tum temporum decursu tum simultanea hierarchia ordinare ut communis rerum cursus universique ordo consequatur." *DBM*, 77 [*Supplement*, 31].

Lonergan's concern about anthropomorphism. I will interpret each of these themes individually in the following sub-sections: (1) World Order as the Proper Effect of God Produced through Secondary Causes, (2) World Order and Divine Justice, and (3) Dispelling Anthropomorphic Understandings of Divine Justice.

3.3.1 World Order as the Proper Effect of God Produced Through Secondary Causes

Lonergan's judgment that the common course of things and the order of the universe is the proper effect of God (*effectus Deo proprius*), produced through secondary causes, is essentially an appropriation of Aquinas's concept of universal instrumentality.⁸⁶ Lonergan had addressed this in his dissertation:

...for an instrument is a lower cause moved by a higher so as to produce an effect within the category of proportionate to the higher; but in the cosmic hierarchy all causes are moved except the highest, and every effect is at least in the category of being; therefore, all causes except the highest are instruments.⁸⁷

For Lonergan, the fact that all causes except the highest are instruments represents the meaning of "*proprius effectus Dei*."⁸⁸ Any secondary cause is an instrumental cause. Since the whole universe is the proper effect of God, then *all* causes in the universe other than God are instrumental (secondary) causes. So we have universal instrumentality.

To state that the order of the universe is directly intended by God, or is the proper effect of God, reveals a fundamental aspect of Lonergan's thought regarding the relationship between order and essence on the one hand, and divine wisdom on the other.

⁸⁶ In *Grace and Freedom*, Lonergan explains that Aquinas accepted the Aristotelian cosmic system of first mover (including the celestial spheres and terrestrial process), but he also accepted the Platonist idea of universal causes. Among Thomist universal causes, two were most conspicuous: God, who alone is proportionate to the production of being, and the *corpus caeleste*, which had the role of causing all terrestrial change. As such, Lonergan explains that this Platonist-Aristotelian syncretism could not but have the corollary of universal instrumentality. See *Grace and Freedom*, 83.

⁸⁷ Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom*, 83.

⁸⁸ Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom*, 83 n. 83.

A proper effect of God cannot be a compound of the logically necessary and/or arbitrary, but must be directly willed by God in accordance with divine wisdom. And since divine justice is grounded in the fact that the divine will follows divine wisdom, then divine wisdom *intends world order prior to essences*.⁸⁹ The common course of things and the order of the universe are indeed produced through secondary causes, but these secondary causes could not operate in the first place without a prior order conceived by divine wisdom. It is clear that one of Lonergan's principal aims is to convince the reader to reject any notion of a voluntaristically conceived divine will as well as any notion that would attempt to understand the order of the universe as a coincidental, arbitrary byproduct of individual essences.

3.3.2 World Order and Divine Justice

Understanding world order is a means to understand divine justice because of the prior judgment that there is no higher rule for divine justice than divine wisdom, and divine wisdom has conceived this world order. Lonergan's understanding of world order

⁸⁹ In the ninth and tenth articles Lonergan makes at least twenty explicit references to the teachings of Aquinas. The vast majority relate in one way or another to the order of the universe. *De ratione convenientiae*, written previous to the *Supplement*, references many of the same doctrines. *De ratione convenientiae* does however explicitly reference a doctrine of Aquinas not mentioned explicitly in the *Supplement*, but is nevertheless operative in Lonergan's thought. Lonergan states this doctrine as follows: "In God's intention, the order of the universe is prior" [*order universi est prior in intentione divina*]. See Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 4. This is Lonergan's interpretation of Aquinas's argument in *Summa contra Gentiles* that the first cause of the distinction and diversity of things in this universe is not caused by secondary agents (*SCG*, II, c. 42). In other words, Aquinas teaches that the distinction and order of things in the universe is not a result of the actions of secondary causes, but the inverse is true: the actions of secondary causes are on account of the order and the distinction established in things. This doctrine was also operative as a fundamental presupposition in Lonergan's thesis in "The Natural Desire to See God." Lonergan's thesis affirmed the existence of a natural desire to see God, but my purpose here is not to enter into the debate about this disputed question in Catholic theology. This is outside the scope of the dissertation. My point is an interpretive judgment that when Lonergan speaks of world order as a "proper effect" of God, this is equivalent to his thought, explicitly mentioned in other works, that divine wisdom conceives world order prior to finite natures, down to the smallest historical detail. Only consequently, in as much as God knows a world order, does God know its component parts such as his free gifts, finite natures, their properties, exigencies, and so on. See Lonergan, "The Natural Desire to See God," 83-85.

is articulated primarily in the tenth article titled “The Just Order of Reality.” In this article, his method of arriving at a concrete understanding of reality is very similar to the manner in which he arrived at a theological understanding of history: through the use of successive “approximations.” Lonergan builds up to a concrete understanding of the universe in a step-by-step fashion, where each step is an approximation toward reality.

The first approximation is the insight that within the order of this universe there are innate forms and laws of nature. This is a consideration of individual, abstract laws, isolated from the concrete fulfillment of any conditions necessary for that law to be operative. This approximation is hypothetical, prescinding from concrete conditions.

The second approximation includes two insights. First, beings are interrelated and interconnected resulting in a concatenation of several laws in mutual, interconnected operation.⁹⁰ Second, there must be a particular combination or conjunction of factors to fulfill the conditions necessary for a complex of laws to be operative.⁹¹ With this insight, Lonergan is introducing the notion of probability we associate with statistical laws.

The third approximation is the insight that there is not a single complex of laws operative in the universe, but many. These complexes are often interconnected.

Consider Lonergan’s example:

Without a sun and its planetary system, the earth's moisture would not circulate; without this circulation of moisture there would be no plant life, and without plants, none of the many species of animals. Again, every animal has within it several systems that are not only distinct from one another but marvelously interrelated and interdependent: the digestive system, the respiratory, the vascular, the skeletal system and musculature, the nervous system and sensory apparatus.⁹²

⁹⁰ This is what Lonergan calls a “complex” or “series” of laws.

⁹¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 70 [*Supplement*, 29].

⁹² “Nisi enim prius existit systema solis et planetarum, haud circumferuntur aquae; nisi circumeunt aquae, non vivunt plantae; sine plantis, tot animalium species esse non possunt; et in singulis animalibus non solum distinguuntur sed mirabiliter etiam inter se coniunguntur atque dependent systemata digestivum, respirativum, vasculare, ossium et musculorum, nervosum, et sensitivum.” Lonergan, *DBM*, 72 [*Supplement*, 30].

Lonergan's three approximations clearly depend on the complementary intelligibility of natural and statistical laws. In fact, this intelligibility expressed through the complementary use of natural and statistical laws equates to what in *Insight* Lonergan calls *emergent probability*.

3.3.2.1 Emergent Probability

In *Insight*, emergent probability is defined as “the successive realization in accord with successive schedules of probability of a conditioned series of schemes of recurrence.”⁹³ It is a complex theory, and I made reference to it in the previous chapter. To give a full explanation of emergent probability is not warranted here and would take us too far afield of our purpose. Nevertheless, we need to address some of the basics.

World process reveals an order, a design, an intelligibility.⁹⁴ Emergent probability is essentially Lonergan's “world-view.”⁹⁵ It is the articulation of the intelligibility of world process through the complementary employment of classical and statistical laws.⁹⁶ Classical laws are hypothetical in the sense that they are ideal formulations, observable in concrete reality *if* the conditions for their operation are fulfilled. Charles Hefling explains:

There are always *ifs*, and the *ifs* keep fanning out like branches on a tree. Consequently there neither is nor could be a combination of classical laws that grasps all of them in a single explanatory system.⁹⁷

⁹³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 148-149.

⁹⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 149.

⁹⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 138.

⁹⁶ A classical law (or natural law) expresses a particular type of intelligibility in world process, namely a systematic relationship between data. A classical law is a universal. Its intelligibility is the same whether the law is operative in an event in Milwaukee or in Mumbai. Classical laws are arrived at by abstracting from particulars to discover the universal.

⁹⁷ Charles Hefling, “Philosophy, Theology, and God,” in *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Vernon Gregson (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 128.

Thus classical laws on their own cannot fully account for the intelligibility of world process. There is needed an explanation of how often the conditions are fulfilled in which classical laws become operative in concrete events. This calls for the employment of statistical laws. As with a classical law, a statistical law also expresses a particular type of intelligibility.⁹⁸

Next we need to briefly consider what Lonergan means by a “conditioned series of schemes of recurrence.” A single scheme of recurrence refers to a series of events that are related in such a way that the fulfillment of the condition of any particular event in the series allows the other events to occur.⁹⁹ For example, consider a scheme represented as a series of conditioned events named A, B, and C. *If* A occurs, B will occur; *if* B occurs, C will occur; *if* C occurs, A will recur; and the cycle starts over.

Now imagine a world process where multiple schemes of recurrence are operative, and these schemes themselves are interrelated. In *Insight*, Lonergan calls this a *conditioned* series of schemes of recurrence. A conditioned series means that a series is not operative automatically, but only if the conditions for its operation are fulfilled. Statistical laws govern whether or not the conditions for operation are fulfilled.

Essentially a single scheme of recurrence equates to what in the *Supplement* is Lonergan’s second approximation to the order of reality, a pattern of operations resulting from a single complex or series of laws. For example, the circulation of moisture over the earth can be considered a scheme of recurrence. A series of schemes of recurrence

⁹⁸ The intelligibility of a statistical law is the ideal frequency, the probability if you will, that an event governed by one or more classical laws will occur. Probability is not the same as chance. Probability is an intelligibility. See *Insight*, 137. For Lonergan, the intelligibility of probability is that there exists an ideal frequency from which actual frequencies may vary, but not systematically. If actual frequencies *were* to vary systematically, this would indicate that a classical law is operative. See *Insight*, 125.

⁹⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 141.

equates to what in the *Supplement* is Lonergan's third approximation, a pattern of operations resulting from many complexes linked together in a reflexive pattern.¹⁰⁰

In brief, emergent probability is an explanatory idea combining the notion of a conditioned series of schemes with respective probabilities of emergence and survival.

What Lonergan means by "emergence" is not limited to the emergence of schemes at the same "level" of reality. Lonergan's notion of emergent probability also implies the emergence of "higher" schemes from "lower" schemes. The emergence and survival of higher schemes are more or less probable, but given enough time and space, they become highly probable. The emergence of higher schemes from lower schemes is the "directed dynamism" of emergent probability.

3.3.2.2 The Directed Dynamism of Emergent Probability

The emergence of higher schemes from lower schemes implies that the universe is not at rest, not static, not fixed in the present, but is in process. Specifically, there is what Lonergan calls a "directed dynamism" in this universe, an upthrust if you will, from lower to higher entities.¹⁰¹ In *Insight* this directed dynamism also goes by the name of "finality,"¹⁰² and in other works "vertical finality."¹⁰³ Sub-atoms unite into atoms, atoms into compounds, compounds into organisms, and organisms to organic evolution within

¹⁰⁰ Kenneth Melchin explains that "The basic insight at the center of Lonergan's notion of the recurrence scheme is that of reflexivity. The recurrent scheme is reflexive in the sense that the functioning or operation of the scheme has the effect of curling back upon itself and fulfilling the conditions of the scheme to recur." See Kenneth R. Melchin, *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability: Ethics, Society and History in the Work of Bernard Lonergan* (Lanham, MD.: University Press of America, 1987), 105.

¹⁰¹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 472.

¹⁰² Lonergan, *Insight*, 472.

¹⁰³ Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," *Collection*, 19-23; "Mission and the Spirit," *Third Collection*, 24. In "Mission and the Spirit," the latest in these examples, Lonergan states that vertical finality, when considered in the human sphere, is another name for "self-transcendence," which Lonergan also equates with the "passionateness of being." See "Mission and the Spirit," 29.

limited ranges.¹⁰⁴ Vertical finality escapes the limitations of an isolated essence through the fertility that is possible when a plurality of essences is conjoined in space and time.

Vertical finality is integral to Lonergan's world-view:

Still, though accidental to the isolated object or the abstract essence, vertical finality is of the very idea of our hierarchic universe, of the ordination of things devised and exploited by the divine Artisan. For the cosmos is not an aggregate of isolated objects hierarchically arranged on isolated levels, but a dynamic whole...The interconnections are endless and manifest. Vertical finality would seem beyond dispute.¹⁰⁵

As Lonergan notes, vertical finality is the very reason we have a hierarchical universe. Specifically, to state that we have a hierarchical universe means that there are successive levels of intelligibility in the universe.¹⁰⁶ Each level represents a more comprehensive scheme compared to the immediate lower level. Each level is able to relate events in a systematically intelligible way that could not otherwise be systematically related at the lower level. Another way of stating this is that through the directed dynamism of emergent probability, what are otherwise coincidental manifolds at one level are taken up into a higher integration, a higher intelligibility.¹⁰⁷ Charles Hefling explains:

...in such a world process [a world process characterized by emergent probability] there are successive levels of intelligibility. Events that defy any systematic explanation in themselves become intelligible at a "higher" level, that is, within a more comprehensive scheme. There is no reason why the methods proper to chemistry could not eventually get around to explaining, one by one, each and every molecular event that goes on in an amoeba. But the only result would be a very long list of explanations, none of them related to any other in a systematically intelligible way. Move up to the organic level,

¹⁰⁴ Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," 22. An editorial note mentions that Lonergan's guarded language ("within limited ranges") may have been a concession to the anti-evolution mentality still prevalent among Roman Catholics in 1943. See *Collection*, 261, n. f.

¹⁰⁵ Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," 22.

¹⁰⁶ For example, the atomic level is taken up into a higher intelligible unity of the molecular level. The molecular level is taken up into a higher intelligible unity of the chemical level. The chemical level is taken up into a higher intelligible unity of the biological level. The biological level is taken up into a higher intelligible unity of the psychological level. And the psychological level is taken up into a higher intelligible unity of the human being. The levels are not meant to be exhaustive of actual reality.

¹⁰⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 477.

though, and there *is* a systematic pattern to be grasped, and grasping its intelligibility compensates for the lack of system at the molecular level.¹⁰⁸

The term “vertical finality” is not found explicitly in the *Supplement*. The concept is nevertheless operative in Lonergan’s thought when he judges that the common course of things and the order of the universe results from a “co-temporal hierarchic order” (*simultanea hierarchia ordinare*),¹⁰⁹ or from a “hierarchy of schemes” (*hierarchiam schematum*).¹¹⁰ The common course of things and the order of the universe would not have hierarchical schemes or levels of intelligibility were it not for this directed dynamism. Furthermore, the “directedness” of this dynamism does not originate from chance, but is grounded in divine wisdom and providence:

Hence these schematic arrangements of things and complexes of laws are all brought together under one more concrete and more universal order. This order of reality is surely that of divine wisdom and providence, which embraces all things down to the smallest detail of each being, arranges and directs all things and brings each one to its proper end.¹¹¹

Lonergan’s understanding of divine justice through his use of his notion of emergent probability exemplifies his adoption of the Leonine injunction *vetera novis augere et perficere* – to enlarge and enrich the old with the new. In the Christian tradition, redemption and divine justice have always been closely linked, and the category of divine justice took on a particular emphasis in the tradition with the emergence of Anselm’s *Cur Deus Homo?* Lonergan, however, enlarges and enriches our understanding of divine justice. He is faithful to the tradition,¹¹² yet incorporates knowledge from

¹⁰⁸ Hefling, “Philosophy, Theology, and God,” 131.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 77 [*Supplement*, 31].

¹¹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 81 [*Supplement*, 33].

¹¹¹ “Ipsae ergo quas superius distinximus schematicae rerum dispositiones legumque complicationes alio quodam et magis concreto magisque universali ordine comprehenduntur. Qui sane ordo ipsius divinae sapientiae atque providentiae est, quae omnia complectitur secundum omnes singulorum determinationes etiam minimas, quae omnia disponit atque dirigit, quae omnia in fines singulis proprios producit.” *DBM*, 72-73 [*Supplement*, 30]. See also Lonergan, *DBM*, 74 [*Supplement*, 31].

¹¹² Here I would add that for Lonergan, the tradition is represented by Aquinas’s doctrine on divine justice.

contemporary natural and human sciences.¹¹³ What Lonergan is doing in this chapter, from a methodological perspective, parallels what Aquinas did in the thirteenth century. Whereas Aquinas sought a synthesis with the best available scientific knowledge of his time, which for him was found in the thought of Aristotle, Lonergan in the late 1950s develops an understanding of divine justice that incorporates the best available scientific knowledge of *his* time. In *Insight*, Lonergan's incorporation of contemporary knowledge from the natural and human sciences resulted in this theory of emergent probability, and although the *Supplement* does not explicitly use the term "emergent probability" there is no doubt Lonergan is using his thought on emergent probability to advance our understanding of divine justice by advancing our understanding of how our actual world operates through natural and statistical laws.

3.3.3 Dispelling Anthropomorphic Understandings of Divine Justice

Our English word "justice" originates from the Latin *justitia*, where the Latin root is *jus* or *juris*, meaning "right," "rightness of order," or "law." Traditionally the word is associated with legal rights. In the traditional sense the meaning of justice is essentially retributive justice (vindication): making things right through the assignment of reward or punishment (just deserts).

¹¹³ Lonergan's use of analogy, understood through natural knowledge in accordance with the vision of the First Vatican Council, is the use of what later in *Method in Theology* would be called general theological categories. See Doran, "The First Chapter of *De Deo Trino, Pars Systematica: The Issues*," 41. General theological categories are those categories theology shares with other disciplines. Categories strictly peculiar to theology are special theological categories. A point to be made is that analogical understanding of the mysteries of faith intended by the First Vatican Council cannot be content only with special theological categories. We could say that here Lonergan is solidly within the Aristotelian-Thomist tradition as opposed to an Augustinian or Bonaventuran tradition which would be more hesitant and perhaps reluctant to incorporate knowledge from natural and human sciences. See Doran, "The First Chapter of *De Deo Trino, Pars Systematica: The Issues*," 41. See also Lonergan, "Method in Catholic Theology," *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, 45-46.

It is obvious Lonergan's purpose is not only to develop an understanding of divine justice, but specifically an understanding that dispels anthropomorphic understandings based exclusively on legal analogies. We can too easily conceive God's justice as *only* retributive (legal) justice. Divine justice *does* include retributive justice, but retributive justice does not exhaust the meaning of divine justice. The cross of Christ reveals another aspect of divine justice, the transformation of evil into good through self-sacrificing love, which Lonergan considers the highest principle in the whole economy of salvation. We will interpret this aspect of divine justice revealed in the cross of Christ when we come to chapter 4 of the *Supplement*, but the point here is that this highest principle in the economy of salvation is an aspect of divine justice, but it is *not* retributive justice. Retributive justice is essentially rendering to each his own in equal measure, meaning that good is returned to good and the evil is returned to evil. The transformation of good from evil fits neither of these "sub-orderings" of divine justice; hence it is not retributive justice.¹¹⁴

Thus one of Lonergan's intents is to free the reader from the anthropomorphic tendency to limit the understanding of God's justice to retributive justice. What

¹¹⁴ Lonergan does not explicitly speak of "sub-orders" in his chapter on the justice of God. However, this is implicit in his understanding through his argument that divine wisdom orders intelligibles and non-intelligibles, and from the non-intelligible brings forth the intelligible, which is simply to say that the order of divine justice includes a sub-order in which evil is transformed into good. Furthermore, Lonergan discussed these sub-orderings explicitly in *DVI*, written only a few years after the *Supplement*. In *DVI*, where Lonergan includes a note on the justice of God, he states that the orderings to be found within the one justice of God can be divided into four: (1) good follows good, (2) evil follows evil, (3) evil follows good, and (4) good follows evil. See Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 514. The first two sub-orderings, which represent retributive justice, are especially relevant to Lonergan's twelfth article on the personal order of justice where he discusses that death brings each person to the day of judgment. The third sub-ordering (evil follows good) reflects the Scholastic doctrine that there is always a consequence to sin: *malum poenae* always follows *malum culpae*. This third ordering presupposes God's permitting (but not willing) of sin, which in itself is irrational and non-intelligible. The fourth sub-ordering is redemption, the transformation of evil into good. The fourth sub-ordering, in order to be faithful to the sixth article in the first chapter of the *Supplement*, should be understood in the broader sense of "restoration," and within this fourth sub-order we must make a distinction between natural and supernatural restoration.

Lonergan is doing in this chapter is redeeming the notion of divine justice itself, challenging us to reject anthropomorphic understandings based exclusively on analogies of law codes and lawyers, judges and juries, prisons and prison guards. Such notions of God's justice on their own are inadequate for understanding the justice of God.

3.4 The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the *Supplement*

We recall Lonergan's hermeneutical principle that the part is understood through the whole, and the whole through the part. As we noted in the previous chapter, Lonergan's consideration of the justice of God functions primarily as a theology, background material for the remaining chapters of the *Supplement*. Our purpose here is to understand this assertion.

In the introduction to this dissertation, I noted the importance of *Insight* as a heuristic to guide the interpretation of the *Supplement*. Chapter 20 of *Insight* includes Lonergan's heuristic structure of the solution to the problem of evil. The foundational antecedent determination giving rise to Lonergan's heuristic structure has a strong correlation to the material in the *Supplement's* chapter on the justice of God. This foundational antecedent determination can be expressed as follows: there is an intelligible unity of the actual world order.¹¹⁵ And, since there are no divine afterthoughts, one of the key elements in Lonergan's heuristic structure is the following: the solution to the problem of evil (redemption) will be in harmonious continuation with the order of this universe.¹¹⁶ I consider this to be perhaps the fundamental point in Lonergan's entire heuristic structure.

¹¹⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

¹¹⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

It is my intent to use this fundamental point in Lonergan's heuristic structure as a tool to interpret the function of Lonergan's understanding of divine justice in the wider context of the *Supplement*. I will do this in two steps. First, I will consider the question of the function of this chapter in the wider context of the *Supplement* through the lens of Lonergan's heuristic that redemption will be in harmonious continuation with the intelligible unity of the order of this universe. Second, based on that consideration, I will conclude with a section which interprets Lonergan's understanding of divine justice as a theological principle of his soteriology.

3.4.1 Redemption as Harmonious Continuation with the Order of the Universe

In chapter 20 of *Insight* Lonergan states that "...the solution [to the problem of evil] will be in harmonious continuation of the actual order of the universe. For there are no divine afterthoughts."¹¹⁷ This means that the existing world order, as we currently understand it, already has the *potential* for the solution. To state otherwise would be to suggest that God changes his mind as humans do, which is an anthropomorphic error.

Next we may ask, what grounds this heuristic element? As we noted earlier, Lonergan's antecedent determination grounding this specific element (including the entire heuristic structure) is his judgment that there is an intelligible unity to the order of this universe. We may further ask, how does he reach this judgment? The answer to this question is found in chapter 19 of *Insight*. There Lonergan discusses God's "unrestricted act of understanding" and judges that this must be *one* act, not multiple acts of understanding:

¹¹⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 718.

Again, the unrestricted act of understanding is one act. Otherwise, it would be an aggregate or a succession of acts. If none of these acts was the understanding of everything about everything, then the denial of unity would be the denial of unrestricted understanding. If any of these acts was the understanding of everything about everything, then at least that unrestricted act would be a single act.¹¹⁸

Since God understands the order of this universe in *one* unrestricted act of understanding, then there is logically an intelligible unity in the order of this universe. To deny this intelligible unity is a denial that God's unrestricted act of understanding is *one* act. Such a denial is an anthropomorphic conception of God's wisdom. Here Lonergan's thought in *Insight* clearly anticipates his judgment in the *Supplement* that God's wisdom conceives the order of the universe in one immediate intuition, not by trial and error.

Thus the problem of evil and its solution are *both* related to divine wisdom and goodness that has conceived and chosen the existing world order. The world order as it currently exists is good and already has the potency for the solution to the problem of evil. This potency is not dictated by finite natures but by the intelligible unity of world order conceived by divine wisdom. H. Daniel Monsour explains:

If finite natures are derivative possibilities of world-order mirroring forth the glory of God, world-order, the intelligible unity of the whole, not the finite natures, dictates what is possible within that order. If the actual world-order that God brings about is such that there is a natural orientation or order among lower strata for the reception of a fulfilling term from some higher strata, one cannot exclude it as impossible by arguing from finite natures and their exigencies...The fulfillment occurs in accord with the actual order of this universe that mirrors forth the glory of God.¹¹⁹

It is therefore not only possible but expected that redemption will be in harmonious continuation with the actual order of this universe. Stated otherwise, the intelligibility of redemption is intelligibly subsumed under the one, intelligible unity of

¹¹⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 688.

¹¹⁹ H. Daniel Monsour, "Harmonious Continuation of the Actual Order of the Universe in God's Self-Communication," (unpublished paper delivered at the Lonergan Research Institute Seminar, Toronto, November 13, 2003), 31.

the actual order of the universe. This is the cardinal point. And this point, this fundamental theological principle if you will, is arrived at when human wisdom seeks to first understand divine wisdom and to judge that divine wisdom functions as the ground of divine justice and in one immediate intuition has foreseen, ordered, and commissioned all things from the very first beginnings of the universe right down to the end, including salvation history. There are no divine afterthoughts. As such, our redemption and therefore the historical causality of Christ is to be understood as harmonious with our understanding of the just and wise order of this universe conceived by divine wisdom.

Now that I have introduced the term “theological principle,” my purpose in the next section is to explain what I mean by this term, and how Lonergan’s chapter on the justice of God functions as a theological principle in the wider context of the *Supplement*.

3.4.2 Divine Justice as a Theological Principle

Near the time Lonergan wrote the *Supplement*, his articulation of the means used by the systematic theologian to reach theological understanding considered the relationship between understanding and principles. In the *Triune God: Systematics*, Lonergan states that “understanding is about principles.”¹²⁰ What Lonergan means is that understanding depends on principles, and so understanding is only as good as the principles to which they are connected.¹²¹ In that text Lonergan defines a principle as

¹²⁰ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 23.

¹²¹ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 25-27; See also Robert Doran, “*Intelligentia Fidei in Deo Trino, Pars Systematica: A Commentary on the First Three Sections of Chapter One*,” *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19 (2001), 80-81.

“what is first in some order.”¹²² And it is the function of wisdom itself to put things in their right order.¹²³

If understanding is about principles, and principles are first in the order proposed by wisdom, then we should interpret Lonergan’s understanding of divine justice as a theological principle for his understanding of redemption. This is why, along with Frederick Crowe, I would judge Lonergan’s chapter on divine justice to function as “background material” for the explicit Christology presented in the subsequent chapters of the *Supplement*.¹²⁴ My point here is not to suggest that Lonergan’s question on the nature of divine justice is the absolute first question of the *Supplement*. Obviously it is not, for we have already treated his first chapter on good and evil, and there the principal question or problem is anthropological in nature. That first chapter establishes the problem of evil in human affairs, the impotence of purely human solutions, and thus the need for a supernatural solution to the problem of evil. On the other hand, Lonergan’s understanding of divine justice is a theology, and as a theology it functions as a principle for working out his understanding of redemption and in particular the historical causality of Christ. For Lonergan, if divine justice is misunderstood, redemption will be misunderstood.

Now let us reflect deeper on *why* it is necessary for Lonergan to understand divine justice prior to understanding this or that aspect of redemption. In my interpretation, Lonergan’s chapter on divine justice takes up what is perhaps the first question or problem one needs to answer if one wants to understand salvation history, and specifically the historical causality of Christ. In my own words, I would express this

¹²² Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 23.

¹²³ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 23.

¹²⁴ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 103.

question as follows: *In general, how does God operate in our world?* If we cannot answer this question, how can we possibly understand the historical causality of Christ? For Lonergan, the answer to this question is grounded in his understanding of divine justice: there is an intelligible unity in the common course of things and the order of the universe, and this common course and order are the proper effects of God produced through secondary causes. Any aspect of redemption will be in harmonious continuation with this common course and order, this intelligible unity, because divine justice has no higher rule than divine wisdom which has conceived the order of this universe in one intuitional act. If one follows this principle, one's soteriology will find its ground in intelligibility, not necessity. This intelligibility ultimately originates from divine wisdom, the rule of divine justice. It is important to note that Lonergan wants his reader to understand that the theologian's wisdom must not lose sight of divine wisdom. Lonergan's understanding of divine justice is grounded in an understanding of *this* world conceived by divine wisdom, and not some other possible world God could have created that human wisdom is tempted to contemplate.¹²⁵

If Lonergan's understanding of divine justice establishes the theological principle that there is an intelligible unity in the order of the universe, then any subsequent question about the intelligibility of a proper effect of God *must* be intelligibly related to

¹²⁵ In the 1957 Boston College Lectures on Mathematical Logic and Existentialism, Lonergan stated the following in response to a question: "...Thomas is not talking about all possible worlds. Thomas is trying to get the amount of understanding one can have of this world. The intelligibility of this world is the order of divine wisdom as de facto chosen freely by God and realized in the world. To understand that order in this world is Thomas's concern. And as Thomas knows, he doesn't possess divine wisdom. He doesn't try to discuss all possible worlds...Consequently, when Thomas is discussing this world and understanding this world, he isn't talking about all possible worlds...Thomist inquiry is trying to understand this world the way the empirical sciences understand this world. Just as the law of gravitation isn't a necessary law of gravitation but the law that is de facto true, similarly the order of this world isn't what God must do but what God de facto has done. And it's intelligible just as the law of gravitation is intelligible. But it's not necessary, just as the law of gravitation is not necessary." See Lonergan, *Phenomenology and Logic: the Boston College Lectures on Mathematical Logic*, vol. 18 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Philip J. McShane (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 355.

the order of the universe, otherwise there would be no intelligible unity to the universe, amounting to a notion of a voluntaristically conceived divine will, an error Lonergan refutes. The redemption is not necessary, *but it is intelligible*. However, voluntarism has a too superficial understanding of intelligibility to sufficiently grasp the intelligibility of redemption. And the root cause of this problem is a failure to judge that divine wisdom intelligibly orders those things that are contingent, those things freely chosen by God. In short, there is an aspect of voluntarism which ignores the significance of intelligibility, exaggerates accordingly the role of the will, and obscures the notion of divine justice.¹²⁶

Let us dwell for the moment on the significance of intelligibility, because it is critical to interpreting Lonergan. The justice of God is not limited to the events we associate with salvation history. *Every* event in history directly willed by God is related to God in exactly the same way, because anything directly willed by God is intelligible.¹²⁷ Charles Hefling explains:

In the universe that actually exists, every event that actually occurs is related to God in exactly the same way. That is what it means to affirm that God is the First Agent. The Big Bang, biological evolution, my writing this chapter and your understanding it – if any of these is occurring or has occurred, it is intelligible, and God is the reason *why* it is intelligible. But the same thing is true, in the same way, of miracles, revelation, religious conversion, and the Incarnation. The sense in which these are acts of God is no different from the sense in which falling sparrows and lilies of the field are acts of God. Even “salvation history,” in other words, belongs to the intelligible, emergently probable universe.¹²⁸

The cardinal point here is that anything in the created order, including salvation history, belongs to the intelligible unity of the one order of the universe conceived, chosen, and effected by God. Therefore the cross of Christ, the satisfaction of Christ, and the historical causality of Christ, as with anything else in the created order, are intelligible

¹²⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 104 [*Supplement*, 42].

¹²⁷ Hefling, “Philosophy, Theology, and God,” 137.

¹²⁸ Hefling, “Philosophy, Theology, and God,” 137.

in themselves and intelligibly related to the intelligible unity of this universe. Why? Because the cross of Christ, the satisfaction made by Christ, and the historical causality of Christ *are* part of God's choice of a wise order, they *are* part of the course of things and the order of the universe, and as such they *are* the proper effects of God. As such, they are intelligible. If they were not intelligible, they would not be just.

Even though the *Supplement* is a text on redemption, and certainly Lonergan includes material that is not explicitly required to understand the historical causality of Christ, we recall that Lonergan still had the special intent to understand the historical causality of Christ. We also mentioned in our introduction that we would attend particularly to the question of Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ based on his own stated purpose. I will explain how this theological principle is at work in Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ.

First, recall how Lonergan understands the intelligible unity of world process. He understands this intelligible unity in terms of emergent probability. Now emergent probability includes the intelligibility of statistical laws, and statistical laws imply that if an event is to take place, the conditions which enable that event to take place must be fulfilled. Statistical laws attempt to identify the probability that the relevant conditions will be fulfilled for the event to take place. Well, if the historical causality of Christ is an aspect of redemption, and if redemption is in harmonious continuation with the actual order of this universe, then the historical causality of Christ will certainly involve the fulfillment of conditions not only with respect to Christ as historical agent, but also with respect to human agents who cooperate in Christ's redemptive mission.

In fact, when Lonergan discusses agency in the final chapter of the *Supplement*, he will distinguish between agents acting through nature and agents acting through intellect.¹²⁹ Persons who choose to cooperate with Christ in God's plan of redemption are ministerial agents acting through intellect. As such, they not only intend specific effects, but they can also come to knowledge of the requisite conditions that must be fulfilled if their intended effect is to be actualized.

Furthermore, in the final chapter of the *Supplement* where Lonergan discusses "Christ the Historical Agent,"¹³⁰ he will explain why the effect of Christ's historical action as a whole is the total human good of order, both external and cultural, past, present, and future.¹³¹ He will explain that Christ's actions are mediated socially and historically, which means that Christ's actions are adapted to human persons. Humans communicate through expressive signs, and human knowledge begins from the senses. The Word, in becoming flesh, through his whole ministry on earth involving word and deed, made perceptible the Word of God to human beings. In my interpretation, this is a judgment that Christ's historical actions are in harmonious continuation with the actual order of the universe because Christ's actions are adapted to human beings as we actually exist in this world order. God is certainly the absolute, first historical agent. But as Lonergan's article on the "Just Order of Reality" asserts, it is God's way to act through secondary causes and in accordance with their natures.

¹²⁹ An agent acting through intellect, as opposed to an agent acting through nature, acts in accordance with an *intentional* form. An agent acting through nature can only act in accordance with either an innate form or a form naturally acquired. In either case, an agent needs the requisite conditions fulfilled in order to produce their effect. Whereas agents acting through nature are at the mercy of nature to fulfill the conditions that allow the actuation of their own agency, agents acting through intellect not only intend effects, but they also have the ability to understand the conditions that need to be fulfilled and can, to a certain degree, fulfill the necessary conditions that allow the agent to cause the effect. See Lonergan, *DBM*, *239 [*Supplement*, 100-101].

¹³⁰ Article 42.

¹³¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *268 [*Supplement*, 114].

This is particularly important to acknowledge when it comes to human communication, since communication is required for the transmission of beliefs. And the transmission of beliefs is fundamental to the historical causality of Christ, since the proclamation of the solution to the problem of evil is required if the solution is to be in harmonious continuation with the actual order of the universe.¹³² This is why in the article on the “Just Order of Reality,” Lonergan states that God himself became man that he might be a secondary and proportionate cause in restoring all things (Eph 1:10) and making all things new (1 Cor 5:17),¹³³ and that the kingdom is proclaimed and propagated through secondary causes, namely, human beings.¹³⁴

It is quite clear then that when it comes to understanding the historical causality of Christ, this historical causality is not exempt from Lonergan’s assertion that the requisite conditions need to be fulfilled for a cause to have an effect. Now why do requisite conditions need to be fulfilled? The answer again goes back to Lonergan’s understanding of the intelligible unity of world process, understood according to the theory of emergent probability in which higher schemes emerge from lower schemes. As such, in *Insight* Lonergan conceives redemption as a “higher integration” of human living (a higher scheme if you will).¹³⁵ Like any higher integration, the solution to the problem of evil comes about only when the requisite conditions for its fulfillment are actually fulfilled. This applies equally to the historical causality of Christ. To deny that the historical causality of Christ is in harmonious continuation with the actual order of the universe is

¹³² In Lonergan’s heuristic structure of the solution to the problem of evil in chapter 20 of *Insight* he includes an excursus on “belief.” Why does he do this? Because most of what any human person knows is known through belief, not immanently generated knowledge. The transmission of beliefs is fundamentally part of the intelligible unity of world order. As such, communication of the good news from one generation to the next, *as a belief*, is fundamental to a historically-minded understanding of redemption.

¹³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 78-79 [*Supplement*, 32].

¹³⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 79 [*Supplement*, 32].

¹³⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 655.

equivalent to denying that the historical causality of Christ is in harmonious continuation with divine justice, since divine wisdom which has conceived the intelligible unity of world order is the norm, the ground of divine justice.

In summary, we can state that the intelligibility of divine justice discerned in the intelligible unity of world order is a theological principle of the *Supplement*. It is clear that for Lonergan, understanding redemption presupposes an understanding of divine justice. In other words, it is a fundamental theological principle operative in Lonergan's soteriology, whether he is seeking to understand the meaning of the cross, the meaning of Christ's satisfaction, or the meaning of the historical causality of Christ. A principle is what is first in some order. Every aspect of Lonergan's understanding of redemption is influenced by this principle, meaning that the explanatory, systematic conclusions he reaches regarding redemption are ordered to his understanding of divine justice, as conclusions are ordered to principles.

3.5 Summary

The focus of Lonergan's chapter is clearly on divine wisdom, since God's wisdom is the law of God's justice. Lonergan inherited this understanding of divine justice from Aquinas, and through Lonergan's adoption of the Leonine injunction of *vetera novis augere et perficere* Lonergan has synthesized Aquinas's understanding of divine justice with contemporary knowledge from the natural and human sciences. For Lonergan, knowledge from the natural and human sciences, which is integral to his worldview of emergent probability developed in *Insight*, advances our understanding of divine justice by advancing our understanding of how God operates in this world through

secondary (instrumental) causes according to the nature of things and natural laws. And since divine wisdom does not learn by trial and error, redemption in general and the historical causality of Christ in particular are in harmonious continuation with the intelligible unity of the order of this universe conceived by divine wisdom. As Lonergan states in *Insight*, there are no divine afterthoughts.

This understanding of divine justice functions as a theological principle in the *Supplement*. The cross of Christ, the satisfaction of Christ, and the historical causality of Christ are directly willed by God. Therefore they are most just. And if just, they are intelligible. And if they are intelligible, they must be intelligently related to the intelligible unity of the actual order of this universe. Redemption is not necessary, but it is intelligible. If the theological principle of divine justice is misunderstood, a misunderstanding of redemption is sure to follow. This chapter on divine justice clearly shows Lonergan's concern to conceive divine justice correctly, evidenced by his repeated emphasis on the problem of anthropomorphic conceptions of divine justice based on legal analogies.

Finally we should note that this chapter on the justice of God is not Lonergan's final word on divine justice. As he notes at the beginning and end of the chapter, he is leaving room for further development. This further development will appeal to a much loftier analogy: the cross of Christ.

CHAPTER 4: ON THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

4.1 Introduction

Our purpose here is to interpret the third chapter of the *Supplement* titled “On the Death and Resurrection of Christ.”¹ The chapter includes articles 16-21 of the *Supplement*: (16) The Death of Christ, (17) The Payment of the Price, (18) The New Testament Sacrifice, (19) Meritorious Obedience, (20) Vicarious Suffering, and (21) The Power of the Resurrection.

Lonergan begins with an introductory paragraph:

No Christian doctrine has received a clearer or fuller treatment in the New Testament than the dogma of the Redemption. Accordingly, it seems best to collect and set forth first of all whatever teachings are communicated in the primary sources of revelation. The next six articles, therefore -- on the death of Christ (16), the payment of a price (17), the sacrifice of the new covenant (18), meritorious obedience (19), vicarious suffering (20), and the power of the resurrection (21) -- will simply express what is to be found in scripture.²

4.2 A Brief Description of Articles 16 - 21

4.2.1 Article 16: The Death of Christ³

The article is divided into six sub-sections: (1) Proximate causes, (2) Underlying principles, (3) God’s intention, (4) Distinctions, (5) Immanent effects, and (6) Universal effect.

¹ “Caput Tertium. DE CHRISTO MORTUO ET RESURRECTO,” *DBM*, 118-145 [*Supplement*, 48-60].

² “Aliam christianae fidei doctrinam neque clarius neque plenius exposuerunt novi testamenti auctores quam ipsum redemptionis dogma. Quam ob causam, ea in primis colligere atque recitare visum est, quae in primariis revelationis fontibus traduntur. Sex ergo quae sequuntur articulis de morte Christi (XVI), de pretii solutione (XVII), de sacrificio novi testamenti (XVIII), de obedientia meritoria (XIX), de vicaria passione (XX), et de virtute resurrectionis (XXI), non alia fere continentur quam quae in scripturis leguntur.” *DBM*, 118 [*Supplement*, 48-49]. As we noted in the previous chapter, although Lonergan uses the word “dogma,” no specific definition of the doctrine of the redemption has been given dogmatic status by the Catholic Church.

³ “Articulus XVI. De Morte Christi,” *DBM*, 120-123 [*Supplement*, 49-50].

Proximate causes: Lonergan identifies four and possibly a fifth proximate cause of Christ's death: (1) Judas, his betrayer; (2) the High Priests; (3) the Jerusalem mob stirred up by the priests; (4) the soldiers; and (5) if one adds those who consented, the passers-by who jeered at him. Although Lonergan states that these causes are "according to the gospel narratives" (*secundum narrationem evangelicam*), Lonergan's scriptural references are almost exclusively from the gospel of Mark.⁴

Underlying principles: Lonergan notes that John's gospel continually points out the opposition of the Jews,⁵ but the same gospel points out general principles of human nature suggesting that the opposition to Christ was almost inevitable in the normal course of human events.⁶ To substantiate this judgment, Lonergan cites many passages, all from John's gospel.⁷ The fundamental opposition Lonergan discusses can be summed up as follows: Christ was the light of the world (Jn 8:12); the light came into the world but humans preferred darkness to light, for their deeds were evil (Jn 3:19).⁸

God's intention: Lonergan cites Acts 2:23 which teaches that Christ was delivered up by the deliberate intention and foreknowledge of God.⁹ The sufferings of Christ were mandatory (Lk 24:26, 46) and in accordance with the Scriptures (1 Cor 15:13; Acts 3:18).¹⁰

To the above references we may add what is said about the command of the Father (Jn 10:18), Christ's own predictions about his passion and death (Mk 9:12, 31, 10:33 ff.), his

⁴ The article includes six scriptural references. Regarding Judas, Lonergan cites Mk 14:21, 43. Regarding the High Priest, Mk. 14:55, 64. Regarding the Jerusalem mob, Mk 15:11, 14. Regarding the soldiers, Mk 15:16, 21, 24. Regarding the passers-by who consented, Rom 1:32 and Mk 15:29, 31.

⁵ Lonergan references the following passages from John: Jn 5:16, 18; 6:53, 60, 66, 70; 7:12-13, 20, 31-32, 43-44, 51-52; 8:48, 59; 9:16, 22, 30-34; 10:19-21, 31, 39; 11:46-53, 56; 12:19, 42-43.

⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 120 [*Supplement*, 49].

⁷ Jn 3:19-21; 7:7; 8:37-47; 9:41; 12: 39 ff.; 19:11.

⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 120 [*Supplement*, 49].

⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 121 [*Supplement*, 49].

¹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 121 [*Supplement*, 49].

voluntary acceptance of his passion and death (Mk 14:36, Mt 26:33), and his obedience so often mentioned by the apostles (Rom 5:19; Phil 2:8; Heb 5:8, 10:5-7).¹¹

Distinctions: As a physical event the death of Christ is both an action and a passion. Christ's death is an action considered as proceeding from the agents who caused his death, and this same event is a passion as produced in the recipient.¹² Distinctions must be made regarding the wills involved. God in no way wills the evil of sin, so God in no way willed the sin of those culpable for Christ's death. God only indirectly wills the consequences of sin, so God only indirectly willed the evils inflicted upon Christ. God directly wills the good, so God directly willed the acceptance of suffering and death on the part of the obedient Christ.¹³ Lonergan explains why God directly willed this:

Moreover, actions that are in accordance with the precepts of the Gospels are virtuous. Now the Gospel rejects the law of retaliation, *lex talionis*, commands love of one's enemies (Mt 5:38-48), and extols the suffering of evil for the sake of justice (Mt 5:10 ff)...The whole of Christ's passion and death, therefore, inasmuch as it proceeded from the gentle and humble Christ, was directly willed by God.¹⁴

Immanent effects: Lonergan notes that the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches that Christ was perfected through his sufferings (Heb 2:10; 5:8-9), and St. Paul teaches that Christ's exaltation was due to his becoming obedient unto death, even death on a cross (Phil 2:7 ff.).¹⁵ Lonergan notes St. Paul's teaching that the purpose of Christ's death and resurrection is that Christ might be Lord of both the dead and the living (Rom 14:9).¹⁶

¹¹ "Quibus accedunt quae de mandato Patris narrantur (Jn 10:18), propriae passionis et mortis praedictiones a Christo factae (Mk 9:12, 31, 10:33 ff.), voluntaria eiusdem passionis et mortis acceptatio (Mk 14:36, Mt 26:33), et ab apostolis celebrata Christi obedientia (Rom 5:19; Phil 2:8; Heb 5:8, 10:5-7)." *DBM*, 121 [*Supplement*, 49].

¹² Lonergan, *DBM*, 121 [*Supplement*, 49]. Lonergan references *ST*, I-II, q. 20, a. 6, 2um; Lombard, 3, d. 20, c. 5-7.

¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 122 [*Supplement*, 50].

¹⁴ "Praeterea, bonae sunt actiones quae secundum praecepta evangelica fiunt; sed evangelium reprobatur legem talionis, inimicorum dilectionem praecipit (Mt 5:38-48), et malorum perpressionem propter iustitiam summopere laudat (Mt 5:10 ff.)...et ideo totam Christi passionem eiusque mortem, quatenus a voluntate Christi mitis et humilis processit, directe voluit Deus." *DBM*, 122 [*Supplement*, 50].

¹⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 123 [*Supplement*, 50].

¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 123 [*Supplement*, 50].

Universal effect: The universal effect of Christ's death is our redemption.

Lonergan cites a number of passages from Scripture:

Scripture teaches above all that Christ died for our sins (1 Cor 15:3; 1 Pet 3:18), on behalf of sinners (Rom 5:6), for the whole human race (2 Cor 5:15; Heb 2:9), for each individual (Rom 14:15; 1 Cor 8:11; Gal 2:20), for us (Rom 5:8; 1 Thes 5:10); that we were baptized in the death of Christ (Rom 6:3), that the Eucharist proclaims the death of the Lord (1 Cor 11:26), a death undergone for redemption from transgressions (Heb 9:15); that he died in order to gather together the scattered children of God (Jn 11:51-52), and so that all living men should live no longer for themselves but for him who died and was raised to life for them (2 Cor 5:15); that he died in order that, alive or dead, we should still live united to him (1 Thes 5:10); in order to lead us to God (1 Pet 3:18), to bring about a universal reconciliation (2 Cor 5:19; Rom 5:10; Eph 2:16; Col 1:20-22), and to destroy by his death him who had power over death, that is, the devil, and set free all those who had been held in slavery all their lives by the fear of death (Heb 2:14). To all this we may add everything that Scripture says about the blood and the cross of the Lord, about his sacrifice, his love and his self-surrender.¹⁷

4.2.2 Article 17: The Payment of the Price¹⁸

There are two basic parts to this article. In the first, Lonergan considers the literal meaning of the New Testament word "redemption." He surveys various Greek words translated into the Latin as *redimere* (to redeem) or *redemptio* (redemption). Some refer strictly to a commercial transaction, "while others have such a reference but in a much more general and sometimes remote sense."¹⁹ He considers the latter group first. The

¹⁷ "Praecipue vero docet scriptura Christum mortuum esse pro peccatis nostris (1 Cor 15:3; 1 Pet 3:18), pro impiis (Rom 5:6), pro omnibus (2 Cor 5:15; Heb 2:9) et singulis (Rom 14:15; 1 Cor 8:11; Gal 2:20), pro nobis (Rom 5:8; 1 Thes 5:10); in morte Christi nos baptizari (Rom 6:3), Eucharistiam mortem Domini annuntiare (1 Cor 11:26); quam praeterea mortem fuisse in redemptionem praevaricationum (Heb 9:15); ut filios Dei, qui erant dispersi, congregaret in unum (Jn 11:51-52); ut et qui vivunt, iam non sibi vivant, sed ei qui pro ipsis mortuus est et resurrexit (2 Cor 5:15); ut sive vigilemus sive dormiamus simul cum illo vivamus (1 Thes 5:10); ut nos offerret Deo (1 Pet 3:18); in reconciliationem universalem (2 Cor 5:19; Rom 5:10; Eph 2:16; Col 1:20-22); ut per mortem destrueret eum qui habebat mortis imperium, id est diabolum, et liberaret eos qui timore mortis per totam vitam obnoxii erant servituti (Heb 2:14). Quibus accedunt omnia quae de sanguine et cruce Domini dicuntur, de eius sacrificio, de eius dilectione, suique traditione." *DBM*, 123 [*Supplement*, 50].

¹⁸ "Articulus XVII. De Pretii Solutione," *DBM*, 124-128 [*Supplement*, 51-53].

¹⁹ "...aliae autem connexum quidem sed longe generaliore sensum eumque interdum remotum habent." *DBM*, 124 [*Supplement*, 51]. Based on a comparison to Lonergan's 1958 lecture on redemption, this somewhat enigmatic statement likely refers to the Hebrew meaning of redemption in the Old Testament carried forward into the New Testament. The Hebrew understanding of redemption was primarily

Greek words refer to redemption in various contexts.²⁰ Then he examines specific passages which speak of redemption using metaphors related to commercial transactions, such as the Greek *lytron*, which can be translated “ransom.” Lonergan notes a number of examples from the New Testament.²¹ From the New Testament teachings he draws five conclusions. First, there is a distinction between the means and end of redemption:

Redemption *as end* is that state in which we are freed from the power of darkness, from sin, from punishment, from the fear of death, by which we have received the promise, are reconciled to God, are justified, enjoy the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and adoptive sonship, are saved in hope, are able to approach God with confidence; by which we await or will one day enjoy the resurrection of the flesh, life with Christ, and the crown of glory. Redemption *as means* refers to that process by which this state arises or is brought about, not only by causality but also and especially under that condition most burdensome to Christ, namely, death on the cross. The Word of God could have saved us without coming down from heaven; the incarnate Word could have saved us without going through his passion and death; but in actual fact it was through his passion and death that he did save us.²²

liberation or deliverance, and not primarily a meaning expressed in terms of a financial transaction using metaphors taken from the pagan marketplace and the ancient practice of buying and selling slaves and captives. The Hebrew meaning is exemplified through the words *pādāh* (primarily understood as liberation from Egypt), *gā'al* (primarily understood as liberation from Babylon), and *kipper* (liberation from sin). The Hebrew understanding of redemption as liberation or deliverance is especially present in the canticle of Zachariah (Lk 1:68-79). See Lonergan, “The Redemption,” 17.

²⁰ As liberation expected by devout Jews: *lytrōsis* (Lk 1:68, 2:38; Heb 9:12). As the remission of sins: *apolytrōsis* (Eph 1:7, Col 1:14; Heb 9:15) and *lytrousthai* (Tit 2:14). As the redemption hoped for on the last day: *apolytrōsis* (Lk 21:28; Rom 8:23; Eph 1:14, 4:30). As Christ himself and as Christ having won an eternal redemption: *apolytrōsis* (1 Cor 1:30) and *lytrōsis* (Heb 9:12), respectively. In connection with grace and the gratuitous justification: *apolytrōsis* (Rom 3:24). Lonergan, *DBM*, 122 [Supplement, 51].

²¹ Lonergan organizes these examples into five groups: (1) The Son of Man came not to serve, but to give his life as a ransom (*lytron*) for many (Mk 10:45; Mt. 20:28). Lonergan notes that “to give one’s life” would seem to be a Semitism, as “to lay down one’s life” in Jn 10:11, 15, 17, and the meaning of “redemption” (*redemptio*) associated with the metaphor *lytron* indicates a means of liberation; (2) Christ sacrificed himself as a ransom (*antilytron*) for all (1 Tim 2:6); (3) We were ransomed (*elytrōthēte*) not with gold or silver, but in the precious blood of Christ (1 Pet 1:18); (4) There are a number of passages where we find the Greek *timē* [price], *agorazein* [to buy], *exagorazein* [to buy up, buy from]. For example, Paul tells the Corinthians that they have been bought at a price (1 Cor 6:20); (5) A number of passages speak of the Lord giving himself up for our sins (Gal 1:4), giving himself up for me (Gal 2:20), for us (Eph 5:2), for the Church (Eph 5:25), for our sins (Rom 4:25), and for us all (Rom 8:32). Lonergan, *DBM*, 125-127 [Supplement, 51-52].

²² “Redemptio ut finis est status ille quo liberamur a potestate tenebrarum, a peccatis, a poenis, a timore mortis, quo reprobationem accipimus, Deo reconciliamur, iustificamur, inhabitationem Spiritus et filiorum adoptionem habemus, spe salvati sumus, cum fiducia ad Deum accedere possumus, resurrectionem carnis, vitam cum Christo, gloriae coronam vel adhuc exspectamus vel quandoque possidebimus. Redemptio autem ut medium dicit id quo hic status oritur et producitur, non solum causalitate, sed etiam et praecipue sub illa conditione Christo onerosa, quae erat mors crucis. Potuit enim Dei Verbum de caelis nos salvare; potuit Verbum caro factum praeter passionem et mortem nos salvare; sed de facto passione et morte nos salvos fecit.” *DBM*, 127 [Supplement, 52]. Lonergan references ST, III, q. 46, a. 2.

Second, Christ “wrought the salvation of all mankind” (*salutem omnium hominum esse operatum*) under the burdensome condition of “giving his life” (*dandi animam suam*).²³ Lonergan makes this conclusion on the basis of New Testament exegesis, particularly those passages which understand Christ’s “giving his life” for our redemption metaphorically as “paying the price” (*pretii solutio*).²⁴ Lonergan states that “paying the price” is no doubt a metaphor, but it is a real operation and signifies an exchange inasmuch as the death of Christ was real, our salvation is real, and a connection between them is affirmed.²⁵ Third, Christ gave his earthly life in exchange for the eternal life of humanity.²⁶ Fourth, if one asks to whom the price was paid, this pushes the metaphor too far. Lonergan notes that the once-widespread opinion that Christ paid the price to the devil has for a long time been discarded.²⁷ Fifth, as to why God required a price for our salvation, the reason is a mystery in the fullest sense and we can only understand it imperfectly and analogically. For Lonergan, such an understanding would be most fruitful, perhaps more fruitful than *any* other theological understanding,²⁸ but the means to this end is to first determine just *what* is to be understood so that subsequently one might try to attain some understanding.

²³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 127 [*Supplement*, 52].

²⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 127 [*Supplement*, 52].

²⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 127-128 [*Supplement*, 52].

²⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 128 [*Supplement*, 53].

²⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 128 [*Supplement*, 53].

²⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 128 [*Supplement*, 53].

4.2.3 Article 18: The New Testament Sacrifice²⁹

First, Lonergan distinguishes six elements in the New Testament's notion of a sacrifice: (1) the effect of the sacrifice, which is the forgiveness of sin, sanctification, and confident access to God; (2) the recipient of the effect; (3) the agent, the priest; (4) the sufferer or victim sacrificed; (5) the action of the priest offering the sacrifice; and (6) the foundation of the sacrificial system, the covenant or testament by virtue of which that social group, in which priests are appointed to offer sacrifice for the people, is constituted as holy.³⁰

In the remainder of the article Lonergan explains that the new covenant divinely instituted by Christ is superior to the Mosaic covenant, and his explanation relies heavily on an exegesis of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Epistle to the Hebrews brings out this theme through its contrasts of (1) the mediator Moses and the mediator Christ, (2) the priesthood of Levi and the priesthood of Melchisedech, and (3) sacrifices meant to purify the flesh and sacrifices meant to purify the inner self.³¹ Lonergan summarizes that Christ has been made the guarantor, mediator, priest, and victim of the new covenant.

4.2.4 Article 19: Meritorious Obedience³²

Lonergan begins with an explanation of what constitutes the mission of the Son. As it regards the person of the Son, mission refers to his eternal procession from the

²⁹ "Articulus XVIII. De sacrificio novi testamenti," *DBM*, 129-132 [*Supplement*, 53-55].

³⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 129 [*Supplement*, 53].

³¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 130 [*Supplement*, 53].

³² "Articulus XIX. De obedientia meritoria," *DBM*, 133-137 [*Supplement*, 55-56].

Father, with the appropriate extrinsic (created) term.³³ With regard to the human acts performed by the Son, mission refers to dependence upon the Father which Lonergan names *obedience*. To command is to move another through reason and will, and to obey is to be moved by another through reason and will.³⁴

The remainder of the article is essentially a compilation of scriptural passages which speak of the command of the Father to the Son (for example, Jn 10:17-18; 12:49; 15:10), and the Son's obedient response to the Father's command (for example, Jn 4:34; 5:30; 6:38; 8:29; 15:10; 19:30).³⁵ Now Christ's obedience did not only include submission of his reason and will, but his bodily obedience as well. Submission of reason and will are interior acts. But a human act, in the fullest sense, consists not only of these interior acts, but the addition of an external act that is bodily and perceptible by the senses.³⁶ This is an important point, since Lonergan will make use of this in his reflection on Christ's satisfaction in chapter 5 of the *Supplement*.

Lonergan ends the article stating that there is no doubt that Christ's obedience unto death was free and meritorious. And correlative to Christ's obedience is the merit or reward conferred upon his obedience, spoken of by St. Paul in Philippians 2:9 and Romans 5:19. The same idea is found in Hebrews 2:9. Finally, the Council of Trent confirmed this New Testament witness, teaching that the meritorious cause of our

³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 133 [*Supplement*, 55]. In Lonergan's Trinitarian theology, the mission of a divine person is contingent, meaning that it can be or not be. As contingent, a divine mission is constituted by a divine relation of origin itself; second, although such a mission is constituted by a relation of origin alone, nevertheless an appropriate external (created) term is required if there is to be a correspondence of truth (a correspondence with reality). There is no correspondence of truth that there is a mission without an appropriate external term, although nothing real and intrinsic is added to a divine person *as divine* on account of the external term. See Lonergan, *The Triune God : Systematics*, 457. With respect to the mission of the Son, the appropriate external term is a secondary act of existence by which Christ assumes a nonsubsistent human nature. See Lonergan, *The Triune God : Systematics*, 471.

³⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 133 [*Supplement*, 55]. On the meaning of "to command" (*praecipere*) Lonergan cites *ST*, II-II, q. 104, a. 1. On the meaning of "to obey" (*obedire*) Lonergan cites *ST*, III, q. 47, a. 2, 1um.

³⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 133-134 [*Supplement*, 55].

³⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 135 [*Supplement*, 55].

justification was Christ's holy suffering on the wood of the cross (DB 799; DS 1529; ND 1932).³⁷

4.2.5 Article 20: Vicarious Suffering³⁸

“Vicarious” (*vicarium*) refers to that which someone does or suffers in the place of another.³⁹ A person acting vicariously is a substitute or surrogate. Christ's vicarious suffering included an active and passive aspect, and these two should not be separated. Christ was a surrogate in the active sense, since it is he and not us who paid the price of our redemption. It was his obedience, and not ours, that was meritorious.⁴⁰ The passive aspect included his obedient acceptance of death. The unbreakable relationship between the passive and active aspects of Christ's vicarious suffering implies that it was impossible for Christ to act vicariously on our behalf, without by the same token suffering vicariously for us. The words “for us” (*pro nobis*) have a two-sense meaning. In one sense, Christ's suffered vicariously to take away our sins. In another sense, Christ suffered vicariously *because* we are sinners. In other words, Lonergan distinguishes end and motive.

Lonergan proceeds to explore the antecedent cause or reason that Christ's vicarious suffering was in accordance with the intention of God:

Now if the passion and death of Christ occurred according to the divine intention, it surely was not without reason. This is the reason we seek, and we declare it to be that Christ came to redeem us; and he came, not on clouds of glory and sitting at the right hand of the Power, but in flesh that could suffer and would suffer on account of sin.

³⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 137 [*Supplement*, 56]. Lonergan includes a footnote referring the reader to DB 790: “If anyone asserts that this sin of Adam ... is taken away by any other remedy than through the merits of the unique mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, who has reconciled us with the Father in his own blood ... let him be anathema.” Cf. DS 1513, ND 510.

³⁸ “Articulus XX. De vicaria passione,” *DBM*, 138-141 [*Supplement*, 56-58].

³⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 138 [*Supplement*, 56].

⁴⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 138 [*Supplement*, 56].

Christ, therefore, not only acted vicariously on our behalf but also suffered and died, because he not only had eternal life to impart to us, but also the task of taking away our sins and reconciling sinners with God.⁴¹

Loneragan cites a number of New Testament passages to support the authority of his claim. We should note that even though the New Testament witness is sufficient to ground the affirmation that Christ's vicarious suffering is for us and for our sins, Lonergan also appeals to the Old Testament, namely the servant song of Isaiah 53:4-12. For Lonergan, Jesus himself interpreted his own life as the suffering servant foretold in Isaiah.⁴² Lonergan substantiates his judgment by stating that the Catholic tradition has at all times understood this passage (Isaiah 53:4-12) as referring to the death of the Lord.⁴³

4.2.6 Article 21: The Power of the Resurrection⁴⁴

Loneragan states that redemption is brought about by a mediator more than by a means, and is established upon the death and resurrection of Christ rather than upon the fact of his death alone.⁴⁵ For example, Lonergan notes that Christ has become a life-giving Spirit (1 Cor 15:45; Jn 6:62-63), and that Christ is not only our Priest in his death on the cross, but he has also been made an *eternal* High Priest (Heb 6:20; 7:28), has been allotted a "far higher ministry" (*melius sortitus ministerium*), and now sits at the right hand of God.⁴⁶ In his consideration of the power of the resurrection, Lonergan is careful

⁴¹ "Quod si passio morsque Christi secundum divinam intentionem facta est, sane sine ratione non est facta. Quam rationem quaerimus et dicimus Christum ad nos redimendos, non in nubibus caeli et sedentem a dextris virtutis venisse, sed in carne passibili atque passura propter peccata. Ideo ergo Christus pro nobis vicarius non solum egit et fecit sed etiam passus et mortuus est, quia non solum vitam aeternam nobis communicandam habuit sed etiam peccata auferenda et peccatores Deo Patri reconciliandos." *DBM*, 139-140 [*Supplement*, 57].

⁴² Lonergan, *DBM*, 141 [*Supplement*, 58].

⁴³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 141 [*Supplement*, 58].

⁴⁴ "Articulus XXI. De virtute resurrectionis," *DBM*, 142-145 [*Supplement*, 58-60].

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 142 [*Supplement*, 58]. As scriptural evidence that Christ remains a mediator, even after his death, Lonergan cites 1 Tim 2:5; Heb 8:6, 9:15, 12:24.

⁴⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 143 [*Supplement*, 59].

not to downplay the power of Christ's death. Lonergan's point is that Christ is not only a means, but a *mediator* of our salvation.⁴⁷

At the end of the article, Lonergan links the power of the resurrection to its pneumatological implications. Before Jesus' glorification the Spirit was not given (Jn. 7:39). We are washed clean, sanctified, and justified in the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 6:11), and have become children of God by adoption because God has sent into our hearts the Spirit of his Son crying out, "Abba, Father" (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15).⁴⁸ Lonergan ends the article interpreting that Hebrews 5:9 implies that Christ is the cause of our salvation not by his death alone, but by his death and resurrection, and his giving of the Spirit:

Besides, the phrase "the source [Gk. αἴτιος, 'cause'] of salvation for all who obey him" seems to indicate a mode of causality. For from the person of the Father there is sent the person of the Son to us persons in the work of reconciliation, so that the very same love with which the Father loves his own Son is given to us, that is, the Holy Spirit, who is Love proceeding from Father and Son.⁴⁹

4.3 Lonergan on the Means of Redemption

Our purpose here is to interpret how Lonergan has organized the teachings of the New Testament on redemption as means. Recall that he makes the distinction between redemption as end and redemption as means in article 17 (The Payment of the Price). He made the same distinction in Thesis 15 of *DVI*. Thesis 15 formally states:

Redemption denotes not only an end but also a mediation: a price that has been paid, Christ the Mediator's vicarious suffering and death for sinners and on account of sins, the sacrifice offered by our High Priest in his own blood, meritorious obedience, the power of the risen Lord, and the eternal Priest's intercession.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 142 [*Supplement*, 58].

⁴⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 144 [*Supplement*, 59].

⁴⁹ "Praeterea, cum addatur 'causa omnibus obtemperantibus sibi,' causalitatis modus innui videtur. Nam a Patre persona mittitur Filius persona ad nos personas in opus reconciliationis, ut dilectio, qua Filium proprium dilexit, etiam nobis detur, ipse nempe Spiritus, qui est Amor a Patre Filioque procedens." *DBM*, 145 [*Supplement*, 59-60].

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 446.

In *DVI*, in the section titled “The Meaning of the Thesis,” Lonergan explains the meaning of the thesis according to three assertions: 1) the thesis affirms redemption as an end, (2) the thesis affirms redemption not only as an end but also a mediation, and (3) the thesis affirms mediation on the part of the one who not only acts, but also suffers, vicariously.⁵¹ Immediately following this Lonergan states the following:

The three assertions made in the thesis will not be given equal attention.

The various aspects of redemption as an end are considered more fully in other theological treatises dealing with the church, original sin, the moral impotence of the sinner, grace and virtues, the last things, and the sacraments. Here, all these will be presupposed rather than repeated.

Our main concern is with the fact of mediation as scripture clearly and explicitly sets it out; and since it is easy to understand this from the standpoint of vicarious activity, more attention should in some way be given to the vicarious sufferer.⁵²

Lonergan’s emphasis in the *Supplement* is the same as in Thesis 15 of *DVI*: not on redemption as end, but redemption as means. Redemption as means refers to a process, and it quite clear that the focus of the present chapter is on that process. After Lonergan considers the death of Christ, in article 16, he organizes the remainder of the chapter into the articles on the payment of the price, sacrifice, meritorious obedience, vicarious suffering, and the power of the resurrection. These are the same categories listed in Thesis 15 of *DVI*, although there Lonergan makes a distinction between the power of the risen Lord and the eternal Priest’s intercession. In the *Supplement*, these two categories are combined.

⁵¹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 446-447.

⁵² Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 447.

4.3.1 Lonergan's Categorizations and Aquinas's Five Ways

In the *tertia pars* of the *Summa Theologiae*, question 48 is an inquiry into how Christ's passion brings about our salvation. Aquinas constructs a nexus of five ways or modes: merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, redemption (ransom), and efficiency. Although Anselm tried, in a somewhat misguided effort, to unite all these modes into his theory of satisfaction, it is apparent from a simple reading of Aquinas's text that Aquinas was more cautious and content to articulate his understanding of the efficacy of Christ's passion in five complementary aspects.⁵³

We must also note that in Aquinas's five ways, "redemption" is considered not in the wider sense of salvation itself, but in the restricted sense of the literal meaning of *redemptionis*, which derives its meaning from commercial metaphors: "ransom" or "payment of the price."

Furthermore, in q. 48 Aquinas's purpose is not exactly the same as Lonergan's. In q. 48, Aquinas is offering explanations. His purpose is not simply to collect and categorize evidence of the New Testament. In terms of Lonergan's methodology, Aquinas is doing systematics, since Aquinas's aim is to promote understanding rather than to promote certitude that Christ's passion and death has wrought our salvation. The latter is already taken on faith by Aquinas.

In the *Supplement*, Lonergan has organized the teachings of the New Testament on "redemption as means" around the same categories Aquinas used in *ST*, III, q. 48, though not in the same order as Aquinas. This is the tradition Lonergan inherited. He did the same type of organization in both his 1958 lecture on redemption at the Thomas

⁵³ See editor's comment on Lonergan's inheritance of Aquinas's five ways and Lonergan's own orientation to articulate a unified view: Lonergan, "The Redemption," 14, n. 26.

More Institute in Montreal, and as well in Thesis 15 of *DVI*. And although the third chapter of the *Supplement* neither mentions Aquinas's five ways nor makes any reference to *ST*, III, q. 48, there is no doubt that Aquinas's thought has influenced Lonergan's approach to categorizing the teachings of the New Testament. Finally we should note that Lonergan's first article on the death of Christ is not part of Aquinas's consideration in q. 48. We will consider this article specifically.

4.3.2 The Function of Lonergan's Article on the Death of Christ

Lonergan's first article on the death of Christ functions as a foundation for the subsequent articles which, as we have noted, mirror Aquinas's five ways. Lonergan followed the same method in *DVI* where he considered the death of Christ prior to the categorizations corresponding to Aquinas's five ways. In other words, before Lonergan collects the New Testament teachings on how the death and resurrection of Christ has wrought our salvation, he first considers the death of Christ himself, much like Aquinas did in the *tertia pars* of the *Summa Theologiae*.⁵⁴

Now if this article functions as a foundation for the subsequent articles, then what is the principal aim of this article? In my interpretation the principal aim is to establish with certitude the New Testament teaching that not only did Christ voluntarily die for our sins and on behalf of sinners, but Christ's passion and death were "directly willed by God" (*directe voluit Deus*).⁵⁵

To state that the passion and death of Christ was *directly* willed by God means that the passion and death of Christ must be related (connected) to some good. The good

⁵⁴ In the *tertia pars* Aquinas took up the question of the efficient cause of Christ's passion in q. 47 before discussing the relationship between Christ's passion and our salvation in q. 48.

⁵⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 122 [*Supplement*, 50].

is always intelligible. In other words, the passion and death of Christ must involve an intelligibility that is harmonious with the just and intelligible world order conceived by divine wisdom, though in the present chapter Lonergan is not concerned with explaining *what* that intelligibility is *per se*, but rather with the certitude *that* there is an intelligibility to be grasped. God does not directly will the unintelligible. To state otherwise contradicts the theological principle Lonergan established in the previous chapter.

In fact, Lonergan uses this theological principle in the present chapter to establish critical distinctions between the different wills involved in Christ's passion and death. Since God in no way wills the evil of sin, the cause of Christ's death by the actions of those directly involved in his crucifixion constitutes a reprehensible sin (*malum culpae*). Since God only indirectly wills the consequences of sin, then God only indirectly willed the evils inflicted upon Christ (*malum poenae*). Finally, since God directly wills the good, God directly willed the acceptance of the suffering and death on the part of the obedient Christ. So the death of Christ involved at the same time a great good and a most hideous evil. Lonergan stated the same conclusion in Thesis 15 of *DVI*:

Yet granted secondary causes, and granted historical causality, it is still almighty God who nevertheless rules and governs all things through the secondary causes and in accordance with the historical laws...In itself the suffering and death of Christ is the series of events narrated in the four gospels...Physically regarded, the same event is both an acting and a being acted upon...This physical identity does not, however, rule out diversity of wills. The will of the agent is not the same thing as the will of one who is acted upon. Thus in the same event there may be both the gravest of crimes and the most excellent of deeds.⁵⁶

Furthermore, Lonergan qualifies his language when he states that God directly willed the passion and death of Christ. We need to understand this qualification to interpret his understanding of what it means to state that God "directly willed" this event.

⁵⁶ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 453-454

Loneragan's qualification is meant to dispel an anthropomorphic understanding of God's will in relation to Christ's passion and death that would suggest an image of a vindictive God who takes pleasure in evils inflicted upon innocent persons. Christ was innocent, with no fault of his own. God is just. Since God is just, God does not punish innocent persons.⁵⁷ Yet God directly willed Christ's suffering and death. How does one reconcile the first three propositions with the New Testament teaching that God directly willed Christ's passion and death?

The answer is found in how Lonergan qualifies his language with respect to God's direct willing of Christ's passion and death. When Lonergan states that Christ's passion and death were directly willed by God, he qualifies the statement, and he does so twice. First, he states that "God does directly will a good and holy will, and so God directly willed the *acceptance* of suffering and death on the part of the obedient Christ."⁵⁸ A few sentences later he states "The whole of Christ's passion and death, therefore, *inasmuch as it proceeded from the will of the gentle and humble Christ*, was directly willed by God."⁵⁹ In my interpretation the important thing to note here is that with respect to the object of God's direct willing, Lonergan's thought reveals that this object is not so much the suffering and death of Christ simply *qua* suffering and death, but rather the goodness related to Christ's will, to his internal disposition of *obedient acceptance*. Stated otherwise, in terms of the theological principle we identified in the previous chapter, God directly willed Christ's obedient acceptance of God's plan for *this* world

⁵⁷ This would contradict retributive justice. And as we noted in the previous chapter, retributive justice, though it is not the entirety of divine justice, is nevertheless part of the order of divine justice.

⁵⁸ "... [B]onam sanctamque voluntatem directe vult Dues, et secundum hoc Deus directe voluit illam passionis et mortis acceptationem quam Christus obediens peregit." *DBM*, 122 [*Supplement*, 50, emphasis mine].

⁵⁹ "... [E]t ideo totam Christi passionem eiusque mortem, quatenus a voluntate Christi mitis et humilis processit, directe voluit Deus." *DBM*, 122 [*Supplement*, 50, emphasis mine].

order, which includes the divine plan of redemption, conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by the divine goodness in harmonious continuation with this world's order.

4.3.3 Some Specific Comments on Lonergan's Categorizations

In this section my purpose is to note a few significant differences between Lonergan's categorizations of the New Testament teachings as compared to Aquinas's categorizations as well as to two of Lonergan's other works on redemption, specifically the 1958 lecture and Thesis 15 of *DVI*.

The first comment applies to Lonergan's category of "vicarious suffering" in article 20. In *ST*, III, q.48, a. 2, the question Aquinas addresses is whether or not Christ's passion brought about our salvation *per modum satisfactionis* (by way of satisfaction).⁶⁰ Now in the present chapter, nowhere in the Latin text does Lonergan mention the noun *satisfactio* or its genitive *satisfactionis*. However, article 20 on "Vicarious Suffering" is meant to correspond to the category of satisfaction (or atonement) in Aquinas's five ways. That Christ suffered vicariously is clearly evident in Aquinas's argument in q. 48, a. 2.⁶¹ Furthermore, in Thesis 15 of *DVI*, Lonergan clearly establishes the link between vicarious suffering and satisfaction.⁶²

⁶⁰ In the translation by Fathers of the English Dominican Province, *satisfactionis* has been translated as "atonement."

⁶¹ Whereas Lonergan speaks of "vicarious suffering" (*vicaria passione*), in q. 48, a. 2, Aquinas does not explicitly use the word *vicaria* to qualify the satisfaction given by Christ. The explicit term "vicarious satisfaction" did not enter the theological language until the 19th century, but the idea was certainly already present in Aquinas's theology. Since Aquinas says in q. 48, a. 2 that Christ has made satisfaction for our sins, he obviously believes that Christ's satisfaction is vicarious. So when I refer to "vicarious satisfaction" in Aquinas's thought I am referring to Aquinas's understanding that 1) it is possible for one person to make satisfaction *for another* if they are one in will by the union of love (see *ST*, I-II, q. 87, aa. 7-8), and 2) this is in fact what Christ did (*ST*, III, q. 48, a. 2).

⁶² Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 447-448.

The same correlation between vicarious suffering and the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction is explicit in Lonergan's 1958 lecture on redemption. There, rather than titling the category "vicarious suffering," he uses the category "vicarious satisfaction," since his purpose in the lecture is to explain the various aspects of redemption.⁶³ In the lecture he notes that "vicarious suffering" is very clear in the New Testament and has been interpreted in the Church, particularly through the influence of St. Anselm, as "vicarious satisfaction."⁶⁴ Lonergan chooses to use the language of "vicarious suffering," rather than "vicarious satisfaction," because his intent in the chapter is to collect the evidence of the New Testament. In the New Testament, there is indeed found the notion of vicarious suffering, but not the notion of vicarious satisfaction *per se*. That notion is a later development in the Christian tradition.

The second comment is related to the metaphors of "ransom" or "paying the price." Lonergan differs slightly with Aquinas in how far one takes these metaphors. We recall that these metaphors are taken from the marketplace. As Lonergan noted in article 17, "paying the price" is no doubt a metaphor, but it does signify a real operation, a real exchange inasmuch as there is a real connection between our salvation and the death of Christ. Now at least since Anselm, the once widespread opinion that the price was paid to the devil has been discarded. Lonergan and Aquinas are in full agreement here. The devil has no rights deserving such a payment. However, where Aquinas states that the

⁶³ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 14. Thus in the lecture Lonergan's primary purpose was systematic, that is, to promote an understanding of redemption, whereas in the present chapter of the *Supplement* his primary purpose is to collect the New Testament teachings on redemption.

⁶⁴ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 19-20.

price was paid to God, and not to the devil,⁶⁵ Lonergan explicitly states that to ask the question of to whom the price was paid is pushing the metaphor too far.

Finally, and perhaps most significant given Lonergan's purpose to explain the historical causality of Christ, is a development Lonergan makes related to the fifth of Aquinas's five ways. For Aquinas, the fifth category in *ST*, III, q. 48, is "efficient causality." In that question (q. 48, a. 6), Aquinas considers whether or not Christ's passion brought about our salvation by means of efficient causality. Aquinas answers in the affirmative, and his answer depends on a twofold distinction in efficient causality (agency), namely the principal cause and the instrumental cause. Since Christ's humanity is an instrument of the Godhead, then all of Christ's actions and sufferings operate instrumentally. So Aquinas concludes that Christ accomplishes our salvation through efficient causality. The point here is that Aquinas's focus is on Christ's earthly actions and in particular Christ's passion and death.

Now in the *Supplement*, as well as in *DVI*, Lonergan's discussion of the New Testament witness correlating to Aquinas's category of efficient causality focuses on the power of the resurrection, which is not an emphasis in Aquinas's discussion of efficient causality. And perhaps we should not expect this of Aquinas, for q. 48 does not ask how Christ's resurrection saves us, but rather how Christ's passion saves us. In q. 53, a. 1, Aquinas explicitly takes up the question of whether it was necessary for Christ to rise again. Aquinas answers in the affirmative and in his response he clearly correlates Christ's resurrection to the completion of our salvation.

In the *Supplement*, Lonergan does not explicitly use any Latin term that could be translated as "efficient causality" in his article on the power of the resurrection. Nor did

⁶⁵ *ST*, III, q. 48, a. 3, ad 3m.

he use this terminology in *DVI*, yet in *DVI* he states that Aquinas's category of efficient causality corresponds to his (Lonergan's) section on the power of the risen Lord and the intercession of the eternal Priest.⁶⁶ If in *DVI* Lonergan makes this explicit correlation between Aquinas's mode of efficient causality and Lonergan's own discussion of the power of the resurrection, it is almost certain he has the same intent in the *Supplement*. Lonergan's understanding of Christ's efficient causality as mediator of redemption intends to establish the fact that our redemption does not come about by the fact of Christ's death alone, but comes about through Christ's death *and* resurrection.

Furthermore, in that same article, Lonergan correlates Christ's resurrection to the teaching in Hebrews that Christ has become for us not only our Priest in his death on the cross, but an eternal High Priest (Heb 6:20; 7:28), and has been allotted a far higher ministry (Heb 8:6) sitting at the right hand of God.⁶⁷ The emphasis of the article is that Christ was, is, and remains forever the mediator of salvation not only because of his death, but because of his resurrection. In that same article, Lonergan also describes the resurrection as a condition for Christ's sending of the Spirit.⁶⁸

We may ask the following: what basic point is Lonergan trying to make in discerning from the New Testament the certitude that our redemption is not brought about by Christ's death alone, but by his death and resurrection?

In my interpretation, given Lonergan's stated purpose to explain the historical causality of Christ, I believe the answer to this question is found in the last paragraph of the chapter. Here Lonergan refers to the passage in Hebrews 5:9 which states that Christ became the source of salvation for all who obey him. Lonergan notes that this passage

⁶⁶ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 479, 485.

⁶⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 143 [*Supplement*, 59].

⁶⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 144 [*Supplement*, 59].

seems to indicate a “causality” (*causalitatis*) between Christ and those who “obey” (*obtemperantibus*) him.⁶⁹ Lonergan is indicating a causality between Christ and those who obey him because, as he indicated in article 19 (Meritorious Obedience), to command is to move another through reason and will, and to obey is to be moved by another through reason and will. Now these two linked concepts of commanding and obeying are central to Lonergan’s understanding of agency, and in particular to Christ’s agency. In chapter 6, article 39, where Lonergan will discuss “Christ as Agent,” Lonergan will state Christ acts both as God and as man, and so Christ’s agency involves two principles of operation, divine and human. Lonergan states:

The ordering of these operations is had through divine command and human obedience. *To command is to move another through reason and will; to obey is to be moved in accordance with the reason and will of another* [ref. to *ST*, II-II, q. 104, a.1.c.].⁷⁰

This reference to Aquinas in the above quotation is also found in article 19 of the present chapter. Lonergan understands agency, in this case the causality of agents acting through intellect, in terms of command and obedience. This applies to Christ as man, as well as to human agents who cooperate with Christ. What Lonergan is doing in this chapter, particularly in article 21 on the “Power of the Resurrection” is laying the groundwork for understanding the historical causality of Christ not just through the means of Christ’s passion and death, but also through Christ’s ongoing role as Mediator of salvation through the course of history, and this emphasis on Mediator rather than means must take into account the resurrection of Christ. The contrast between means and mediator is Lonergan’s own distinction made in article 21 on the “Power of the

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 144-145 [*Supplement*, 59-60].

⁷⁰ “Quae duarum operationum ordinatio per divinum mandatum et obedientiam humanam habetur. Praecipere enim est per rationem et voluntatem alium movere; obedire autem est secundum rationem et voluntatem alterius moveri.” *DBM*, *249 [*Supplement*, 105, emphasis mine].

Resurrection.” Recall in the first paragraph of the article, which we quoted earlier, Lonergan states that our redemption is brought about by a mediator more than by a means and is established upon the death and resurrection of Christ rather than upon the fact of his death alone.⁷¹

Hence it follows that “if Christ has not risen, your faith is pointless, and you are still in your sins” (1 Cor 15:17). Of course, this is not to be understood in the sense that the death of Christ was insufficient to take away sin; the purpose of these statements is to bring to mind not only the means but also the Mediator of our salvation.⁷²

It is clear Lonergan is making an intelligible connection between the power of the resurrection and Christ as mediator. Through the power of the resurrection, Christ becomes an ongoing mediator of redemption in history. It is no coincidence that in chapter 6, where Lonergan will explicitly develop an understanding of the historical causality of Christ, he will not limit Christ’s historical causality to the actions of Christ the man during his life on earth. Christ’s historical causality continues as he sits at the right hand of the Father. Lonergan will consider this specific aspect of Christ’s historical causality in article 43 titled “The Mediator in Heaven.” In my interpretation we have here a development of the mode of salvation that Aquinas had termed “efficient causality” that takes into account the New Testament teaching that Christ has wrought our salvation not only by means of giving his life, but also as ongoing mediator of redemption in history because of the influence he continues to exert as our eternal high Priest, a life-giving Spirit, seated at the right hand of the Father.

⁷¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 142 [*Supplement*, 58].

⁷² “Nam ‘traditus est propter delicta nostra et resurrexit propter iustificationem nostram’ (Rom 4, 25). Quare ‘si Christus non resurrexit, vana est fides vestra; adhuc enim estis in peccatis vestris’ (1 Cor 15, 17). Quod sane non ita intelligendum est quasi non sufficeret mors Christi ad peccata tollenda; sed ideo asseritur ut praeter medium nostrae salutis in mentem reducatur eiusdem mediator.” *DBM*, 142 [*Supplement*, 58].

4.4 The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the *Supplement*

4.4.1 Lonergan's Purpose: Collecting the Teachings on Redemption

As Frederick Crowe has noted, according to Lonergan's own introductory statement the purpose of the chapter is to do little more than collect the relevant passages of scripture which function as authoritative teachings on redemption.⁷³ As Crowe also notes, Lonergan may have already collected these passages in his class lectures of the Christology courses he taught at the Gregorian.⁷⁴ As to why Lonergan collects the relevant New Testament teachings at this point in the *Supplement*, the reason is based on his method. We will examine this in the next sub-section.

Also, Lonergan's introductory statement that no doctrine in the New Testament has received a clearer or fuller treatment than the "dogma" of the Redemption is not an isolated statement found only in the *Supplement*. He maintained this position in his later years. In the 1973 Christology lectures in Toronto, he emphasized the same fact: that the New Testament witness is much more concerned with the work of Christ than the ontological constitution of Christ.⁷⁵ The early Church assumed Christ was truly the Son of God. Its emphasis was to proclaim the good news of Christ's saving deeds, not to explain how a divine person could assume a human nature.

⁷³ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 103.

⁷⁴ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 103.

⁷⁵ In the first lecture in Lonergan's course in Christology at the Toronto School of Theology, 1973, Lonergan stated the following: "Christology is the doctrine of the person of Christ. It is distinguished from soteriology – *soter*, the savior - the doctrine of the work of Christ. The New Testament is much more a soteriology than a Christology...but who he [Christ] is was not the question predominant in the New Testament. The question predominant in the New Testament is that he was the savior." An audio recording of this lecture can be found in the Bernard Lonergan Archive at www.bernardlonergan.com, file 73100A0E070 / CD/mp3 731.

4.4.2 Lonergan's Method: Doctrines Precede Systematics

If Lonergan's purpose in the chapter is to do little more than collect the authoritative teachings of the New Testament on redemption, we might ask the following: why is Lonergan's chapter restricted to this purpose? The answer to this question is found in Lonergan's theological methodology.

In Lonergan's theological methodology, he distinguishes between dogmatic (doctrinal) theology and systematic theology.⁷⁶ The basis for this distinction is his judgment (which he inherited from Aristotle) that ultimately human inquiry and wonder comes down to two fundamental questions: what is it? (*quid sit*) and is it so? (*an sit*). In human cognitional processes, the former precedes the latter. We experience, then we attempt to understand, then we attempt to judge whether our understanding is true. In theological method, specifically with respect to the relationship between doctrines and systematics, the reverse is true. The natural light of human reason, on its own, cannot reach certitude about the mysteries of faith. We must depend on revelation of scripture and the teaching authority of the Church. Then, presuming an acceptance of these teachings (doctrines) through faith, we then attempt understanding (systematics). Here the *an sit* precedes the *quid sit*. Lonergan appeals to this method explicitly in article 17:

⁷⁶ I mentioned in a footnote in the prior chapter, throughout Lonergan's career despite development in his vision of the whole of theology which came with his development of functional specializations, systematic theology for Lonergan always remained the imperfect, analogical, obscure, but extremely fruitful understanding of the mysteries of faith according to the teaching of the First Vatican Council. See Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 7-8. Now if Lonergan's vision of systematic theology remained essentially unchanged throughout his career, then by logical deduction it is a meaningful assumption that throughout his career, Lonergan would have also understood the need to define *what* is to be understood before one attempts to attain some understanding of it. This is the function of establishing teachings (doctrines).

A further question may be asked, however, as to why God required a price for our salvation. Even though there certainly must be a fully sufficient reason for this, one that is most just, it is also quite certain that we can only understand it imperfectly and by analogy. Therefore, although such an understanding might be more fruitful than any other theological understanding, *it would be more prudent to determine first just what is to be understood, so that subsequently one might try to attain some understanding of it.*⁷⁷

The relationship of Thesis 15 to Theses 16-17 of *DVI* reveals the same methodology. Thesis 15 is only interested in establishing the certitude, the various facts associated with the mystery of redemption as revealed in the New Testament. Lonergan explicitly states in Thesis 15 that there is no intent on theological speculation. He makes this statement with respect to the New Testament's notion of Christ's vicarious suffering:

For the present, however, the point is not to understand vicarious suffering but to arrive at certitude as to the fact of vicarious suffering drawn from the scriptural text. For this reason, theological speculation is kept out of this thesis [Thesis 15]...⁷⁸

Although this statement specifically refers to the category of vicarious suffering, the distinction between establishing facts (truths) and subsequent speculation applies to the whole of Thesis 15. In brief, then, Lonergan's purpose in chapter 3 of the *Supplement* is to establish theological certitude, from the New Testament witness, of the doctrine of redemption, just as in *DVI* his purpose in Thesis 15 was to establish the truths (facts) of the New Testament's teaching on redemption before proceeding to speculate on the meaning of those truths in Theses 16 and 17.

⁷⁷ "At ulterius quaeri potest curam Deus pretium nostrae salutis exegerit. Sed quamvis certissimum sit adesse rationem prorsus sufficientem, eamque iustissimam, certum etiam est nos non posse eam intelligere nisi imperfecte et analogice. Quare, quamvis haec intelligentia forte fructuosior sit quam reliqua intelligentia theologica, prudentius tamen procedit qui primo clare determinet quid sit intelligendum ut postea aliquam intelligentiam assequi nitatur." *DBM*, 128 [*Supplement*, 53, emphasis mine].

⁷⁸ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 448-449.

4.5 Summary

Lonergan's chapter on the death and resurrection of Christ has one major purpose: to collect the New Testament teachings on Christ's death and resurrection as *means* of our redemption. His purpose, methodologically, is to establish doctrines before proceeding to systematics. His methodology also reflects his inheritance of the tradition of Aquinas, who was content to understand the efficacy of Christ's passion according to five different ways or modes in q. 48 of the *tertia pars* of the *Summa Theologiae*. In addition to the *Supplement*, q. 48 provides the framework in which Lonergan categorized the means of redemption in two other works: the 1958 lecture on redemption, and Thesis 15 of *DVI*.

Perhaps the most significant development in Lonergan's thought, compared to Aquinas's five ways, is Lonergan's emphasis on the power of Christ's resurrection. This is not to suggest that the power of the resurrection was ignored by Aquinas. It was not, but it was treated in a separate question of the *Summa Theologiae*. The New Testament teaches that Christ is the ongoing Mediator of redemption in history because, through the power of the resurrection, he has become a life-giving Spirit and an eternal high Priest, living forever to intercede on our behalf. Lonergan has integrated this teaching to expand our notion of "efficient causality" beyond Christ's earthly actions and sufferings. When we come to chapter 6 of the *Supplement* which deals with the historical causality of Christ, Lonergan includes an article titled "The Mediator in Heaven." The present chapter, by establishing the certitude that our redemption is established upon the death and resurrection of Christ rather than upon his death alone, establishes a doctrinal foundation for this later systematic development in chapter 6 of the *Supplement*.

CHAPTER 5: THE CROSS OF CHRIST

5.1 Introduction

Our purpose here is to interpret the fourth chapter of the *Supplement* titled “The Cross of Christ.”¹ The fourth chapter includes articles 22-25 of the *Supplement*: (22) The Idea of the Cross, (23) The Law of the Cross, (24) The Mystery of the Cross, and (25) The Justice of the Cross.

The fourth chapter begins with a brief introduction:

The doctrines of the Christian faith are usually contained explicitly in the New Testament as to their factual basis, while a fuller understanding of these facts is to be found explicitly only in the writings of the Church Fathers and the theologians. But the dogma of our redemption is not only very fully expounded in the inspired word of God, but is also further elucidated by a law so that there can be no doubt as to how it is to be understood. For the cross of Christ is not only a fact, but also a precept and an example for us to follow: we are to be conformed to and associated with Christ crucified. In the whole economy of salvation there is no higher principle than the transformation of evil into good. For this reason we have judged it best to treat of the meaning, the law, the mystery, and the justice of the cross before going on to other theological questions.²

5.2 A Brief Description of Articles 22 - 25

5.2.1 Article 22: The Meaning of the Cross³

Lonergan begins by identifying the fundamental meaning (*ratio*) of the cross:

The fundamental meaning of the cross is the transformation of evil into good: “Do not let evil defeat you; instead overcome evil with good” (Rom 12:21). Thus there are three

¹ “Caput Quartum. DE CRUCE CHRISTI,” *DBM*, 146-179 [*Supplement*, 60-74].

² “Alias christianae fidei doctrinas saepius contingit quoad ipsum factum in novo testamento explicite contineri sed quoad plenioris facti intelligentiam nisi a Patribus et theologis non explicite proponi. Sed nostrae redemptionis dogma, sicut abundantius in verbo Dei inspirato exponitur, ita etiam ea lege declaratur ut, quemadmodum sit intelligendum, haud dubitari possit. Crux enim Christi non solum factum quoddam est sed etiam praeceptum atque exemplum; Christo crucifixo conformari eique consociari debemus; neque aliud principium in tota nostrae salutis oeconomia altius iacet quam malorum in bonum transformatio. Quam ob causam, prius de ratione, lege, mysterio, iustitia crucis agendum esse duximus, quam alias et theologicas quaestiones adgrederemur.” *DBM*, 146 [*Supplement*, 60].

³ “Articulus XXII. De ratione crucis,” *DBM*, 147-150 [*Supplement*, 60-62].

elements here: (1) evil to be overcome, (2) a victory of the will, and (3) good that emerges from evil through this victory.⁴

The article is organized around these three elements.

Evil to be Overcome: Lonergan makes the distinction between the evil of sin (*malum culpae*) and the consequent evil of punishment (*malum poenae*). The consequences of sin incline individuals and society to further sin. Both types of evil are to be overcome according to the meaning of the cross through a victory of the will.⁵

Victory of the Will: Things are cured by their contraries.⁶ Since the evil to be overcome includes both the evil of sin and the consequent evil of punishment, there are two senses in which Lonergan conceives the victory of the will. The evil of sin arises through a defect in rational consciousness and aversion to God, so the victory of the will is a conversion to God and restoration of rational consciousness.⁷ The consequences of sin result in evils within the human good of order, both interior (the cultural good of order) and exterior (the external good of order), so the victory of the will is a painful absorption of the evil consequences of sin for the sake of a more difficult good.⁸ A victory of the will in the transformation of evil into good is not a triumph of justice in the sense of legal, retributive justice. It is a triumph grounded in a superabundant generosity of the humble of heart.⁹

Good that Emerges from this Victory: The good is twofold. The first is the perfection of the one who wins the victory of the will. The second is the improved

⁴ “Ratio crucis est mali in bonum transformatio, secundum illud, ‘Noli vinci a malo, sed vince in bono malum’ (Rom 12, 21). Dicit ergo (1) malum vincendum, (2) victoriam voluntariam, et (3) bonum e malo per victoriam ortum.” *DBM*, 147 [*Supplement*, 60].

⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 149 [*Supplement*, 61].

⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 149 [*Supplement*, 61].

⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 149 [*Supplement*, 61].

⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 149 [*Supplement*, 61].

⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 150 [*Supplement*, 61-62].

human situation. Lonergan ends the article noting that the transformation bringing good out of evil is grounded in divine providence: divine providence brings it about that for those who love God all things work unto good (Rom 8:28).¹⁰

5.2.2 Article 23: The Law of the Cross¹¹

The law of the cross is an understanding of how the meaning of the cross functions concretely in the total context of the Christian life:

The law of the cross is the notion of the cross as it pertains to the new covenant. This it does by way of precept, by way of example, conformation, and association, and by way of the economy of salvation.¹²

Lonergan organizes the article by discussing the law of the cross as (1) precept, (2) precept and example, (3) conformation to and association with Christ, and (4) the basic law governing the economy of salvation.

As precept, the law of the cross is proclaimed in many different ways. He gives three examples: Matthew 5:38-48, Matthew 8:34-35, and John 12:24-25.¹³ Matthew 5:38-48 is the first scripture passage quoted in the article, and the longest in the *Supplement*. This passage is from the Sermon on the Mount, where Christ instructs his disciples to not resist evil, to turn the other cheek, to give to anyone who asks, to love their enemies and to do good to those who hate them, so that they will be true children of their heavenly Father who makes his sun shine on the good and bad alike and his rain to fall on both the virtuous and the wicked.

As precept and example, Christ's teaching found in Mark 10:42-45 and Matthew

¹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 150 [*Supplement*, 62].

¹¹ "Articulus XXIII. De lege crucis," *DBM*, 151-157 [*Supplement*, 62-65].

¹² "Lex crucis est ratio crucis prout ad novum testamentum pertinet. Pertinet autem per modum praecepti, per modum exempli, conformationis, et consociationis, et per modum oeconomiae." *DBM*, 151 [*Supplement*, 62].

¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 151-152 [*Supplement*, 62].

20:25-28 instructs the disciples that any among them who wants to be great must be a servant to all:

“Jesus called [the Twelve] to him and said to them, ‘You know that among the Gentiles their so-called rulers lord it over them, and their great men make their authority felt. This is not to happen among you. No; anyone who wants to be great among you must be your servant, and anyone who wants to be first among you must be slave to all. For the Son of Man himself did not come to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.’”¹⁴

As conformation to and association with Christ, we are called to imitate Christ and thus to share in Christ’s sufferings. Lonergan appeals to a number of New Testament passages (Jn 10:17-18; Rom 8:17; Phil 3:10-11; 1 Pet 4:13; Jn 17:14; Col 1:24; Rom 8:29). He notes that the New Testament passages that teach love for Christ crucified, imitation of Christ, conformation to Christ, and association with Christ are almost too numerous to mention.¹⁵

As the basic law governing the economy of salvation, Christ and the law of the cross were neither the type of savior nor the means of salvation expected by the disciples. The wisdom of this world desired salvation through a destruction of the present order and expected a kingdom of justice in which there would be no injustices to be patiently borne by good people. But the wisdom of God discerned in Christ crucified, which seems folly to human wisdom, reveals a God who has chosen the law of the cross as the basic law governing the economy of salvation. The revelation of this divine wisdom cannot be grasped by the unspiritual person, but only by the spiritual person who has received the

¹⁴ “Jesus autem vocans eos ait illis: Scitis quia hi qui videntur principiari gentibus, dominantur eis, et principes eorum potestatem habent ipsorum. Non ita est autem in vobis, sed quicumque voluerit fieri maior, erit omnium minister; et quicumque voluerit in vobis primus esse, erit omnium servus. Nam et Filius hominis non venit ut ministraretur ei, sed ut ministraret et daret animam suam redemptionem pro multis.” *DBM*, 152 [*Supplement*, 62]. Lonergan includes a footnote referencing Mk 10:42-45; Mt 20:25-28; cf. 1 Pet 5, 3. Lonergan calls to mind two other teachings in 1 Peter 2:19-24 and Philippians 2:3, 7-8. Lonergan, *DBM*, 152-153 [*Supplement*, 63].

¹⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 151 [*Supplement*, 63]. Lonergan does however list a number of passages: Rom 8:35 ff., 12:2, 13:13 f.; 1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor 4:7-14, 5:14 f.; Gal 2:19 f., 3:26-28, 4:19; Eph 4:22-24; Phil 3:20 f.; Col 3:9-11.

mind of Christ through the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit.¹⁶

Lonergan then states that the pervasiveness of the law of the cross in the whole economy of salvation is clear from the three elements within the meaning of the cross itself. First, the law of the cross presupposes evil to be overcome, the evils all-pervasive in the human race. Second, evil is overcome by a victory of the will. The victory belongs first to Christ, but we imitate Christ's victory sacramentally, morally, and physically. We imitate Christ's victory sacramentally through our baptism. We imitate Christ's victory morally inasmuch as we become obedient to Christ, rather than slaves to sin. We imitate Christ's victory physically when Christ will transfigure our bodies into copies of his own glorious body (Phil 3:20-21).¹⁷ Third, there is the good that emerges from the victory of the will. Here Lonergan contrasts the true good that results from the law of the cross against evils that the wisdom of the world misconstrues as good.¹⁸ Lonergan speaks of the true good using the metaphor of the fruits of the good tree. The first fruit is seen in the risen Lord himself, who is now eternal High Priest, and secondly in his followers who conform themselves to the image of the Son.¹⁹ This conformation is possible through the free gift of the Father's love, the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit which makes us adopted children of God.²⁰

¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 154 [*Supplement*, 63].

¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 155 [*Supplement*, 64].

¹⁸ Lonergan gives the example of Nietzsche, who according to Lonergan ridiculed the idea of divine wisdom being manifested in the cross on the grounds that the cross expresses a servile mentality more deserving to be called cowardice than virtue. Lonergan also uses the example of Marx to describe a widespread attitude which rejects the law of the cross and advocates class struggle and violent revolution. See Lonergan, *DBM*, 156 [*Supplement*, 64-65].

¹⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 157 [*Supplement*, 65].

²⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 157 [*Supplement*, 65].

5.2.3 Article 24: The Mystery of the Cross²¹

Lonergan states that the fact that the human race is redeemed from sin by way of the cross is hardly a mystery in itself, but that it is a great mystery that the Son of God himself shared so completely in our humanity (Heb 2:14) that he himself through the cross brought us out of sin to live the life of God. This mystery is that all things be brought together in Christ (Eph 1:9-10), the mystery Paul says has been kept secret for endless ages but now so clear it must be proclaimed to all nations according to the decree of the eternal God (Rom 16:25-26).²² God's hidden plan, kept secret for ages, is revealed to us through God's Spirit (1 Cor 2:10-16).²³ In brief then, the New Testament's conception of "mystery" is the first way Lonergan considers the mystery of the cross, and according to the exegetes Lonergan cites, this mystery is to be understood as the hidden plan of God's will.²⁴

Lonergan then transitions to a more specific consideration of the mystery of the cross. He states that the work of our redemption involves mysteries in the strict sense of the word: the mercy of the Father, the incarnation of the Son, the sanctifying work of the Spirit, and our absolutely supernatural end.²⁵ There is also general agreement that in the work of our redemption God is made known to us in a way that we could never know by natural knowledge. By the natural light of human reason we can come to judge that God

²¹ "Articulus XXIV. De mysterio crucis," *DBM*, 158-167 [*Supplement*, 65-69].

²² Lonergan, *DBM*, 158 [*Supplement*, 65].

²³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 158-159 [*Supplement*, 66].

²⁴ Lonergan cites Deden, Vogt, and Prümm, but gives no textual references. However, based on reference to the same three authors in *De Verbo Incarnato*, where he establishes the same general conclusion that in the New Testament "mystery" in its primary sense refers to the hidden plan of God, we may judge that Lonergan is using the following texts: D. Deden, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis* 13 (1936): 414; E. Vogt, *Biblica* 37 (1956): 247-257; K. Prümm, *Biblica* 37 (1956): 135-161 and "Mystère," *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément, 6: 151-225. See Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 583.

²⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 160 [*Supplement*, 66].

is wise, free, loving, merciful, and just, but these judgments are made by way of analogy from creatures. However, the Son's incarnation, death, and resurrection provide "another and much loftier analogy" (*aliam longeque altiore analogiam*) to understand God as he is in himself, and both the authors of the New Testament and the whole Catholic tradition have marveled at this new revelation of divine mercy and love.²⁶

Lonergan then considers three additional ways in which we can consider the meaning of the word mystery. First, in the sense that we speak of the mysteries of Christ's life or the mysteries of the Rosary. In this way the material body of the Lord in its suffering, dying, and rising gives expression to his human mind and heart, translating for us his divinity into human terms.²⁷ Second, there is the mystery of iniquity. Here Lonergan repeats material from his chapter on divine justice. Sin is irrational, the absurd, the non-intelligible. There is nothing about sin to be understood other than to understand that there is nothing to be understood.²⁸ Third, there is the mystery of death. Scripture reveals that death has the element of penalty of sin (Gen 2:15, 3:19; Wis 2:24; Rom 5:12; Rom 6:22-23). All of these passages speak of the justice of God in which retribution and punishment are consequences of sin.²⁹ However, Christ has transformed death into a means of salvation through the divine wisdom of the cross which deemed it better not to wipe out past evil and create a brand-new good, as Jewish eschatological expectations would have it, but rather that through Christ evil should be transformed into good.³⁰

Lonergan ends the article listing five aspects of the mystery of the cross: (1)

²⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 160 [*Supplement*, 66].

²⁷ Lonergan *DBM*, 161 [*Supplement*, 67].

²⁸ Lonergan *DBM*, 161 [*Supplement*, 67]. This equates to what in *Insight* Lonergan calls an "inverse insight." An inverse insight apprehends that there is no intelligibility to be grasped where one expected to find it. See Lonergan, *Insight*, 43-50.

²⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 163 [*Supplement*, 68].

³⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 162 [*Supplement*, 67].

symbolic, (2) intellectual, (3) volitional, (4) providential, and (5) divine.

Symbolically, the sensible depiction of the body of Christ, and the shedding of his blood, express outwardly Christ's interior acts of his mind and heart.³¹

Intellectually, the cross of Christ expresses some intelligible meaning. For the human intellect this poses two limitations. First, although the meaning of the cross is intelligible within the order conceived by divine wisdom, this meaning still presupposes the non-intelligibility of sin. Second, the intelligibility of the cross involves an infinite intelligibility which in this life we can only understand imperfectly and analogically.³²

Volitionally, the cross of Christ represents a diversity of wills. Physically, it was one event. Morally, it represents two volitions. As willed by Pilate, the priests, and the mob, the cross represents a most heinous sin. As willed by an accepting Christ, the cross represents a most excellent deed in which evil is transformed into good.³³

Providentially, the cross of Christ is meant to overcome evil with a victory of the will. Christ's followers are meant to embrace the law of the cross as precept and example. But there is a difference between Christ and his followers. Christ atoned not for his own sins, but for those of others. He won resurrection not for himself alone, but for the whole human race. He offered himself as a sacrificial victim on behalf of others. He gave his life as a ransom for many. As such, in accordance with the divine plan and because of the dignity of the Son, Christ's victory stands as the cause, the exemplar, and the motive of every other such victory.³⁴

Divinely, the cross of Christ is a revelation of God. One who grasps the wisdom

³¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 164 [*Supplement*, 68].

³² Lonergan, *DBM*, 164-165 [*Supplement*, 68].

³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 165 [*Supplement*, 68].

³⁴ Lonergan, *DBM* 166, [*Supplement*, 69].

and goodness of God not by analogy from creatures but from the man Christ Jesus and his death and resurrection has a far more profound knowledge of God.³⁵

5.2.4 Article 25: The Justice of the Cross³⁶

In this article Lonergan reviews the general principles of divine justice developed in his second chapter, and then applies these principles to the meaning of the cross.

Lonergan recalls five principles: (1) God can do anything that does not involve an intrinsic contradiction; (2) since God's wisdom is manifold, it comprehends the entire range of divine power and directs absolutely everything that God can do; (3) God's will is just in that it chooses to put into effect any order of reality determined by divine wisdom; (4) thus the actual order of things is most fitting because it is ordained by divine wisdom and most just because God's choice follows God's wisdom; and (5) God's choice of the order of things is most free since with equally infinite wisdom and equally infinite goodness God can do whatever absolutely speaking He can do.³⁷

Before applying these principles to the cross, Lonergan lists five elements discerned in the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross:

These are: (1) God's salvific intention and activity; (2) the meaning and the law of the cross according to which this activity unfolds; (3) the intervention of a mediator through whom this salvific activity is carried out; (4) this mediator himself as accomplishing his work according to the meaning of the cross; (5) the manifestation of divine goodness in letting evils happen in such a way that good may be drawn out of them.³⁸

³⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 167 [*Supplement*, 69].

³⁶ "Articulus XXV. De iustitia crucis," *DBM*, 168-179 [*Supplement*, 69-74].

³⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 168 [*Supplement*, 69-70].

³⁸ "Quorum prima est ipsa divina intentio salvifica atque activitas; altera est ratio atque lex crucis secundum quam evolvitur haec activitas; tertia est mediatoris interventio per quem activitas salvifica procedit; quartum est ipsum mediatorem secundum rationem crucis opus suum peragere; quinta denique est ea divinae bonitatis manifestatio quae mala fieri permittit ut de malis efficiat bonum." *DBM*, 170 [*Supplement*, 70].

Lonergan then applies the basic principles of divine justice to these five elements. First, God's salvific intention and activity is to restore goods lost and to offer the free gift of justification to those who believe. Lonergan states that this salvific activity is what Paul speaks of as the "justice of God" (*Dei iustitiam*).³⁹

Second, God's salvific activity is done in accordance with the meaning of the cross. With respect to God's salvific intent, God could (1) destroy the corrupted good and create an entirely new good in its place, (2) transform evil into good without human cooperation, or (3) transform evil into good *with* human cooperation. The third alternative embodies the meaning of the cross and is more fitting than the first two.⁴⁰ The first alternative does not redeem the corrupted good but simply replaces it. The second alternative is not fitting because evil would be transformed into good without human consent to conversion. Lonergan then includes a lengthy quote from Augustine's *De Trinitate*⁴¹ to make the point that the Fathers of the Church understood God's justice and insisted that the devil had to be defeated not by power but by justice.⁴²

Third, the work of salvation was carried out through a mediator, God's own Son. Again, Lonergan uses the argument of fittingness. It would not be fitting to inaugurate the Kingdom of God all at once through the immediate conversion of all, nor through some group of believers who in turn would convert others. The former has the weakness that not all human beings are in existence at the same time as well as the fact that the common course of events and the order of the universe would not be maintained if all

³⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 170 [*Supplement*, 70]. Lonergan includes reference to Rom 3:21-22, 25-26. Lonergan also includes reference to the exegesis of S. Lyonnet, "De 'Iustitia Dei' in Epistola ad Romanos 3, 25-26," *Verbum Domini* 25 (1947).

⁴⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 170-171 [*Supplement*, 70]

⁴¹ St. Augustine, *De Trinitate* XIII, xiii, 17; PL 42:1026 f.

⁴² Lonergan, *DBM*, 171 [*Supplement*, 71].

people living at one given time were miraculously converted. The latter has the weakness that there is no fitting reason why one group of persons, as opposed to an individual, should have the privilege of being the first to have the power and authority to convert others. So Lonergan concludes that it is fitting that the Kingdom of God be inaugurated by *one* person, and the most fitting person would be the one who is most likely to be able to bring others into the kingdom.⁴³

Fourth, the Son as mediator brings us to salvation according to the meaning of the cross through a twofold assimilation.⁴⁴ The first assimilation (that of the Son to us) is effected through the Incarnation and the love of the Incarnate Word. The second assimilation (that of us to the Son) is a union, almost an identification, which is the effect of love. This is possible because a friend regards his or her friends as a “second self” (*ut alterum se*). A person desires the same good for her friend as she does for herself. The notion of a “second self” comes from Aristotle’s notion that a friend is one’s “alter ego” (*alter ipse*), and from Augustine’s notion that a friend regards another friend as “half of his soul” (*dimidium animae suae*).⁴⁵

Fifth, in the order of reality established by divine wisdom, God’s goodness is manifested in that God in no way would permit evil in his works unless He was also omnipotent to draw good out of evil.⁴⁶ And in no other way does God draw good out of evil than according to the meaning, the law, the mystery, and justice of the cross. God does not ask others to do what He has not done first.⁴⁷

⁴³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 173 [*Supplement*, 72].

⁴⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 174 [*Supplement*, 72].

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 175 [*Supplement*, 73]. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* IX, 1166a 31; Augustine, *Confessions*, IV, 6; PL 32:698.

⁴⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 178 [*Supplement*, 74]. Lonergan references St. Augustine, *Enchiridion*, XI; PL 40:236. Cf. *Summa Theologiae*, 1, q. 48, a. 2, ad 3m.

⁴⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 179 [*Supplement*, 74].

5.3 Lonergan on the Meaning, Law, and Mystery of the Cross

In the previous chapter Lonergan stated that his purpose was simply to collect and express the relevant teachings found in scripture regarding the doctrine of redemption. In the present chapter, based on the introductory paragraph alone, we can rightly judge that Lonergan's purpose is now to offer an explanation as to how the doctrine of redemption is to be understood. In other words, he is now shifting to systematic theology. And in the introductory paragraph, he does not hesitate in getting to the heart of the matter. He states upfront that within the whole economy of salvation there is no higher principle than the transformation of evil into good. He equates this principle to the "fundamental idea" or "notion" of the cross, and in the first article titled "The Idea of the Cross" he states that this notion can be considered in three different ways:

analytically, by examining the meaning itself; in *general*, by looking at the meaning of the cross in the total context of the Christian life; and *specifically*, by contemplating the wisdom of God in Christ crucified (1 Cor. 1:23-24).⁴⁸

The analytical consideration corresponds to article 22. The general consideration corresponds to article 23. The specific consideration corresponds to article 24. The three subsections below interpret each of these three considerations.

5.3.1 An Analytical Consideration: The Meaning of the Cross

When Lonergan "analyzes" the threefold process by which evil is transformed into good, he is specifying an intelligibility to be grasped through the terms and relations

⁴⁸ "...nam prima est *analytica* consideratio quae ipsam rationem examinat; altera est *generalis* consideratio quae eadem rationem in tota vita christiana perspicit atque observat; tertia est *specialis* consideratio quae in Christo crucifixo Dei sapientiam contemplatur (1 Cor 1, 23.24)." *DBM*, 147 [*Supplement*, 60].

expressed in the following process: (1) evil to be overcome, (2) a victory of the will, and (3) good that emerges from evil through this victory.⁴⁹

However, as an analytical consideration *per se*, Lonergan's consideration abstracts from concrete instances of evil, concrete instances of a victory of the will, and concrete instances of the good that emerges from evil through this victory. In this sense, each element of the process could be considered as what in *Insight* Lonergan terms a "heuristic notion." A heuristic notion is an anticipation of an unknown content.⁵⁰ For example, an analytic consideration of the first element, as a heuristic notion, does not specify any *particular* evil of sin, any *particular* consequence of sin. Again, the second element identifies a victory of the will but does not specify what specific form the victory of the will might be expressed in a concrete situation. And again, an analytic consideration of the third element abstracts from any concrete specification of the good which emerges. For example, the good could be an improvement in the human situation, and this improvement could take any number of concrete forms: improvements in the economy, in technology, in the polity, or changes in the meanings and values of a culture which enhance the common good resulting in a more equitable distribution of particular goods.

Now I will consider each element in the process in more detail. First, regarding the evil to be overcome. I interpret this evil as *both* the evil of sin (*malum culpae*) and the evil consequences of sin (*malum poenae*) because Lonergan explicitly includes both in the first element.⁵¹ I emphasize what might seem obvious because readers familiar with Thesis 17 of *DVI* may miss this detail and assume that in the *Supplement* the evil to

⁴⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 147 [*Supplement*, 60].

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *Insight*, 417.

⁵¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 149 [*Supplement*, 61].

be overcome is solely *malum poenae*, since in *DVI* Lonergan is explicit that the evil to be overcome is *malum poenae*, not *malum culpae*.⁵²

Lonergan includes both *malum culpae* and *malum poenae* in the evil to be overcome based on the reinforcing influence between the two evils. Lonergan dedicates two paragraphs to explaining this reinforcing influence. The evil of punishment not only results from the evil of sin but strongly inclines one to the evil of sin as well because the evil of punishment, considered internally to the sinner, distorts the rational consciousness of the individual. And the external, social consequences of sin incline everyone in that social order to further sin because individuals within that social order must live and work.⁵³ This reinforcing influence creates what Lonergan calls the “kingdom of sin” (*regnum peccati*).⁵⁴ In *Insight*, he names this kingdom of sin the “social surd,”⁵⁵ a cumulative deterioration of the social situation which he equates to the “longer cycle” of decline in human history.⁵⁶

The pivot point in the process is a “victory of the will” (*victoriam voluntariam*), and to understand Lonergan we should begin with what a victory of the will is *not*:

This victory does not mean that sinners are wiped out so that no traces of guilt or punishment remain. Nor does it involve the suspension of the laws of nature, psychological, social, religious, or historical, according to which the private sin of one individual can inflict all sorts of evil consequences upon us and incite us to further evil acts. Rather, while sin and its consequences remain, their evil is overcome by good through the victory of the will.⁵⁷

⁵² Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 556. We should note that it is not as if Lonergan’s thought in *De Verbo Incarnato* ignores *malum culpae*. But if you consider his explanation of evil in his formal statement of Thesis 17, and his subsequent description of the three steps of the Law of the Cross, the inclusion of *malum culpae* in the evil to be transformed is implicit at best. However, it is outside the scope of this dissertation to offer a hypothesis as to why in *De Verbo Incarnato* Lonergan equates the evil to be overcome essentially to *malum poenae*.

⁵³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 147-148 [*Supplement*, 60-61].

⁵⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 148 [*Supplement*, 61].

⁵⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 254-255, 651-652, 711-712, 714-715, 721.

⁵⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 251-253.

⁵⁷ “Haec ergo victoria non in eo est quod delentur peccatores ut nullum iam remaneat culpae vel poenae malum. Neque haec victoria in eo est quod suspenduntur leges naturales, psychologicae, sociales,

Lonergan's understanding is consistent with the theological principle he established in the chapter on divine justice. Since divine wisdom has conceived both the world order itself and the redemption of this order in one intuitive act, then redemption will be in harmonious continuation with the order of this universe. Thus a victory of the will does not involve the suspension of laws which govern human living.⁵⁸

The notion of the victory of the will also explains *how* evil is overcome. The evil of sin, since it arises through a defect in rational consciousness⁵⁹ and aversion to God, is overcome through conversion to God and the restoration of rational consciousness. The evil consequences of sin are overcome by painfully absorbing the evil to bring forth good.⁶⁰

It is also important to note that the victory of the will is not merely the transformation of the evil consequences of sin. The victory of the will, since it also involves overcoming *malum culpae*, can be a victory in which a person refuses to sin in the first place despite the temptation to sin. This of course does not mean that we will always succeed. The Catholic doctrine of original sin grounds the doctrine of human

religiosae, historicae, quibus ex privato et individuali malo culpae per innumera poenae mala premimur atque urgemur in mala culpae multiplicanda. Sed manentibus malo culpae et malo poenae, vincitur malum in bono per victoriam voluntariam." *DBM*, 149 [*Supplement*, 61].

⁵⁸ Given the context in which Lonergan speaks of *leges naturales*, we should clarify that Lonergan is referring to laws which govern human living: psychological, social, religious, and historical laws. He is not referring to the laws of nature investigated by the natural sciences.

⁵⁹ Based on Lonergan's explanation of the evil of sin in his first chapter, we should state here that Lonergan's reference to "rational consciousness" (*conscientiae rationalis*) has a wider meaning than his use of the term "rational consciousness" in *Insight*. In *Insight*, rational consciousness corresponds to judgment, and rational *self*-consciousness corresponds to a decision consistent with one's judgment. See Lonergan, *Insight*, 636. In the *Supplement*, however, it is evident that when Lonergan uses the term "rational consciousness" he intends to mean both judging and choosing (deciding). See Lonergan, *DBM*, 33 [*Supplement*, 15].

⁶⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 149 [*Supplement*, 61]. Here I interpret that a "painful" absorption of evil does not simply mean physical pain, though that could be a component. In my interpretation of Lonergan, mental anguish in the victory of the will, with or without any physical outward expression, would qualify as painful absorption of evil.

powerlessness. Ultimately we cannot avoid sinning. But victories of the will can reduce the occurrence of sin by overcoming the temptation to sin in a given situation. In brief, then, to correctly interpret Lonergan, a victory of the will in overcoming evil is (1) avoiding sin in the first place and doing the good, and (2) lovingly absorbing the evil consequences of sin and returning good in the process.⁶¹

Furthermore, the victory of the will is not retributive justice:

This victory of the will, therefore, does not directly bear upon justice itself but upon the possibility of justice among sinners. Human justice renders “to each his own” and “in equal measure.” ...After the sin has been committed, just tribunals or a just war seek to redress the situation and restore it to the state in which it was before the seizure...The triumph of justice is one thing, however, and the meaning of the cross is quite another. Those who win the victory of the cross are not judges or military leaders but the gentle and humble of heart. The cross triumphs over the law of rapine, “another's for me,” by its law, “mine for the other.”⁶²

The first sentence is somewhat enigmatic: “This victory of the will, therefore, does not directly bear upon justice itself but upon the possibility of justice among sinners.” The sentence, interpreted in the context of the paragraph, means that the victory of the will is not related to the type of justice we equate with retributive justice. What Lonergan means by “the possibility of justice among sinners” is not simply the possibility of righting wrongs by restoring things to the way they were before. What he means is that the kingdom of sin is a *potential good* that can be actualized, but only according to the method of the cross rather than retributive justice. As an example of the latter he

⁶¹ This is also consistent with Lonergan’s later statement in *Method in Theology*: “As human authenticity promotes progress, and human unauthenticity generates decline, so Christian authenticity – which is a love of others that does not shrink from self-sacrifice and suffering – is the sovereign means for overcoming evil. Christians bring about the kingdom of God in the world not only by doing good but also by overcoming evil with good (Rom. 12, 21).” See Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 291.

⁶² “Haec ergo victoria voluntaria non ipsam iustitiam respicit sed inter peccatores possibilitatem iustitiae. Ipsa enim humana iustitia reddit ‘cuique suum’ et ‘ad aequalitatem.’...Peracto ergo peccato, statum qui ante peccatum erat quaerunt iusta tribunalia et iusta bella...Sed alia est haec iustitia victrix, et alia est ratio crucis. Crucis victoriam reportant non iudices neque belli duces sed mites et humiles corde. Crucis victoria per legem, ‘meum alteri,’ vincit legem raptoris, ‘alterius mihi.’” *DBM*, 149-150 [*Supplement*, 61-62].

refers to just tribunals or just war. In my interpretation Lonergan is not refuting the validity of just tribunals or just war. His point is to contrast the results of retributive justice against the results of a victory of the will that transforms the potential good into actual good. Retributive justice does not transform situations. Retributive justice intends, to the degree possible, equality, meaning a restoration of the situation to the state it was before. The meaning of the cross, on the other hand, is meant to transform the situation itself. I believe this is the cardinal point Lonergan is making. He made the same point in *De ratione convenientiae*:

When the objective situation is intelligible, the rule of right reason suffices to perpetuate this intelligibility. But when the objective situation has already been corrupted through accumulated wrongs and deep-rooted errors, right reason calling for justice hardly suffices to eradicate the irrational element. For justice is directed towards equality, and unless transformed by charity it will not wipe out enmity and hatred. When individuals suffering under wretched conditions, or oppressed classes of society, or subjugated nations have to be raised up again, I know of no other remedy than that charity that does not insist on its rights, that voluntarily does good when that is feasible, and that is ready to love its enemies and to lay down its life for those whom it loves.⁶³

In and of itself, juridical or retributive justice is not evil. Lonergan's point in *De ratione convenientiae* and here in the *Supplement* is that this type of justice is inadequate as an ultimate remedy to the problem of evil. What is needed is the method of the cross, and the pivot point in this method, the victory of the will, is motivated by charity. The victory of the will is a cure because it is contrarian to the actual problem.⁶⁴

Lonergan's reference in the *Supplement* to the "humble of heart" who win the victory of the cross raises an interpretive question of what constitutes an appropriate Christian response to social injustice. I do not interpret Lonergan's understanding of *victoriam voluntariam* as merely passive submission to evil. The proliferation of evil

⁶³ Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 12 [translation Shields].

⁶⁴ This victory is what in *Insight* Lonergan calls a "dialectical attitude" of the will that returns good for evil. Only through this dialectical attitude that returns good for evil can the social surd become a possible good. See Lonergan, *Insight*, 721.

means that we are going to suffer, and suffering is not easily tolerated. The victory of the will refers to *voluntary* action that refuses to shrink from this suffering. I do not interpret Lonergan as suggesting we remain passive victims of abuse amidst the evils of unjust social structures. In my interpretation it is inconceivable that Lonergan would not agree that self-sacrificing love may need to take the form of nonviolent resistance.⁶⁵

Finally, regarding the good drawn out of evil. This good is twofold: a contribution to the perfection of the individual and an improvement in the “human situation” (*situationem humanam*).⁶⁶ The “human situation” should be interpreted as the human good of order, both external and cultural, given that in the first chapter Lonergan provides us an understanding of the human situation in terms of the human good of order.⁶⁷ The human good of order, external and cultural, is Lonergan’s category for expressing the earthly realities that are to be brought together under Christ.

5.3.2 A General Consideration: The Law of the Cross

When Lonergan states that the meaning of the cross pertains to the new covenant by way of precept, by way of example, by conformation to and association with Christ, and by way of the economy of salvation, he is essentially considering the meaning of the cross in the total context of the Christian life. Thus Lonergan’s general consideration of

⁶⁵ As Robert Doran has noted, this second step in the transformation of evil can be considered as “loving absorption of the evil due to sin and the elevation of human response in grace to a level that transcends the cycle of violence *even when that response takes the form of resistance*.” See Robert Doran, “The Nonviolent Cross: Lonergan and Girard on Redemption,” *Theological Studies* 71 (2010), 51, emphasis mine.

⁶⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 150 [*Supplement*, 62].

⁶⁷ See article 2 in the first chapter titled “Good and Evil.”

the meaning of the cross takes the form of a “law” because of the complete *generality* the meaning of the cross has in the economy of salvation.⁶⁸

We can also understand why the idea of the cross is also a “law” through the insights Lonergan provides in *DVI*:

‘Law’ can be understood as a link that cannot be otherwise, as it is in logic and metaphysics. Again, ‘law’ can be understood as a link which can be otherwise, but which in itself is positively intelligible or fitting and is, as a matter of fact, always verified in every particular instance. The natural laws investigated by the empirical sciences are laws of this second kind. Thirdly, ‘law’ can pertain to the spiritual order in a way that is neither absolutely necessary nor verified in every particular instance. And this third sense has three subdivisions. (1) Law in the spiritual order can be just a precept and nothing more. There is nothing fitting about it; what it expresses is the will and the exercise of power, rather than wisdom and right reason. (2) Law in the spiritual order can be a precept that is altogether good and appropriate, yet remains ineffective since it is not observed. Finally (3) law in the spiritual order can be a precept that is good and effective and universal even though it does not exclude the possibility of sin. And such is the Law of the Cross.⁶⁹

In the *Supplement*, Lonergan does not provide a contrast between natural laws (here meaning laws investigated by the empirical sciences) and laws in the spiritual order to explain why the law of the cross is a “law.” But his explanation in *DVI* is applicable to what he means in the *Supplement*. The law of the cross is a spiritual, universal law. The universal dimension is grounded on the universal nature of the human spirit. The human spirit is not moved toward its goals by the blind forces of nature, but by laws in the spiritual order, or what in *DVI* Lonergan identifies as “laws that lead free spirit toward its goal.”⁷⁰ And according to the theological principle Lonergan established in his chapter on divine justice, in order for redemption to be in harmonious continuation with the actual order of the universe divine wisdom has conceived, redemption will be in

⁶⁸ I am borrowing the term “generality” from *De Verbo Incarnato*. There Lonergan states that the law of the cross is called a “law” by reason of the appropriateness seen in each step and “the generality it has within this economy [of salvation].” See Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 556.

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 574.

⁷⁰ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 574-575.

harmonious continuation not only with the laws we associate with the empirical sciences, but also the laws we associate with the human sciences, laws which govern the human spirit. So the law of the cross does not abrogate the psychological, social, religious, or historical laws which govern the human spirit. Otherwise, if these laws were violated, then the law of the cross would seem to be a divine afterthought of a voluntaristically conceived divine will. But for Lonergan there are no divine afterthoughts.

This complete generality of the meaning of the cross is also evident if we consider what the meaning of the cross presupposes. Recall that in his analytical consideration of the meaning of the cross, Lonergan discusses the “kingdom of sin.” The kingdom of sin itself has a complete generality: it has spread through the whole human race.⁷¹ The problem is all-pervasive. So the law of the cross is an all-pervasive solution to an all-pervasive problem.

We should also note that in Lonergan’s general consideration of the meaning of the cross he returns to a consideration of the good that emerges from a victory of the will. He does so through the analogy of the fruits of the good tree. The fruits of the good tree are first to be seen in the risen Lord.⁷² The fruits of the good tree are seen secondly in those who become true images of God’s Son, through adoption as children of God made possible by the free gift of the Father’s love, the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit.⁷³ Lonergan does not specifically use the term “Body of Christ” to name this relationship between Christ and the adopted children of God, but I interpret his meaning as such. This interpretation is supported by statements in the final article of the chapter on the justice of the cross. There Lonergan states that through Christ’s vicarious suffering, sacrifice, and

⁷¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 154 [*Supplement*, 63-64].

⁷² Lonergan, *DBM*, 157 [*Supplement*, 65].

⁷³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 157 [*Supplement*, 65].

giving of his life, the Church, according to ancient symbolism, was born from the side of Christ. And there Lonergan correlates the Church to the union of Head and members.⁷⁴

Thus in my interpretation this good resulting from a victory of the will is not just a natural improvement of the human situation, but the creation of a new community, a supernatural human good of order that is the whole Christ, Head and members.⁷⁵

Next I will consider Lonergan's criteria for judging that the meaning of the cross is also a law governing the entire economy of salvation. The criteria are overwhelmingly based on the witness of the New Testament.⁷⁶ Lonergan includes approximately sixty-eight references to passages from the New Testament. The first passage quoted captures perhaps for Lonergan the essence of the New Testament witness: Matthew 5:38-48 from Christ's Sermon on the Mount.⁷⁷ His method of arriving at this judgment is the method that in *Divinarum personarum*⁷⁸ Lonergan calls "systematic exegesis," which is an abstraction from all of the relevant passages in scripture to find the systematic

⁷⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 177 [*Supplement*, 74]. Further evidence is found in the final chapter of the *Supplement* where Lonergan equates the secondary purpose of the Incarnation to the external glory of God, the order of the universe which is the most excellent thing in creation. And there he states that this external glory of God is also the Body of Christ, Head and members. See Lonergan, *DBM*, *282 [*Supplement*, 120].

⁷⁵ My interpretation is informed by Lonergan's language in Thesis 17 of *De Verbo Incarnato*. There he describes the good that emerges from evil as a "supreme good," and this supreme good is the whole Christ, Head and members, in this life as well as in the life to come, in all their concrete determinations and relations. In other words the supreme good is a new, supernatural community. See Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 553-554.

⁷⁶ In this article there are approximately seventy-one references to external sources, sixty-eight of which are references to the New Testament. As for the remaining three references: There is one reference to DB 1796, one reference to *ST*, III, q. 45, a. 4, ad 2m, and one reference to Lonergan's own *Divinarum Personarum Conceptio Analogica*, pp. 215-239. The reference to DB 1796 is used to support Lonergan's claim that we can arrive at some understanding of the good that emerges from the victory of the will. See *DBM*, 156 [*Supplement*, 64]. Lonergan uses the latter two references to state that the Holy Spirit, as Proceeding Love from the Father and the Son, is symbolized in scripture by the dove in the narrative of Jesus' baptism (Mk 1:10) and the overshadowing cloud in the transfiguration narrative (Mk 9:7). See *DBM*, 157 [*Supplement*, 65].

⁷⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 151 [*Supplement*, 62]

⁷⁸ Bernard Lonergan, *Divinarum personarum conception analogicam evolvit B. Lonergan, S.I.* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1957, 1959). Abbreviated here and henceforth as *Divinarum personarum*. In 1964 Lonergan published his two volume work, *De Deo Trino*. The first part, *pars dogmatica*, was a revised version of his earlier work *De Deo Trino: Pars analytica*, published in 1961. The second part, *pars systematica*, was a revised version of *Divinarum personarum*. Quotations from *Divinarum personarum* are taken from Appendix 4 of *The Triune God: Systematics* (trans. Shields).

understanding common to all of the passages.⁷⁹ The systematic understanding common to all of the passages is the meaning of the cross. Again, this helps to understand why Lonergan would consider the meaning of the cross as a “law.” The meaning of the cross, as law, is for Lonergan an inescapable practical conclusion from the New Testament.

Given Lonergan’s overwhelming reliance on scripture and my interpretation that he considers the law of the cross as an inescapable practical conclusion from the New Testament, I interpret that for Lonergan the law of the cross becomes a doctrine. This does not mean that the law of the cross is *only* a doctrine. In the present chapter, there is no doubt that the law of the cross is the systematic intelligibility associated with the meaning of the cross considered in its complete generality to the entire economy of salvation. But the law of the cross, even though it is a systematic theological achievement, also takes on a doctrinal status. To help explain this I will rely on the work of Robert Doran.

In *What is Systematic Theology*, Doran discusses the meaning of theological doctrines that systematics attempts to understand, based on his interpretation of Lonergan’s methodology. In Lonergan’s methodology, “doctrines” are not limited to mysteries of faith that can only be known through revelation. As Doran notes, there are also doctrines, both theological and ecclesial, that do not directly express mysteries of faith, but nevertheless that systematic theologians attempt to work into a synthetic construction.⁸⁰ Doran asks the following question: What would qualify theological achievements with a certain doctrinal status? Here he is not limiting doctrinal status to ecclesial doctrines, but includes those *judgments of fact or value* in which a theologian

⁷⁹ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 751.

⁸⁰ Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 28.

confers something of a doctrinal status for his or her own theological reflection.⁸¹

Doran's basis for this inclusion is grounded on Lonergan's methodology, where doctrines correspond to judgments of fact or value. Systematics attempts to understand those judgments. Doran lists three criteria that would qualify a theological achievement with a certain doctrinal status.⁸² The first is that the achievement has brought definitive closure to a particular theological debate. The second is that the achievement provides the only analogy of nature yet discovered and developed useful for understanding a particular divine mystery. The third is that the achievement is an inescapable practical conclusion of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.⁸³

As I have noted, Lonergan's criteria for interpreting the meaning of the cross as "law" is overwhelmingly based on the witness of the New Testament. In terms of Doran's criteria, the law of the cross is for Lonergan an inescapable practical conclusion of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Lonergan's inescapable practical conclusion is a judgment of fact, and this judgment is supported by Lonergan's own words in the introductory paragraph of the chapter. He states that doctrines of the Christian faith are typically contained explicitly in the New Testament with respect to their factual basis while a fuller understanding is found only in the writings of the Church Fathers and the theologians. But he states that the dogma of our redemption is not only *fully expounded in scripture* but is also further elucidated by a "law" so that there can be *no doubt* as to how it is to be

⁸¹ Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 29.

⁸² Doran acknowledges that he is making no claim that this list of criteria is complete.

⁸³ Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 31-32. As an example of a theological achievement that has been granted doctrinal status due to the inescapable practical conclusion of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Doran mentions the theological doctrine of the "preferential option for the poor" which theologians of liberation originally developed but which has now become official Catholic teaching. See Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 40.

understood.⁸⁴ Lonergan is making a judgment of fact regarding *how* this law is to be understood, and judgments of fact in his methodology correspond to doctrines. Thus I interpret that for Lonergan, the law of the cross is not only a systematic theological achievement, but it is also a doctrine within a doctrine, where the latter is the wider doctrine of redemption. And as I will note later, the law of the cross *qua* doctrine functions in the remaining chapters of the *Supplement* to help control the systematic meaning Lonergan develops with respect to the further theological questions he will take up, specifically the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction and the historical causality of Christ.

5.3.3 A Specific Consideration: The Mystery of the Cross

In the article "The Mystery of the Cross," Lonergan moves from an analytical and general consideration of the meaning of the cross to a specific consideration of Christ crucified. For Lonergan, the fact that the Son of God made the law of the cross his own to bring us out of sin to live the life of God is a great mystery.⁸⁵ He clearly correlates this mystery to what the New Testament terms the "hidden plan of his [God's] will" (*sacramentum voluntatis suae*) which Paul speaks of in Ephesians 1:9.⁸⁶ It is the mystery that all things be brought together in Christ (Eph 1:9-10).⁸⁷ Lonergan made the same correlation between "mystery" and the hidden plan of God's will in his 1958 lecture on

⁸⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 146 [*Supplement*, 60]. This does not mean that the tradition has provided Lonergan with no clues for his theological achievement. For example, in the *Supplement* Lonergan is fond of noting Augustine's teaching that God judged it better to draw good things out of evil than to allow no evils to exist. Lonergan, *DBM*, 99, *197, *198, *202 [*Supplement*, 41, 83 (2x), 85]. As cited in Augustine, *Enchiridion*, VIII, 27. Lonergan also notes a closely related statement of Augustine: "God, the all-powerful ruler of all things, being supremely good, would in no way permit any evil in his works unless he were so omnipotent and good as to draw good out of evil." Lonergan references *Enchiridion*, XI; PL 40:236. Cf. *Summa Theologiae*, 1, q. 48, a. 2, ad 3m. See *DBM*, 179 [*Supplement*, 74].

⁸⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 158 [*Supplement*, 65].

⁸⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 159 [*Supplement*, 66].

⁸⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 158 [*Supplement*, 65].

redemption,⁸⁸ as well as in Thesis 17 of *DVI*.⁸⁹ God's hidden plan of redemption is still a mystery, but a revealed mystery. And although there are a number of mysteries involved in the work of our redemption, the cross of Christ holds a special place not only in terms of the revelation of God's plan, but as the analogy *par excellence* in which to understand the wisdom, the will, the love, the mercy, and the justice of God.⁹⁰

Thus in the *Supplement* when Lonergan speaks of the "mystery" of the cross he is referring to a supernatural reality. But at the beginning of the article on the mystery of the cross he states that the fact that the human race is redeemed from sin by way of the cross is hardly a mystery in itself.⁹¹ This statement is enigmatic, a seeming contradiction. We can reconcile this apparent contradiction by considering the contrast Lonergan makes in the same paragraph where this statement appears. The contrast is between the way or law of the cross *in itself*, as opposed to the fact that the Son of God made the cross his own as the means of our redemption. Considered analytically (abstractly), the law of the cross as a threefold process of transforming evil into good can be understood by the natural light of human reason. I believe this is why Lonergan states that it is hardly a mystery *in itself*. But the fact that the Son of God made the cross his own is a revelation of God's wisdom that cannot be known by the natural light of human reason. This is why the revelation of the Holy Spirit is required to discern the wisdom of God in Christ crucified. Without this revelation, the law of the cross *as God's solution to the problem of evil* (as opposed to an abstract understanding of the law of the cross in itself) seems like folly, irrationality, a stumbling-block.

⁸⁸ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 24.

⁸⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 583-584.

⁹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 159 [*Supplement*, 66].

⁹¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 158 [*Supplement*, 65].

Next, we recall from Lonergan's chapter on divine justice that he hinted there was a special facet of divine justice revealed in the cross of our Lord, and that he would defer an explanation of this to chapter 4. In article 24 we find his explanation:

There is likewise general agreement that in the work of our redemption God is made known to us in a way that we could never know by our natural knowledge. Even if by the natural light of human reason we were able to show that God is wise, free, loving, merciful, and just, we could only draw these conclusions by way of analogy from creatures. But from the Son's incarnation, death, and resurrection we have another and much loftier analogy for coming to know God as he is in himself. St. Paul often speaks of this new knowledge of God's wisdom (1 Cor 1:18-2:16, 3:18-19; Rom 11:33, 16:2)...We know what his justice is like, no longer only on the analogy of law courts and prisons and gallows, but also from the crucifixion of his own Son.⁹²

The cross of Christ not only reveals divine justice, but it is the loftier analogy for coming to know God as he is in himself. Lonergan reiterates this in the last paragraph of the article on "The Mystery of the Cross" where he states that the death and resurrection of Christ allows us to grasp the wisdom and goodness of God not by analogy from creatures but from the man Christ Jesus, providing us a far more profound knowledge of God.⁹³

Lonergan's conviction that Christ Jesus is the loftier analogy is expounded when we consider his Trinitarian theology. The Incarnation is a supernatural reality, yet because the mission of the Son involves a contingent, created external term which is the *esse secundarium* of the human nature assumed by the Son, God has entered into human history as intimately as God can, to take part in what Lonergan later called "man's

⁹² "Constat praeterea in opere nostrae redemptionis revelari Deum esse talem qualem naturaliter cognoscere non possumus. Etsi enim naturale rationis lumen demonstrare possit Deum esse sapientem, liberum, diligentem, misericordem, iustum, haec tamen omnia nisi ex analogia creaturarum non concludit. Quare, ex Filio Dei incarnato, mortuo, resurrecto aliam longeque altioem analogiam accipimus ad ipsum Deum cognoscendum prout in se est. Novam hanc divinae sapientiae notitiam celebrat S. Paulus (1 Cor 1, 18 - 2, 16; Rom 11, 33; 16:27; 1 Cor 3, 18.19)...Qualis denique sit Dei iustitia, iam non solum ex analogia tribunalium et carcerum et patibulorum sed etiam ex Filio proprio crucifixo concludimus." *DBM*, 160 [*Supplement*, 66].

⁹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 166 [*Supplement*, 69].

making of man.”⁹⁴ Essential to Lonergan’s Trinitarian theology is his understanding that the secondary act of existence of the Incarnation (the *esse* of the assumed human nature of the Incarnate Word) is a created participation of paternity.⁹⁵ Thus Jesus Christ, as the Word made flesh, reveals the Father. Therefore since the *esse* of the assumed human nature of the Word is a *created* participation of paternity, any aspect of the life of Christ can be an analogy for understanding God as he is in himself.

We also recall that Lonergan listed five modes in which the mystery of the cross may be considered.⁹⁶ We have already touched on the last mode where Lonergan considers the cross of Christ as a revelation of God, the loftier analogy for coming to know God as he is in himself. For reasons of space I will not consider all of the other modes, but I do want to briefly consider the first where Lonergan considers the mystery of the cross through the category of “symbol.” This aspect of the mystery of the cross will show up again in the next chapter in Lonergan’s understanding of what it means to state that Christ has made satisfaction for our sins.

Readers familiar with *Insight* may recall Lonergan’s discussion of the relationship between mystery and symbol in that text. Let us consider this discussion because it will aid our interpretation of what Lonergan means when he states that “symbol” is an aspect of the mystery of the cross. In *Insight*, Lonergan’s definition of “mystery” is the paradoxical category of the “known unknown.”⁹⁷ The very fact that we are cognizant of a mystery, and that we ask questions regarding a mystery, means that there is a “known” element in the unknown. If there were no “known” element, the mystery would be

⁹⁴ Lonergan, “Natural Right and Historical Mindedness,” *Third Collection*, 171.

⁹⁵ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 473.

⁹⁶ Symbolic, intellectual, volitional, providential, and divine.

⁹⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 555, 569.

completely outside our horizon of awareness and we would not even have the ability to ask questions of the mystery in the first place. In *Insight* Lonergan also states that “some sensitive awareness and response, symbolic of the known unknown, must be regarded as a generally and permanently recurring feature of human living.”⁹⁸

This is the same point Lonergan is making in the *Supplement*. He describes the symbol of the cross as an expression of mystery, giving rise to sensitive awareness and response:

The sensible depiction of the body and the shed blood of Christ on the cross represents and expresses outwardly the interior acts of his mind and heart; it forcefully strikes our senses and deeply moves our emotions, so that we receive spiritual benefit from the very act of gazing at the crucifix and from the consequent affections of our will.⁹⁹

Lonergan stated essentially the same insight in article 19 (Meritorious Obedience) of the prior chapter of the *Supplement*. There he stated that since a human being not only has a soul but a body as well, then a human act in the fullest sense consists not only of the interior acts of knowing and willing, but also an external act, bodily and perceptible by the senses, which gives expression to the interior acts of knowing and willing.¹⁰⁰

5.4 The Justice of the Cross

In article 25 Lonergan takes the general principles of divine justice, developed in chapter 2 of the *Supplement*, and applies these principles to five elements he discerns in the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross. Lonergan’s statement below captures the essence of the general principles of divine justice:

⁹⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 557.

⁹⁹ “Ipsam enim Christi crucifixi sensibile corpus sanguisque effusus et interiores actus mentis cordisque Christi repraesentant atque expriment, nostrosque sensus sentimentaque percipiunt, unde fructum spiritualem in aperitione oculorum voluntatisque affectibus percipimus.” *DBM*, 164 [*Supplement*, 68].

¹⁰⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 135 [*Supplement*, 55].

From this [Lonergan's prior consideration of the general principles of divine justice] we conclude that the actual order of things is most fitting because ordained by divine wisdom and most just because God's choice follows his wisdom, and also is most free since with equally infinite wisdom and equally infinite goodness God can do whatever absolutely speaking he can do.¹⁰¹

Let us also recall the five elements Lonergan discerns in the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross: (1) God's salvific intention and activity to restore goods lost, (2) the meaning and the law of the cross according to which this activity unfolds, (3) the presence of a mediator through whom this salvific activity unfolds, (4) this mediator himself as accomplishing his work according to the meaning of the cross, and (5) the manifestation of divine goodness in letting evils happen in such a way that good may be drawn out of them.¹⁰²

In my interpretation, the first thing we should attempt to understand is the basis from which Lonergan can state that there is "little difficulty" (*facillima*) in applying the general principles of divine justice to the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross.¹⁰³ Why little difficulty? The reason is based on the fundamental principle of divine justice itself. *Whatever* God does is done in accordance with the supremely free, wise, fitting, right and just divine plan.¹⁰⁴ Lonergan is reiterating his fundamental position that there is no such thing as a voluntaristically conceived divine will. There are no divine afterthoughts. So if God has willed our salvation through the mediation of Christ Jesus by way of the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross, then God's "willing" of this mediation must be in

¹⁰¹ "Quae cum ita sint, actualem rerum ordinem concludit et maxime convenientem esse quia divina sapientia eum ordinavit, et maxime iustum esse quia divina electio divinam sapientiam secuta est, et maxime liberum esse quia pari sapientia infinita et pari bonitate infinita potest Deus facere quodcumque absolute potest facere." *DBM*, 168 [*Supplement*, 70].

¹⁰² Lonergan, *DBM*, 170 [*Supplement*, 70].

¹⁰³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 169 [*Supplement*, 70].

¹⁰⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 169 [*Supplement*, 70]. We also recall Lonergan's statement from article 15 in the chapter "The Justice of God." There he states, "Whatever God does is just;" [Quodcumque agit Deus, hoc iustum est;] *DBM*, 112 [*Supplement*, 46].

accord with divine wisdom, since divine wisdom is the rule of divine justice. The application of the general principles of divine justice to the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross are just as reasonable and straightforward as are the application of these general principles to absolutely any other thing that God wills in the order of this universe, whether natural or supernatural. The principles of divine justice apply to absolutely everything that God wills, the cross included.¹⁰⁵

Next we can turn to the substance of the article. What this article intends is to explain the *fittingness* of whatever God does with respect to the economy of salvation. I will consider four basic points Lonergan makes.

The first is closely related to what we have just stated. Lonergan desires to impress upon his reader that the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross is not contradictory to God's justice. The first general principle of divine justice is that God can do anything that does not involve an intrinsic contradiction.¹⁰⁶ Whatever God does is just and often our human wisdom has trouble accepting this. For example, it is evident that by the time of Aquinas a question arose as to whether God's mercy conflicts with God's justice.¹⁰⁷ Aquinas rejected this conclusion. Whatever God does is both merciful and just.¹⁰⁸ Lonergan himself refers to the mercy of God on six occasions in the article on the mystery of the cross,¹⁰⁹ and there he also states how the mystery of the cross, as revelation, caused both the authors of the New Testament and the whole Catholic

¹⁰⁵ We must qualify this as Lonergan does, noting that the cross involved a distinction in "wills." In no way did God directly will the evil perpetuated against Christ. What God directly willed was Christ's victory of the will to overcome these evils and transform them into a great good.

¹⁰⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 168 [*Supplement*, 69]. Lonergan appropriates this from Aquinas. See *ST*, I, q. 25, a. 3.

¹⁰⁷ I base this judgment on *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 3, where Aquinas takes up the question of whether mercy can be attributed to God. The second objection states that mercy is a relaxation of justice and since God cannot remit what appertains to His justice, mercy is not becoming of God.

¹⁰⁸ *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 4.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 159 (3x), 160 (2x), 165 [*Supplement*, 66 (5x), 68].

tradition to marvel at this new revelation of divine mercy and love.¹¹⁰ Nowhere in the present chapter is divine mercy pitted against divine justice. But the objection exemplified in the question taken up by Aquinas, whether raised in the thirteenth century or today, reveals an anthropomorphic tendency to see mercy and justice as contradictory rather than complementary, and to conceive God in such a way that if God is *too* merciful then God is irrational, that God is contradicting God's own justice. And since God is not irrational, this anthropomorphic tendency comes down on the side of justice, but justice conceived by human wisdom. Human wisdom with its anthropomorphic bias tries to control what is possible and not possible for God. Lonergan's point is that God is not bound by God's own justice to provide us a solution to the problem of evil according to retributive justice.

Of course this is not to deny the fact that human sin incurs a debt of penalty according to God's own justice. For Lonergan, following Aquinas, sin does incur a debt of penalty. So God would not be unjust if God were to exact retributive justice on the whole human race by destroying the corrupted good and creating a completely new good in its place. Nor would God be unjust if God chose to transform evil into good without human cooperation. But by God's own justice, God is not obliged to choose either of these options. For Lonergan, it is clear from the New Testament that God chose the option to convert evil into good through a victory of the will, and that the mystery of the cross in this drama is not to be understood in the context of retributive justice. For Lonergan, God's choosing of this option is more fitting than the others and there is no intrinsic contradiction if God chooses this option.

¹¹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 160 [*Supplement*, 66].

Second, Lonergan recalls the Patristic understanding that the devil had to be defeated not by power but by justice.¹¹¹ Power and domination are not evils in themselves, but as a solution to the problem of evil, they are an illusion.¹¹² As Lonergan stated previously in article 22, those who win the victory of the cross are not judges or military leaders but the gentle and humble of heart. The justice of the cross is grounded not in power and domination, but in superabundant generosity. This is not to be understood as if there is no “power” in the justice of the cross. The justice of the cross *is* a power, but power properly conceived, a power grounded in generosity rather than force.

Third, the justice of the cross reveals that we are saved by a Mediator. If all the people living at one given time were by some miraculous divine intervention successfully converted from a multitude of evils to one true good, then this would not be in keeping with the common course of events in the order of this universe established by divine wisdom.¹¹³ We see at work here Lonergan’s theological principle he established in the chapter on divine justice. Thus having a Mediator is in harmonious continuation with the common course of events and the order of the universe established by divine wisdom. For Lonergan it is fitting that the kingdom of God be inaugurated by *one* person, the Mediator Jesus Christ, the foundation and head of the whole economy of salvation.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ He quotes Augustine on this position. See Lonergan, *DBM*, 171-172 [*Supplement*, 71]. The quotation is from Augustine’s *De Trinitate*, Bk. 13, Chpt. 13.

¹¹² Lonergan, *DBM*, 172 [*Supplement*, 71].

¹¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 173 [*Supplement*, 72].

¹¹⁴ Although Lonergan does not reference the work of Arnold Toynbee, it is possible that Toynbee’s insight into the advancement of societies is partly behind Lonergan’s explanation of why it was fitting that the Kingdom of God be inaugurated by one person. Lonergan had read Toynbee’s *A Study of History* prior to writing the *Supplement*. In *A Study of History* Toynbee notes the role of the single individual, the “creative genius” as catalyst of change. He summarizes this insight in a section titled “The Creative Genius as a Saviour.” In this section Toynbee states that the source of action which inaugurates the advancement of a society is never the society itself but always an individual, an individual soul that is in some sense a “superhuman” genius, part of the creative minority, who then influences others to act. See Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History, Vol. I: Abridgement of Volumes I-VI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 533; originally published in 1947.

Fourth, to understand the justice of the cross we must also understand how the Son of God brings *us* to salvation according to the meaning, law, and mystery of the cross. Again, Lonergan's focus is on fittingness. A key statement he makes captures the essence of this fourth point:

It is fitting for the Father to love us with the same love with which he loves his Son, to the extent that we and the Son are one. But we and the Son are one inasmuch as the Son is assimilated and joined to us and we in turn are assimilated and joined to the Son.¹¹⁵

For Lonergan we are assimilated to Christ in two ways. First, through the effect of the Incarnation. The Word has assumed a human nature, and assimilates Himself to all humanity.¹¹⁶ Second, there is what Lonergan calls a "union" (*coniunctio*) or "almost an identification" (*quasi identificatio*) with Christ that is the effect of love.¹¹⁷

A friend regards his friend as a 'second self' in that he wants the same good for his friend as he does for himself. So it is that a friend is said to be one's alter ego;¹¹⁸ and Augustine in the *Confessions* exclaims, "Well has someone said of his friend that he is half of his soul."¹¹⁹ As to the greatness and excellence of Christ's love for us, he himself has given ample testimony by his deeds and also in his words: "A man can have no greater love than to lay down his life for his friends" (Jn 15:13).¹²⁰

This notion of the "union of love" is fundamental to Lonergan's understanding of how Christ, as Head of the Body, is united to His members thus allowing the members to appropriate the work of the Head. In the next chapter where Lonergan considers the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction, his argument will include the judgment that those who

¹¹⁵ "Eatenus enim convenienter Deus Pater eadem dilectione ac proprium suum Filium etiam nos diligit, quatenus ex Filio et nobis efficitur unum. Eatenus ex Filio et nobis efficitur unum, quatenus et Filius nobis assimilatur atque coniungitur et nos Filio assimilamur atque coniungimur." *DBM*, 174 [*Supplement*, 72]. Lonergan includes the following footnote: St Augustine, *In Ps 118, Sermon*. 16, 6: PL 37:1546: "We should not become sharers in his divinity if he were not a sharer in our mortality." *Sermon*. 192, 1; PL 38:1012: "Intending to make Gods of those who were men, he willed to become that which he himself had made."

¹¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 174 [*Supplement*, 72].

¹¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 175 [*Supplement*, 73].

¹¹⁸ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* IX, 1166a 31; cf. 1171b 33.

¹¹⁹ *Confessions*, Chap. 6; PL 32:698. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1-2, q. 28, a. 1 c.

¹²⁰ "Amicus enim amicum apprehendit 'ut alterum se,' in quantum scilicet vult ei bonum sicut et sibi ipsi. Et inde est quod amicus dicitur esse alter ipse; et Augustinus dicit in IV Confessionum: 'Bene quidam dixit de amico suo, dimidium animae suae.' Quanta autem qualisque fuerit dilectio Christi erga nos, et ipse sicut factis ita etiam verbis testatus est, dicens: 'Maiorem hac dilectionem nemo habet, ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis suis.' (Io 15, 13)." *DBM*, 175 [*Supplement*, 73].

are unequal in guilt are one in will through their union in love. For Lonergan, the union of wills through love is the foundation of vicarious satisfaction.¹²¹ Lonergan will thus use this notion of the union of wills through love to explain how Christ, as Head, can make satisfaction for Christ's members.

5.5 The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the *Supplement*

In the present section I will interpret the function of the current chapter within the wider context of the *Supplement*. There are three considerations here. The first considers the present chapter in relation to Lonergan's summarization of the New Testament teachings on redemption (chapter 3 of the *Supplement*). The second and third considerations interpret the present chapter in relation to Lonergan's understanding of the satisfaction given by Christ (chapter 5 of the *Supplement*) and the historical causality of Christ (chapter 6 of the *Supplement*).

5.5.1 Lonergan's Understanding of the Cross of Christ in Relation to the Teachings of the New Testament

We recall that in Lonergan's chapter on the death and resurrection of Christ his purpose was to collect the New Testament teachings relevant to the doctrine of redemption. We also recall that Lonergan's methodology in that chapter reflects his inheritance of the tradition of Aquinas, who was content to explain the salvific efficacy of

¹²¹ Lonergan appropriates this from Aquinas. See *ST*, I-II, q. 87, a. 7.

Christ's passion in five complementary aspects rather than in some single, unified viewpoint.¹²²

In Lonergan's 1958 lecture on redemption, given only a few months after he had completed a draft of the *Supplement*,¹²³ he discussed the various aspects of redemption according to Aquinas's five ways. In the same lecture he stated that the mystery of redemption is not an intelligibility that can be put in a single formula, then later in the lecture suggested how one might move toward a "total view" to synthesize Aquinas's five ways.¹²⁴ There is an apparent conflict in these statements. With respect to the apparent conflict, an editorial comment was inserted in the published transcript of the lecture. The editorial note states "it is more of a conflict between aspects of thought growing toward unity than between two positions already taken and fixed for life."¹²⁵ The editorial note goes on to state: "Three factors are involved here: the understanding of the redemption Lonergan inherited, his own habitual orientation toward a unified understanding, and the unity he was able to achieve by further thought."¹²⁶ The editorial note equates the unity Lonergan was able to achieve to the "Law of the Cross" articulated in Thesis 17 of *DVI*.¹²⁷ Much of the material in the present chapter of the *Supplement* was later synthesized by Lonergan into Thesis 17 of *DVI*. Thus the editorial note in the

¹²² *ST*, III, q. 48. As Charles Hefling has noted, this is not to be interpreted as if Aquinas's five ways are disconnected *sentencia*, but neither do they have a clear intelligible unity. See Hefling, "Lonergan's *Cur Deus Homo*," 163.

¹²³ As we noted in the introduction of this dissertation, in a letter dated May 25, 1958, Lonergan reported to Frederick Crowe that he had six chapters (45 articles) "pretty well done." The 1958 lecture on redemption was given on September 25, 1958.

¹²⁴ On the former statement, see Lonergan, "The Redemption," 14. On the latter statement, see pg. 24.

¹²⁵ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 14, n. 26. According to Charles Hefling, the editorial note is anonymous, but its content and style strongly suggests Crowe's authorship. See Hefling, "Lonergan's *Cur Deus Homo*," 163, n. 13.

¹²⁶ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 14, n. 26.

¹²⁷ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 14, n. 26. The editorial note identifies specifically pages 574-579 of *De Verbo Incarnato*. It is in this section of the text that Lonergan identifies the law of the cross with the "intrinsic intelligibility" and "essence" of redemption.

transcript of the 1958 lecture correlating Lonergan's achievement in Thesis 17 of *DVI* to a synthesis of the tradition Lonergan inherited raises an interpretive question of how the present chapter relates to the previous chapter. Should we interpret Lonergan's understanding of the meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the cross as a synthesis of Aquinas's five ways?

In my interpretation the answer to this question is that it is highly probable that in the *Supplement* Lonergan did consider his understanding of the meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the cross as a synthesis of Aquinas's five ways, but not as a "unified view" of redemption. Let me first explain why I believe Lonergan considered his understanding to be a synthesis of Aquinas's five ways. There are two basic reasons.

The first reason is that the *Supplement* itself exhibits the methodology that in the 1958 lecture Lonergan indicated was the clue to a unified view of the traditional five aspects (ways) enumerated by Aquinas. In the 1958 lecture Lonergan did not offer a unified view, but he did state that in his opinion the key to such a total view is the fundamental category of *mystery*. What Lonergan meant by mystery is not the theologian's sense of a truth we cannot fully understand in this life, nor in the sense of Christian piety that meditates on the mysteries of the life of Christ. Lonergan was referring to mystery as the writers of the New Testament would have understood this word. In the 1958 lecture he stated that the New Testament's understanding of mystery refers to the secret counsel of God, the hidden plan of God's will.¹²⁸ In the present chapter, by progressing from an analytical and general understanding of the fundamental meaning of the cross to the specific consideration of the cross as mystery, Lonergan is sublating the meaning and law of the cross into the mystery of redemption, God's hidden

¹²⁸ Lonergan, "The Redemption," 24-25.

plan now revealed, to gather all things together under Christ. He is doing what he hinted was the key to a unified view of the tradition he inherited from Aquinas. The meaning of the cross, whether considered in itself, as law, as mystery, or as divine justice is at its core the systematic understanding of what Lonergan considers the highest principle in the economy of salvation: the transformation of evil into good. The four articles in the present chapter are simply different considerations of this fundamental principle. But at its core, it is a systematic intelligibility expressed in a set of terms and relations where the terms are (1) evil to be overcome, (2) a victory of the will that overcomes this evil, and (3) good that emerges from evil through this victory. In my interpretation, this systematic intelligibility is for Lonergan the common intelligibility to be found in the traditional images and theories of redemption he inherited from Aquinas. In other words, in each of Aquinas's five ways Lonergan discerns a common denominator whether the image is "price paid" (ransom), sacrifice, meritorious obedience, vicarious suffering, or efficient causality.¹²⁹ That common denominator, the unity that is found in all the images, is the transformation of evil into good through a victory of the will.

The second reason is based on Lonergan's statements in *DVI*. In Thesis 17 he states that the law of the cross is the "intrinsic intelligibility of redemption" (*intrinsic redemptionis intelligibilitas*),¹³⁰ and the "essence of redemption" (*essentia redemptionis*).¹³¹ Thesis 17 represents a unified, systematic viewpoint of the teachings of the New Testament Lonergan presented in Thesis 15 of the same text. In Thesis 15 he also categorized the teachings of the New Testament according to the traditional five

¹²⁹ We note here that among Aquinas's five ways, the fifth way is by way of efficiency or efficient causality. We noted that in the previous chapter Lonergan expanded on this category by giving fuller attention to the resurrection of Christ.

¹³⁰ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 576.

¹³¹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 577.

aspects enumerated by Aquinas. The organization of the *Supplement* shows the same pattern. Chapter 3 of the *Supplement* is to Thesis 15 of *DVI* as the present chapter of the *Supplement* is to Thesis 17 of *DVI*. Given the short time span between the two texts, it is highly probable that Lonergan had this same understanding in mind in the *Supplement*, that is, that his articles on the meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the cross provide a systematic unification of the teachings of the previous chapter which are organized according to the traditional five aspects enumerated by Aquinas.

Now the question of whether Lonergan understands this synthesis to be a “unified view” of redemption is a different matter. The question relies on a distinction between the meanings of “intrinsic intelligibility” and “unified view.” In my judgment the meanings are not the same. In *DVI*, when Lonergan identifies the “Law of the Cross” as the intrinsic intelligibility of redemption, he explains what he means by contrasting the four Aristotelian causes to make a distinction between “intrinsic” and “extrinsic” intelligibility:

The Law of the Cross is the intrinsic intelligibility of redemption. Intelligibility is either intrinsic or extrinsic. The extrinsic intelligibility of a thing is always sought in something else—in the final, the exemplary, or the efficient cause. But intrinsic intelligibility is grasped in and through the thing itself, as the definition is grasped in that which is defined, or an invariant relationship of things in the very things that are invariably and cogently connected.¹³²

Thus for Lonergan, “intrinsic intelligibility” does not exhaust the full meaning of intelligibility. Logically then, the intrinsic intelligibility of redemption does not exhaust the full intelligibility of redemption.

¹³² Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 576. In *Insight* Lonergan makes a similar distinction between “immanent intelligibility” and intelligibility associated with final, material, instrumental, and efficient causality. “Immanent intelligibility” described in *Insight* is the same as “intrinsic intelligibility” described in *De Verbo Incarnato*. Intrinsic (immanent) intelligibility can be associated to the intelligibility of formal causality. See Lonergan, *Insight*, 57, 101-102.

Furthermore, and perhaps most importantly, in my interpretation Lonergan would not consider *any* view of redemption as a unified view without an explanatory account of how the economy of salvation evolves historically.¹³³ Such a consideration would include the intelligibility of Christ's historical causality on human development, which is the theological question Lonergan takes up in the last chapter of the *Supplement*. At the time of Aquinas, the question of history was not on the table, so Aquinas's five ways do not address the efficacy of Christ's salvific action from a historical perspective.¹³⁴ Thus if one synthesizes Aquinas's five aspects without introducing historical categories, then one may have a synthesis of Aquinas, but not a unified view of redemption.

To support this interpretation I will offer three additional pieces of evidence, all from Lonergan's works. I will do so chronologically.¹³⁵ First, there is a statement Lonergan makes in his epilogue to *Insight*. He states that with regard to any individual who has embraced God's solution, there is to be added the consideration of cumulative

¹³³ This judgment is supported by a statement Lonergan made to Joseph Komonchak. Komonchak states the following: "When we were studying theology in Rome, David Tracy and I would occasionally go to see Fr. Lonergan and pester him with questions...In one of those conversations I asked him about redemption, phrasing my question, as I recall it, in terms of Aristotle's four causes. In reply, Fr. Lonergan suggested that redemption was one of those realities that could not be adequately dealt with in Aristotelian categories, that it required a theory of history and historical categories." Joseph Komonchak, "The Church," *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*, 222. See also Joseph Komonchak, "Lonergan's Early Essays on the Redemption of History," *Lonergan Workshop 10: The Legacy of Lonergan*, ed. Frederick Lawrence (Chestnut Hill: Boston College, 1994), 160.

¹³⁴ In "The Future of Thomism," Lonergan states: "A contemporary theology must take and has taken the fact of history into account. Inasmuch as it does so, St. Thomas ceases to be the arbiter to whom all can appeal for the solution of contemporary questions; for, by and large, contemporary questions are not the same as the questions he treated, and the contemporary context is not the context in which he treated them. But he remains a magnificent and venerable figure in the history of Catholic thought. He stands before us as a model, inviting us to do for our age what he did for his." Lonergan, "The Future of Thomism," *Second Collection*, 49. And again: "St. Thomas did not have the modern concern for history and man's historicity...and if one wishes to evade history and historicity, one wishes to live in a world that no longer exists." Lonergan, "The Future of Thomism," 53.

¹³⁵ The chronology is based on the following: (1) the dating of *Insight*, written between 1949 and 1953, published in 1957; (2) the dating of *Divinarum personarum*, 1957; (3) the dating of *De Verbo Incarnato*, first published in 1960.

historical development.¹³⁶ Lonergan suggests that this historical aspect possesses a peculiar relevance to the treatise on the mystical body of Christ and states that such a treatise remains incomplete as long as it fails to draw upon a theory of history.¹³⁷

Second, there is a relevant statement Lonergan makes in *Divinarum personarum*. In that text Lonergan explains the notion of systematic exegesis we discussed previously. He also discusses a new step in theological comprehension complementing this exegesis:

According to Aristotle, science has two meanings: it is science in potency when it is merely of universals; it is science in act when it is applied to particular things. Besides systematic exegesis, therefore, there is historical exegesis, which, far from omitting the accidentals, includes them synthetically. Besides systematic theology, there is a theology that is more concrete and more comprehensive, which deals with and seeks to *understand the economy of salvation as it evolves historically*. This new step in comprehension has over a lengthy period of time been gradually prepared by copious studies in the biblical, conciliar, patristic, medieval, liturgical, ascetical, and other areas of research, but in such a way that its synthetic character is not yet clearly apparent, since today's scholars seem to resemble more the twelfth-century compilers than they do the thirteenth-century theologians in the proper sense.¹³⁸

Finally, there is a statement in *DVI*. In Thesis 12 titled "Christ's Knowledge," Lonergan includes two scholions at the end of the thesis. The second scholion is titled "The Power of Christ the Man." The scholion is extremely brief, but the second sentence states the following: "There is need for further consideration of the historical causality that Christ the man manifestly exercises."¹³⁹ Lonergan would not add this comment to *DVI* if he thought the Law of the Cross in Thesis 17 of that same text addressed this need. Thesis 17 on the "Law of the Cross" does not address Christ's historical causality.

¹³⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 763.

¹³⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 764.

¹³⁸ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 753, emphasis mine. As Robert Doran notes, Lonergan's statement about twelfth-century compilers was not meant as a criticism, but a factual comment on the historical situation Lonergan found himself in 1957 when this text was published. See Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 146-147.

¹³⁹ "Ulterius desideratur consideratio de causalitate historica quam Christus homo manifeste exercet." *De Verbo Incarnato*, 416 (trans. Hefling).

In summary then, I interpret that Lonergan's understanding of the meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the cross represents for Lonergan a synthesis of the traditional five aspects enumerated by Aquinas, but I do not interpret that Lonergan himself considered this synthesis as a unified view of redemption. Otherwise there would be no need for Lonergan to take up the theological question of Christ's historical causality in the final chapter of the *Supplement*.

5.5.2 Lonergan's Understanding of the Cross of Christ in Relation to the Satisfaction Given by Christ

In chapter 5 on the "The Satisfaction Given by Christ," Lonergan will make four specific references to "the meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the Cross."¹⁴⁰ At other times he will simply refer to the "meaning of the Cross," again on four specific occasions.¹⁴¹ All eight of these references are found in article 29, "The Punishment of Christ." What Lonergan is doing in this article is attempting to clear away what he considers false interpretations of Christ's experience of "punishment" and lay a firm foundation for determining the truth of the matter.¹⁴² The punishment involved in the satisfaction given by Christ is part of the mystery of the cross, but in order to understand the nature of this punishment in its proper theological context, Lonergan will correlate the punishment of Christ to the threefold process of the law of the cross. As inflicted on Christ, the punishment was unjust. As accepted by Christ, the punishment was

¹⁴⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *196, *198, *199, *202 [*Supplement*, 83, 84 (2x), 85].

¹⁴¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *197 (3x), *199 [*Supplement*, 83 (3x) 84].

¹⁴² Lonergan, *DBM*, *199 [*Supplement*, 84]. The context of the question is that with Anselm, there was the disjunction *aut satisfactio aut poena* (either satisfaction or punishment). But since Christ did indeed die on the cross, and according to scripture death is a consequence of sin, then it would seem that Christ suffered punishment. As Lonergan will state in the next chapter, Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, and Aquinas reintroduced the word *poena* with respect to the notion of Christ's satisfaction. This is the context of Lonergan's article on the punishment of Christ. The question, however, is how to understand what the "punishment of Christ" means.

transformed from an unjust evil inflicted upon Christ to a voluntary sacrifice (a victory of the will). As rewarded by the Father, Christ's victory of the will becomes the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him.¹⁴³ Lonergan states that this divine plan was realized in the meaning, the law, the mystery, and the justice of the cross, by reason of which Christ crucified is acknowledged to be the wisdom of God (1 Cor 1: 23 f.).¹⁴⁴

Then, in article 30 on "The Transference of Punishment to Christ," Lonergan will begin to use the term "the justice of the cross" in contrast to what he terms "the justice of a judge" (*iustitia iudicis*).¹⁴⁵ The justice of a judge refers to retributive justice. Lonergan will argue that Christ's passion and death, as punishment, is to be understood in the context of the justice of the cross, not the justice of a judge. Lonergan's purpose is to refute the error that Christ received punishment in the strict sense of retributive justice. And he refutes this error by appealing to his prior judgment, found in the current chapter, that Christ suffered, died, and was raised up in accordance with the divine wisdom and justice of the cross, which is not retributive justice.

Lonergan is not only developing a systematic understanding of the cross of Christ in terms of its meaning, law, mystery, and justice, but as I stated earlier the law of the cross functions as a doctrine. In the next chapter, this law, as doctrine, will provide a framework for Lonergan to control meaning in a systematic explanation of the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction.

¹⁴³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *202 [*Supplement*, 85].

¹⁴⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *202 [*Supplement*, 85].

¹⁴⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *223, *226, *228, *230, *230, *231, *231, *233 [*Supplement*, 85, 86, 88, 88, 89, 89, 89, 90].

5.5.3 Lonergan's Understanding of the Cross of Christ in Relation to the Historical Causality of Christ

In the last chapter of the *Supplement* Lonergan takes up the theological question of the historical causality of Christ. He does so from a number of different understandings of Christ's agency. Lonergan does not explicitly mention the meaning, law, mystery, or justice of the cross until the last article where he takes up Anselm's question *Cur Deus homo*. This does not mean that the meaning, law, mystery, or justice of the cross is not operative implicitly in other articles of the last chapter. My interpretation is based on Lonergan's understanding that one of the purposes of Christ's historical action is to advance the total human good of order, both external and cultural.

Specifically, in Lonergan's discussion of Christ as historical agent (article 42), he will state that (1) Christ's historical action is directly aimed at ordering human life on earth to the future life in heaven; and (2) since this ordering liberates human beings from evils and turns them towards true good with the result that the human good of order is greatly improved, this improvement itself is necessarily intended indirectly by Christ as an historical agent.¹⁴⁶ Thus Christ's historical action as a whole is for the total human good of order both external and cultural, past, present, and future. Implicitly then, advancement of the human good of order implies the law of the cross since advancing the human good of order means that Christ's historical causality liberates persons from evils and turns them toward the good.

As I previously noted, Lonergan's reference to the law of the cross is most explicit in the final article of the *Supplement*. His purpose there is to explain why a God-

¹⁴⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *269 [*Supplement*, 114].

man was required to achieve the secondary end of redemption.¹⁴⁷ But how is this secondary end achieved? Lonergan will state that unless psychological and social laws are suspended, contradictory to what he calls the “principle of continuity,” humans cannot be turned from evil to good except according to the method (law) of the cross and as such it is fitting that the God-man not only teach and prescribe the law of the cross but also perform his work according to the mystery of the cross.¹⁴⁸

Once again, the law of the cross is functioning as a doctrine. It is also functioning as a systematic component in Lonergan’s understanding of Christ’s historical causality, since he states that it is *fitting* that the God-man teach and prescribe the law of the cross. The ground for this insight is the prior judgment, the doctrine, that in no other way does God draw good out of evil than according to the law of the cross.

5.6 Summary

In the introduction to his chapter “The Cross of Christ,” Lonergan states that in the whole economy of salvation there is no higher principle than the transformation of evil into good.¹⁴⁹ And in the first sentence of the first article he equates the fundamental idea of the cross to this principle of transformation.¹⁵⁰ This principle of transformation presupposes evil to be overcome, then overcomes this evil through a victory of the will, such that good emerges from evil. This principle of transformation is discerned in the event of the cross itself, but from the New Testament witness this principle of transformation becomes a precept and example to follow, a law governing the entire

¹⁴⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *285 [*Supplement*, 121].

¹⁴⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *292 [*Supplement*, 124].

¹⁴⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 146 [*Supplement*, 60].

¹⁵⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 147 [*Supplement*, 60].

economy of salvation. For Lonergan, the meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the cross is not only a synthesis of the traditional five aspects of redemption enumerated by Aquinas, but the law of the cross in particular takes on for Lonergan himself a doctrinal status because it is an inescapable practical conclusion of the New Testament.

Much of the material in this chapter was later synthesized by Lonergan into Thesis 17 of *DVI*, titled “Understanding the Mystery: The Law of the Cross.” As Robert Doran has correctly noted, Lonergan’s position on the Law of the Cross “has been acknowledged as one of his most profound theological achievements.”¹⁵¹ Since our working hypothesis is that Lonergan completed a draft of the *Supplement* prior to *DVI*, then this chapter of the *Supplement* may be the earliest extant writing on what is one of Lonergan’s most profound theological achievements.

¹⁵¹ Doran, “The Nonviolent Cross: Lonergan and Girard on Redemption,” 49.

CHAPTER 6: THE SATISFACTION GIVEN BY CHRIST

6.1 Introduction

Here we will interpret the *Supplement's* fifth chapter titled “The Satisfaction Given by Christ.”¹ The chapter includes articles 26-34: (26) Division of the Question, (27) The Meaning of Necessity, (28) The Meaning of Punishment, (29) The Punishment of Christ, (30) The Transference of Punishment to Christ, (31) The Sacramental Analogy, (32) The Sorrows of Christ, (33) The Satisfaction Given by Christ, and (34) The Superabundant Satisfaction Given by Christ.

The fifth chapter begins with a one-paragraph introduction:

Since the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction draws some of its basic elements from Scripture and tradition and others from St. Anselm's speculation about the reason for the God-man, we shall first divide the question itself (Art. 26), then seek to understand the meaning of the Anselmian disjunction, “either satisfaction or punishment” (*aut satisfactio aut poena*). To this end, we first of all deny that a third member besides satisfaction and punishment is absolutely impossible (Art. 27), next we likewise deny that satisfaction has to be understood in such a way as to exclude per se any notion of punishment (Art. 28 and 29), and thirdly we deny that the punishments of sinners, as such, have been transferred to the sinless Christ (Art. 30). Having established these premises, we go on to determine that Christ's satisfaction is to be understood according to the analogy of sacramental satisfaction (Art. 31), that the man Christ grieved for our sins (Art. 32), and that as an expression of this sorrow he accepted his passion and death so that through this passion and this death satisfaction might be truly (Art. 33) and indeed superabundantly (Art. 34) given.²

¹ “CAPUT QUINTUM. DE SATISFACTIONE CHRISTI,” *DBM*, *180-228 [*Supplement*, 74-97].

² Cum doctrina de satisfactione Christi elementa alia ex scripturis et traditione ducat, alia autem ex speculatione S. Anselmi cur Deus homo, primo ipsam quaestionem dividimus (art. XXVI), et deinde anselmianae disiunctionis intelligentiam quaerimus, quonam scilicet sensu dicatur aut satisfactio aut poena. Quem in finem, primo negamus absolute fieri non potuisse ut tertium praeter satisfactionem et poenam daretur (art. XXVII), deinde pariter negamus ita intelligendam esse satisfactionem ut ab ea per se omnis ratio poenae excludatur (art. XXVIII et XXIX), tertio denique negamus ipsas peccatorum poenas simpliciter dictas esse in Christum innocentem translatas (art. XXX). Quibus stabilitis, determinatur satisfactionem Christi esse intelligendam secundum analogiam satisfactionis sacramentalis (art. XXXI), Christum hominem de nostris peccatis doluisse (art. XXXII) et in expressionem huius doloris passionem mortemque suam acceptasse ut haec passio haecque mors satisfactionis rationem haberent (art. XXXIII) et quidem superabundantius (art. XXXIV).” *DBM*, *180 [*Supplement*, 74-75].

6.2 A Brief Description of Articles 26 - 34

6.2.1 Article 26: Division of the Question³

Lonergan begins noting the different meanings of the noun “satisfaction” (*satisfactio*).⁴ For example, in law courts there is the distinction between the payment of a debt and satisfaction: satisfaction is made when the creditor freely agrees that the debt may be extinguished in some other manner. There is also the meaning associated with the sacrament of penance. The sacrament includes three acts: contrition, confession, and satisfaction (DB 896, 904; DS 1673, 1689; ND 1620, 1630). Ecclesial doctrine states that Christ has given satisfaction for our sins (DB 799, 904; DS 1529, 1689; ND 1932, 1630). Lonergan states that what this doctrine means, since there are several opinions, cannot be stated briefly.⁵ So he begins with a distinction between dogmatic and speculative meanings of Christ’s satisfaction.

In the dogmatic sense, Christ’s satisfaction means (1) the redemption, as a means, carried out by our Lord; (2) Christ’s vicarious suffering and death for us and for our sins in accordance with the intention of God; (3) the payment of a certain price through his death; (4) a sacrifice that efficaciously takes away sins and provides access to God, as shown by God’s appeasement; and (5) Christ’s obedience unto death meriting our justification, which through baptism removes all guilt and liability to punishment.⁶

³ “Articulus XXVI. Dividitur quaestio,” *DBM*, *181-184 [*Supplement*, 75-76].

⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *181 [*Supplement*, 75].

⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *181 [*Supplement*, 75].

⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *181-182 [*Supplement*, 75].

Anselm was virtually the first to treat the satisfaction of Christ, but he had a speculative interest in mind. Anselm was looking for a *necessary reason to Cur Deus homo?* For Lonergan, Anselm's argument boils down to the following:

It is therefore necessary that either the dishonoring [of God by sin] be redressed, or that punishment be meted out. Otherwise God would not be just towards himself, or else powerless to do either - which is utterly unthinkable.⁷

For Lonergan, this argument grounds the rest of Anselm's theory, a theory Lonergan summarizes as follows: (1) a mere human being owes absolutely everything to God and therefore cannot give supererogatory satisfaction for sins, (2) but a God-man is not liable to death and thus by dying can give satisfaction, and (3) such satisfaction is greater than all sins whatsoever and merits the remission of all sins.⁸ Lonergan, noting that every theory gives rise to further questions, ends with questions of his own:

The question arises, why was it necessary for Christ to die, and why did his death necessarily call for the remission of sins? Secondly, was the death of Christ in some way a punishment, and if so by what sort of justice was Christ punished? Thirdly, in what precisely does the satisfaction made by Christ consist? Was it superabundant? How could it have been vicarious, and how could vicarious satisfaction remove the aftermath of sin and restore the order of reality? Fourthly, must the whole work of Christ be deduced from Anselm's necessary reason, or is there some other way to come to a theological understanding of this matter?⁹

⁷ "Necesse est ergo ut aut sublatus honor solvatur aut poena sequatur. Alioquin aut sibi deus iustus non erit aut ad utrumque impotens erit; quod nefas est vel cogitare." *DBM*, *183 [*Supplement*, 76]. This is a direct quote of the Latin text from Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, I, 13. See *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, vol. 2, ed. F. S. Schmitt (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946), 71. Lonergan notes that Anselm sometimes used arguments of appropriateness and distinguished between compelling and non-compelling necessity. Lonergan nonetheless judges that Anselm's theory is based on a *necessary* reason.

⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *183 [*Supplement*, 76].

⁹ "Quaeritur enim qua necessitate mortuus sit Christus et qua necessitate propter eius mortem concedatur peccatorum remissio. Quaeritur deinde utrum mors Christi rationem poenae habuerit et qua iustitia haec poena a Christo sit sumpta. Quaeritur tertio in quonam praecise consistat satisfactio Christi, utrum fuerit superabundans, quemadmodum vicaria esse potuerit, quemadmodum per vicariam satisfactionem reliquiae peccatorum tollantur et rerum ordo restauretur. Quaeritur quarto utrum totum Christi opus deduci oporteat ex ratione anselmiana necessaria, an alia via ad intelligentiam theologicam procedendum sit." *DBM*, *183-184 [*Supplement*, 76].

6.2.2 Article 27: The Meaning of Necessity¹⁰

Lonergan notes that Anselm's argument is based on the disjunction *aut satisfactio aut poena*. Is there a third possibility where neither satisfaction is given nor punishment undergone? Hypothetically the answer is yes. God can do anything that does not involve an intrinsic contradiction, and God is not bound by any stricture of justice to require satisfaction.¹¹ Furthermore, God could have gratuitously pardoned all sins, or even if God had wanted satisfaction the slightest suffering on the part of Christ would have sufficed.¹² However, in the present order of reality the answer is no since we have the ecclesial doctrine of Christ's satisfaction. Lonergan notes that theologians ask the further question, why did Christ suffer such *great* pain? Lonergan quotes Aquinas:

“Christ wanted to free mankind from sin not only by exerting his power but also by fulfilling the requirements of justice. Therefore he not only considered the value his sorrow would have by virtue of his divine nature, but also how far his pain would go by virtue of his human nature towards giving so great a satisfaction as was needed for sin.”¹³

Aquinas understood this in terms of fittingness, but later theologians took a voluntaristic or hypothetical approach to understand this in terms of necessity. The former appealed to a divine decree of acceptance. The latter concocted supersubtle distinctions to show that Christ gave condign satisfaction according to the full rigor of justice.¹⁴

¹⁰ “Articulus XXVII. De Ratione Necessitatis,” *DBM*, *185-186 [*Supplement*, 76-77].

¹¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *185-186 [*Supplement*, 77].

¹² Lonergan, *DBM*, *186 [*Supplement*, 77]. Lonergan cites Aquinas as the authoritative source of this doctrine (*ST*, III, q. 46, a. 5, 3um). He also notes this is the teaching of Pope Clement VI (DB 550).

¹³ “Christus voluit genus humanum a peccatis liberare non sola potestate sed etiam iustitia. Et ideo non solum attendit quantum virtutem dolor eius haberet ex divinitate unita: sed etiam quantum dolor eius sufficeret secundum naturam humanam ad tantam satisfactionem.” *DBM*, *186 [*Supplement*, 77]. This quotation is from *ST*, III, q.46, a. 6, 6um.

¹⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *186 [*Supplement*, 77]. Lonergan does not identify any particular theologian. However, in Thesis 16 of *DVI* he gives the same illustrations of voluntaristic and hypothetical approaches. Scotus and Suarez are named explicitly, the former to the error of voluntarism and the latter to solutions based on hypothetical legal contracts. *De Verbo Incarnato*, 493.

6.2.3 Article 28: The Meaning of Punishment¹⁵

Lonergan begins with the question of whether Anselm's disjunction means, in the real sense, either punishment undergone by Christ or punishment undergone by sinners.¹⁶ Christ did die, and according to scripture death is a punishment for sin. Logically, then, Christ suffered punishment.

Aside from scripture Lonergan also considers the pre-Anselmian and post-Anselmian traditions. Representing the pre-Anselmian tradition, Lonergan notes the teaching of Augustine. Augustine understood death as a penalty for sin but declared that Christ, in undergoing punishment and yet not accepting guilt, wiped away both guilt and punishment.¹⁷ Representing the post-Anselmian tradition, Lonergan begins with Catholic thinkers. He notes the positions of Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, and Thomas Aquinas, all of whom retrieved the pre-Anselmian tradition that Christ suffered punishment.¹⁸ Aquinas held that in matters pertaining to human volition, evil is divided into sin and punishment (penalty).¹⁹ Aquinas distinguished three types of punishment: (1) simple or punitive, (2) medicinal or remedial, and (3) satisfactory or expiatory.²⁰ Christ's punishment is to be understood as satisfactory, or expiatory.²¹

¹⁵ "Articulus XXVIII. De Ratione Poenae," *DBM*, *187-193 [*Supplement*, 77-81].

¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *187 [*Supplement*, 77].

¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *187 [*Supplement*, 77]. Lonergan references *Serm.* 171, 3; PL 38:934.

¹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *189 [*Supplement*, 77-78].

¹⁹ *ST*, I, q. 48, a. 5.

²⁰ Simple punishment means that each person is punished for his or her own sin (*ST*, I-II, q. 87, a. 8 c). Medicinal punishment is suffering the loss of a lesser good for a greater good (*ST*, I-II, q. 87, a. 7 c). Satisfactory punishment is undergone voluntarily when one person who has not committed a fault willingly undergoes punishment in place of another, because in some cases, persons unequal in guilt are one in will through their union in love (*ST*, I-II, q. 87, a. 7 c). Lonergan, *DBM*, *189 [*Supplement*, 79].

²¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *189 [*Supplement*, 79]. Lonergan recalls Aquinas's teaching that to inflict punishment without regard to guilt or innocence is brutality, while to punish beyond the proportion of fault is cruelty. Lonergan references *ST*, II-II, q. 159, a. 2.

Lonergan then transitions to a consideration of the sixteenth-century reformers.²² Their denial of sacramental satisfaction removed the basis of the analogy for understanding Christ's satisfaction. By bringing in the notion of fiduciary faith and the notion that the righteousness of Christ has been imputed to us, the door was opened to the notion that our unrighteousness was imputed to Christ.²³ The opinion was fully developed through Quenstedt (1617-1688), who taught that by reason of God's justice God was obliged to require full payment of the debt incurred by sin. Without this payment God could not remit sins. So Christ voluntarily had our sins charged to himself.²⁴ Based on scripture and tradition (Catholic and Protestant), Lonergan judges that Anselm's disjunction cannot be maintained.²⁵

The remainder of the article primarily considers the opinion of Jacques Rivière.²⁶ Rivière distinguished three possible modes for explaining Christ's satisfaction: (1) chastisement, (2) expiation, or (3) reparation. Rivière opted for reparation understood along the lines of how Aquinas understood satisfaction.²⁷ Rivière acknowledged the added element of expiation in Christ's sufferings but understood Christ's submission to evil as subordinate, secondary, and external. Others view Rivière's opinion as doubtful, such as Xiberta who held that Christ's sufferings were by divine ordination, suggesting another alternative to Anselm's disjunction: either punitive expiation or punishment.²⁸

²² Lonergan notes the positions of Melancthon, Calvin, F. Socinus (1534-1604), H. Grotius (1583-1645), and Quenstedt (1617-1688).

²³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *189 [*Supplement*, 79].

²⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *189-191 [*Supplement*, 79-80].

²⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *191 [*Supplement*, 80].

²⁶ Rivière authored the entry "Redemptionis" in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique (DTC)*, vol. 13.

²⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *192 [*Supplement*, 80]. For Aquinas, one satisfies (atones) for an offence when he or she displays to the offended person something which pleases that person as much or more than what displeased the person by the offense. *ST*, III, q. 48, a. 2.

²⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *192 [*Supplement*, 81].

6.2.4 Article 29: The Punishment of Christ²⁹

Lonergan begins with the statement that the Latin word *poena* (“punishment” or “penalty”) cannot be separated from Christ’s redemptive work. He notes how Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, and Aquinas reintroduced the word *poena*, but his emphasis is on Aquinas. Aquinas understood satisfaction in the proper sense as not having an intrinsic connection with undergoing evil,³⁰ but at the same time Aquinas spoke of “satisfactory punishment.”³¹ Lonergan comes to the following judgment:

Granted that one can put forth a coherent theory according to which satisfaction would not necessarily and of itself include suffering evil, nevertheless in our opinion such a theory would contribute little to the present discussion, since it is universally acknowledged that Christ, in accordance with God's will, suffered and died for us and for our sins.³²

For Lonergan, elements of a coherent theory must affirm the compatibility of the following judgments, which Lonergan appropriates from Rivière: (1) God does not directly will evil; (2) Christ’s passion and death was not simply good, nor a simple absence of good, but a privation of good and indeed a privation of the most painful and severe kind; and (3) God did directly will Christ's atonement, and so that satisfaction given by Christ cannot simply be identified with the suffering of evil.³³

He then states that an objection to this position may be raised, based on the assumption that the following three elements are incompatible: (1) Christ made atonement by suffering, (2) God directly willed Christ’s atonement, and (3) God did not

²⁹ “Articulus XXIX. De Poena Christi,” *DBM*, *194-202 [*Supplement*, 81-85].

³⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *194 [*Supplement*, 81]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 48, a. 2.

³¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *194 [*Supplement*, 81]. Lonergan references *ST*, I-II, q. 87, a. 7, 3um.

³² “Quapropter etsi concedamus theoriam sibi cohaerentem ita excogitari posse ut satisfactio mali perpeccionem per se non includat, credimus tamen theoriam eiusmodi ad nostram materiam parum facere, cum constet Christum Deo volente pro nobis nostrisque peccatis esse passum atque mortuum.” *DBM*, *194 [*Supplement*, 81].

³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *194 [*Supplement*, 82]. Lonergan references *DTC* 13, pp. 1970, 1973. Lonergan qualifies his agreement with Rivière by stating that the element in Rivière’s opinion that Christ’s sufferings are subordinate or incidental to Christ’s satisfaction warrants correction.

directly will Christ's passion.³⁴ Lonergan argues that these elements are quite compatible, and on two levels. On the first level, he uses the terminology of scripture and the Church Fathers. On the second level, he uses scholastic terminology.

Lonergan summarizes the scriptural and Patristic witness as an interplay of three roles: (1) the role of the devil perpetrating Christ's passion and death, where this passion and death, as inflicted on Christ, was a most grave sin;³⁵ (2) the role of Christ who voluntarily submitted to his passion and death, while at the same time never in the least indicated that the ridicule heaped upon him and the scourging and crucifixion he suffered were being inflicted upon him by his Father;³⁶ and (3) the role of the Father resurrecting and exalting his beloved Son, making the Son Lord and Christ and giving to the Son the promise of the Father, the Holy Spirit.³⁷ Lonergan then relates these roles to his speculative work from the previous chapter:

It is not difficult to discern in these three roles the meaning, the law, the mystery, and the justice of the cross. For the cross presupposes evil, it includes the notion of the triumph of the will over evil, and leads to superabundant good lavished by God the Father.

Besides, these three aspects all converge in the meaning of the cross. However divergent these three roles are among themselves, they come together in the single meaning of the cross which presupposes evil to be overcome, transforms that evil into good, and through that transformation leads us to understand the meaning of the text, "In all things God works for good with those who love him" (Rom 8:28).³⁸

³⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *195 [*Supplement*, 82].

³⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *195 [*Supplement*, 82]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 46, a. 3, 3um; q. 48, a. 4, 2um, 3um; q. 49, a. 2 c., 1um.

³⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *196 [*Supplement*, 82].

³⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *196 [*Supplement*, 83].

³⁸ Neque difficile in istis tribus est perspicere rationem, legem, mysterium, iustitiam crucis. Haec enim et malum praesupponit, et malum per victoriam voluntariam victum dicit, et in bonum superabundans a Deo Patre collatum conducit.

Praeterea, per rationem crucis eadem tria in unum conflantur. Quamvis enim inter se maxime sint diversae partes diaboli et partes Christi et partes Dei Patris, in tribus simul sumptis una est crucis ratio, quae et malum vincendum praesupponit, et ipsum hoc malum in bonum transformat, et per malum in bonum transformatum eo pervenit ut sciat quid sit illud, 'diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum' (Rom 8, 28)." *DBM*, *196-197 [*Supplement*, 83].

Lonergan then begins his argument using a scholastic mode of expression. The argument is mediated by replying to the following questions: Why would an all-powerful God have dealings with the devil? Why did God not spare his own Son but instead handed him over on behalf of us all? Lonergan's reply is that human reason can go no farther than Augustine's dictum that God judged it better to draw good out of evil than to allow no evils to exist.³⁹ Despite the existence of evil, divine wisdom did not ordain that evils should exist. God neither directly nor indirectly wills sin, but allows sin and the evil consequences of sin and arranges for good to be drawn out of this evil. God's absolute and universal dominion remains intact without God being in any way the cause or author of sin. Sin cannot be attributed to God as if it were intelligible, because sin is the non-intelligible, the absurd, the irrational.⁴⁰

Accordingly, since the evil of sin truly exists and is not from God and only exists by his permission, we now know what is represented by the devil in the above-mentioned picture, and in a way lies hidden under the name of devil. Ours is not to ask why an omnipotent God should be condescend to deal with the devil, but rather to humbly accept the fact that God who alone is wise (Rom 16:27) lets the evil of sin happen.⁴¹

Once God's allowance of evil was granted, there was nothing to do but draw good out of evil through the meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the cross.⁴² Lonergan acknowledges that this does not fully explain what is meant by Christ's satisfaction, "but it does serve the useful purpose of clearing away false opinions and laying a firm foundation for determining the truth of the matter."⁴³ He states that we can also see this

³⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *197 [*Supplement*, 83]. Lonergan references Augustine's *Enchiridion*, 27, PL 40:245.

⁴⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *197-198 [*Supplement*, 83].

⁴¹ "Proinde, cum malum culpae et vere sit, et a Deo non sit, et nisi Deo permittente non fiat, illud iam habemus quod in dicta pictura per diabolum repraesentatur et sub nomine diaboli quodammodo latet. Non ergo est quaerendum cur Deus omnipotens Dominus ita cum diabolo tractare dignatus sit, sed illud potius est humiliter acceptandum quod Deus solus sapiens (Rom 16, 27) malum culpae esse permisit." *DBM*, *198 [*Supplement*, 83].

⁴² Lonergan, *DBM*, *198 [*Supplement*, 84].

⁴³ "...sed hanc utilitatem eamque haud parvam habent ut et falsas opiniones amoveant et solidum praebeant fundamentum ad veritatem determinandam." *DBM*, *199 [*Supplement*, 84].

foundation by examining the notion of Christ's punishment. Punishment was involved in the passion and death of Christ because (1) passion and death are evils in themselves, and (2) these evils resulted from the sins of others. Christ's passion and death were a privation of the good, and privation of the good is the definition of evil.

Furthermore, since punishment is evil that results from sin, there are going to be as many species of punishment as there are connections according to God's manifold wisdom by which evil is linked to sin.⁴⁴ Since divine wisdom regulates divine justice, all these kinds of punishment are just according to the wisdom and justice of God. Lonergan reiterates the three types of punishment he already covered in article 28: simple punishment, medicinal punishment, and satisfactory punishment. Simple punishment is not applicable to Christ, since Christ's sinlessness is frequently mentioned in scripture. Medicinal punishment is not applicable to Christ, since theologians agree that Christ was incapable of sinning and needed no such remedy. The punishment of Christ is to be understood as satisfactory punishment.⁴⁵ The nature of satisfactory punishment is to be found in the mystery of the cross wherein Christ crucified is the wisdom of God.⁴⁶

Lonergan concludes with four distinctions with respect to Christ's punishment. As inflicted, it was unjust. As accepted, it was transformed. As rewarded by the Father, it made Christ the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him. Finally, inasmuch as God in his eternal decree allowed this punishment to be inflicted, accepted, and rewarded, we can discern with Augustine the plan of divine wisdom that judged it better to draw good out of evil than to allow no evils to exist.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *199 [*Supplement*, 84]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 21, a. 1, 2um.

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *200 [*Supplement*, 84].

⁴⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *201 [*Supplement*, 85].

⁴⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *202 [*Supplement*, 85].

6.2.5 Article 30: The Transference of Punishment to Christ⁴⁸

In this article Lonergan rejects any theory that Christ was in some way condemned or chastised by the Father according to retributive justice. Christ did suffer punishment, so there is a penal element to understand. But what are the possible contexts to understand this? Here is Lonergan's answer:

For Christ's satisfaction or atonement, although it may be referred to as punishment, is made according to the divine wisdom and justice of the cross; but simple punishment, punishment as such, is imposed upon sinners themselves according to the wisdom and justice of a divine judge. And so the disjunction, "either satisfaction or punishment," comes back in a fourth form -- the correct one -- that in the actual order of reality this is the operative disjunction, "either the justice of the cross or the justice of a judge."⁴⁹

Lonergan provides five arguments why Christ's punishment is to be understood according to the justice of the cross, not the justice of a judge.

First, a just judge does not punish twice for the same offence. If Christ was punished for *all* sins via the justice of a judge, hell and purgatory would be empty.⁵⁰

Second, due punishment in the strict sense for mortal sin is eternal damnation. If Christ was duly punished for sin then he received this form of punishment. But this is obviously false since Christ is now exalted at the right hand of the Father.⁵¹

⁴⁸ "Articulus XXX. De poenis in Christum translatis," *DBM*, *203-210 [*Supplement*, 85-89].

⁴⁹ "Satisfactio enim Christi, etsi poenae nomen habeat, secundum divinam crucis sapientiam atque iustitiam redditur; sed poenae simpliciter quae peccatoribus ipsis infliguntur secundum sapientiam et iustitiam divini iudicis solvuntur. Quae cum ita sint, alio et quarto modo eoque vero redivisio, aut satisfactio aut poena, ut in actuali rerum ordine illud valeat, aut iustitia crucis aut iustitia iudicis." *DBM*, *203 [*Supplement*, 85].

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *204 [*Supplement*, 86]. Lonergan notes and refutes a possible objection. One could object that (1) even though Christ was punished sufficiently for all sins, it does not immediately follow that Christ's merits are applied equally to all; or (2) Christ's merits are certainly applied to those forgiven in the sacrament of penance, and in these cases all liability to punishment is remitted. Lonergan counters that these objections of the sixteenth-century reformers were condemned as heretical (DB 904, 905, 922, 925).

⁵¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *204-205 [*Supplement*, 86]. Lonergan notes and refutes a possible objection. One could object that it would have been sufficient for Christ to undergo the pains of hell only for a very short time. Lonergan counters that (1) this objection abandons the opinion that Christ suffered the very punishment due to sin, and (2) to suggest that Christ suffered the pains of hell does not contribute to determining the truth of the matter because such assertion has no serious ground.

Third, it is contrary to the teaching of the New Testament to state that the anger of God was directed against his Son. Christ is not a child of God's wrath but the Son that the Father loves.⁵² God is not unjust and does not condemn one without sin.⁵³

Fourth, those who interpret the passion and death of Christ in the context of the justice of a judge do an injustice to God the Father, to Christ himself, and to Christ's example and precept.⁵⁴ For Lonergan, these injustices stem from mixing fact with fiction (fictitious anger of the Father towards Christ, fictitious imputation of guilt to Christ, fictitious condemnation of Christ, fictitious punishment of Christ).⁵⁵ Even though Christ repudiated the law of retaliation and preached the wisdom of the Cross, the Father would seem to have ignored his own wisdom and followed the law of retaliation.⁵⁶ This is a contradiction and an injustice to the Father, since scripture is clear that the Father first loved us (1 Jn 4:9), and being rich in mercy, because of this love for us sent his Son reconciling the world to himself (2 Cor 5:19) proving his love for us (Rom 5:8).⁵⁷ Furthermore, according to the opinion that Christ was punished according to the justice of a judge, one is equating Christ with the First Adam and this is an injustice to Christ since Christ is not the head of sinful humanity but Head of the Church which he loves.⁵⁸

⁵² Lonergan, *DBM*, *205 [Supplement, 86]. Lonergan references Eph 2:3 and Col 1:13.

⁵³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *205 [Supplement, 86]. Lonergan notes that one must make the following distinction: It is true that God is angry *with sin*, but it is false to state that God's anger is directed against the Son.

⁵⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *206 [Supplement, 87].

⁵⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *207 [Supplement, 87]. Note: In Shields's English translation, there is a paragraph in this section of the chapter beginning with the words "Our first objection..." (*Primo, ergo, arguitur...*). This is primarily where we find Lonergan's references to these fictions. This paragraph is not found in the file containing the Latin typescript of chapter six. The paragraph has been inserted into the English translation from a fragment in the Lonergan Archives. The fragment is labeled 25260DTL060 / A2526 and can be obtained at <http://www.bernardlonergan.com>.

⁵⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *206 [Supplement, 87].

⁵⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *207 [Supplement, 87]. Lonergan notes and refutes a possible objection. One may object that Christ, though innocent, was ranked among criminals (Mk 15:28) and incurred the anger of God the Father. Lonergan counters that Christ was ranked among criminals not by the Father, but by Pilate, the high priests, and the mob.

⁵⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *208 [Supplement, 88].

Finally, if Christ's example and precept is the justice of the cross, we contradict Christ's example and precept if we interpret his passion and death in the context of the justice of a judge because such an interpretation suggests to us to ignore Christ and follow a precept of retributive justice instead.⁵⁹

Fifth, there is a distinction between the condemnation of sin and the condemnation of a person. The latter changes a person's status in society and concludes that the condemned is guilty of sin and to be punished. Lonergan does not deny that in Christ crucified we see an extreme condemnation of sin. But this is condemnation of sin, not condemnation of Christ. To condemn Christ is to condemn the second person of the Trinity. A suggestion that one person of the Trinity condemns another is blasphemous.⁶⁰

6.2.6 Article 31: The Sacramental Analogy⁶¹

Lonergan begins by noting three assertions from previous articles: (1) Christ's satisfaction was not absolutely necessary; (2) this satisfaction did not necessarily rule out Christ's physical passion and death; and (3) this satisfaction was not punishment for the sins of others in accordance with the justice of a judge.⁶²

Lonergan then recalls two teachings of Trent. First, our Lord Jesus Christ merited justification for us by his most holy passion and cross, and made atonement (*satisfecit*) to God the father on our behalf (DB 799; DS 1529; ND 1932).⁶³ Second, as we suffer something in making atonement for sin we become like Christ who atoned for our sins

⁵⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *208 [*Supplement*, 88].

⁶⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *209-210 [*Supplement*, 88-89].

⁶¹ "Articulus XXXI. De analogia sacramentali," *DBM*, *211-214 [*Supplement*, 89-91].

⁶² Lonergan, *DBM*, *211 [*Supplement*, 89].

⁶³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *211 [*Supplement*, 89].

(DB 904; DS 1689; ND 1630).⁶⁴ Based on these teachings, Lonergan concludes that Christ's satisfaction is to be understood by way of analogy to the sacrament of penance.

Theological tradition⁶⁵ and sacramental theology⁶⁶ support this conclusion.

Lonergan also appeals to the argument he developed previously that Christ's satisfaction was not a matter of juridical justice, but the justice of the cross. Satisfaction understood from an analogy from jurisprudence must be rejected.⁶⁷ Also, a theory which understands Christ's physical sufferings as "*un élément de fait*," "*un trait secondaire et superficiel*" expound a theory contributing little to understanding the vicarious suffering of Christ.⁶⁸ Lonergan ends the article noting that the satisfaction given by Christ and the satisfaction given by penitents is not a univocal predication but an analogous predication.⁶⁹ Christ offered satisfaction not for his own sins, but for the sins of others, and not according to the justice of a judge but according to the justice of the cross. A penitent however atones for his or her own sins which by a judicial act of absolution fully remits the guilt but not as to the punishment due. Christ never had a sinful past life needing renewal, nor the guilt associated with sins, nor the punishment due to sins which would have required retributive chastisement.

⁶⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *211 [*Supplement*, 89].

⁶⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *211 [*Supplement*, 89]. Lonergan notes that before Anselm, the Church was using the word "satisfaction" in reference to the satisfaction made by penitents. Lonergan's source is P. Galtier, "Satisfaction," *DTC* 14, pp. 1129 ff.

⁶⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *211-212 [*Supplement*, 90]. Lonergan notes that we obtain the benefits of Christ's passion in so far as we are patterned after it. This is why Aquinas judged that it is necessary for those who commit sin after baptism to be fashioned in the likeness of Christ through experiencing in themselves some penalty or suffering, even though thanks to the satisfaction offered by Christ this suffering is less than condign. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 49, a. 3, 2um.

⁶⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *213 [*Supplement*, 90].

⁶⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *213 [*Supplement*, 90]. Lonergan does not directly name Rivière but the quote is directly taken from Rivière's article on redemption in *DTC*. *DTC* 13, p. 1972.

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *213-214 [*Supplement*, 90-91].

6.2.7 Article 32: The Sorrows of Christ⁷⁰

In this article Lonergan explains that although satisfaction consists in an external act in such a way that one person can make satisfaction on behalf of another, the external act springs from an interior source or principle.⁷¹ In the case of Christ, the interior source or principle was the sorrow Christ had for our sins. Lonergan grounds this judgment on the authority of Aquinas and also on theological reasoning.

Regarding the authority of Aquinas, Lonergan notes four points. First, the cause of Christ's interior pain or sorrow was the sins of the whole human race.⁷² Second, Aquinas, drawing on Augustine, states that there is a type of sadness that is praiseworthy when it stems from a holy love. This sadness can be of help towards atoning for sin. Thus Christ in atoning for all sins experienced the most profound sadness though not as much as to go beyond the bounds of reason.⁷³ Third, this sorrow surpassed any sorrow ever felt by a repentant sinner because it proceeded from a greater wisdom and love and because Christ grieved for all sins at once.⁷⁴ Fourth, since Christ wished to free us from sin not only through his power but also in accordance with justice, Christ not only considered the value his pain would have by virtue of his own divine nature but also the value his pain would have by virtue of his humanity towards giving as much satisfaction as was called for by sin.⁷⁵

Lonergan also provides an argument from theological reasoning. He makes five points. First, the Son's will was not different from the Father's will. Therefore it was the

⁷⁰ "Articulus XXXII. De dolore Christi," *DBM*, *215-217 [*Supplement*, 91-92].

⁷¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *215 [*Supplement*, 91]. That one person can satisfy for another, Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 48, a. 2, 1um.

⁷² Lonergan, *DBM*, *215 [*Supplement*, 91]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 46, a. 6 c.

⁷³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *215 [*Supplement*, 91]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 46, a. 6, 2um.

⁷⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *215 [*Supplement*, 91]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 46, a. 6, 4um.

⁷⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *216 [*Supplement*, 91]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 46, a. 6, 6um.

Son's own will to suffer and die for sins. Second, if this was the Son's intention he would not do this without detesting sins, grieving for sins, and resolving to take away sins. Third, Christ certainly detested sins because Christ had the immediate vision of the divine goodness. As such, he had a more profound understanding of sin than any other person could have. Christ also loved the Father with the utmost love and so regarded offenses against the Father with the utmost detestation. Fourth, Christ grieved over sins. The greater one's love for God, the greater one's love for his or her neighbor. Since Christ had the greatest love of God and the greatest love of neighbor, our sins were the cause of the most intense grief for Christ. Christ's great love for the Father, and his love for us who were at enmity with God, is what makes Christ the mediator between God and humanity. The juxtaposition between the good Christ loved and the greatest of evils was the root, source, and cause of Christ's sorrow. Fifth, the more we detest evil and grieve over it, the more firmly we resolve to get rid of it. Christ had the greatest possible detestation of sin and sorrow because of sins, so Christ had the most resolute determination to take away the sins of the world.⁷⁶ In brief, then, the interior source of Christ's satisfaction is his detestation of sin, his sorrow and grief for our sins, and his firm determination to take away sins.⁷⁷

6.2.8 Article 33: The Satisfaction Given by Christ⁷⁸

Lonergan begins by recalling the conclusion of the previous article. Christ had a love for God the Father and for us, and knowledge of the seriousness of sin. As such he

⁷⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *216-217[*Supplement*, 91-92]. On the fourth point Lonergan references *ST*, I-II, q. 35, a. 1.

⁷⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *217 [*Supplement*, 92].

⁷⁸ "Articulus XXXIII. De Satisfactione Christi," *DBM*, *218-224 [*Supplement*, 92-95].

had a detestation for sin and sorrow for our sins together with a firm resolve to take away sin and prevent future sin. This interior source can be referred to as an “interior act” (*actum interiolem*).⁷⁹ Christ could have exercised this act in three ways. First, through his immediate knowledge of God and consequent volition, neither of which depend on sentient operations. Second, through acquired knowledge and “interior sensibility” (*sensibilitatem interiolem*) added to his immediate knowledge of God. This second way presupposes sentient operations. Third, through an expression of the interior act via exterior senses and physical movements. This includes the first two but it makes the interior act a more completely human act.⁸⁰ Since Christ’s satisfaction did indeed involve an outward expression of his inward detestation and sorrow for our sins, this third way is the way Christ actually exercised his interior act.⁸¹ Outward expressions manifest human interior acts into the public realm, and this is fitting since humans are, by nature, political and social beings who need the cooperation and contributions of others. Furthermore, signs are divided principally into denotative and expressive. The former cause others to perceive and understand. The latter add to this understanding an affectivity such that others are moved to will and act accordingly.⁸² Christ’s outward act was the latter.

Having laid down these premises Lonergan comes to four conclusions. First, it was appropriate for our Lord to outwardly express his interior sorrow. The Word assumed a human nature in its totality, and it is fitting that complete human operations

⁷⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *218 [*Supplement*, 92].

⁸⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *218 [*Supplement*, 92-93]. Lonergan had made this point earlier in the *Supplement*, in chapter 3, article 19 (Meritorious Obedience). There he states that a human act is full and complete when it consists not only of the interior acts of knowing and willing, but also of an external act that is bodily and perceptible by the senses. *DBM*, 135 [*Supplement*, 55].

⁸¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *219-220 [*Supplement*, 93].

⁸² Lonergan, *DBM*, *219-220 [*Supplement*, 93]. Lonergan distinguishes between the expression itself and the consequent communication. The expression, *per se*, is fulfilled when the interior act is complemented with those physical movements appropriate to the interior act. But communication only begins when this expression affects another that he or she perceives, feels, knows, and wants what is signified.

are performed not only in the intellectual part of a person, but also through external expression. It is also fitting that Christ should express publicly what he was doing for our benefit and what he desired for our imitation.⁸³ Second, it was appropriate that Christ accept his passion and death to express his interior sorrow, because only a supreme act would be proportionate to his sorrow.⁸⁴ Third, Christ's expression of his interior sorrow is rightly understood as vicarious suffering, and this vicarious suffering and death was not only for the purpose of taking away sin but it was also the result of sin.⁸⁵ Fourth, Christ's vicarious suffering, accepted as an expression of his interior sorrow, is rightly understood as vicarious satisfaction because it fulfills the definition of vicarious satisfaction: a penal work undertaken out of detestation for sin, sorrow for sin, and intent of wiping away sins and guarding against future sins.⁸⁶

6.2.9 Article 34: The Superabundant Satisfaction Given by Christ⁸⁷

In this article Lonergan explains why Christ's satisfaction was superabundant, a common doctrine among theologians.⁸⁸ Christ's satisfaction is not to be measured in terms of sin, but in terms of grace: like other graces the satisfaction given by Christ was superabundant.⁸⁹ Lonergan makes seven points supporting this judgment.

First, the ontological and psychological subject making satisfaction was the Word of God, one of the Persons of the Trinity, and the Lord of Glory. Second, the formal

⁸³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *220-221 [*Supplement*, 94].

⁸⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *221 [*Supplement*, 94].

⁸⁵ Lonergan suggests a causal action of our sins on Christ. The causal action is not physical, but intentional, since Christ died for all sins and future sins can only exert an intentional rather than physical causality on Christ. Lonergan, *DBM*, *222-223 [*Supplement*, 94-95].

⁸⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *223 [*Supplement*, 95].

⁸⁷ "Articulus XXXIV. De satisfactione superabundante," *DBM*, *225-228 [*Supplement*, 95-97].

⁸⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *225 [*Supplement*, 95]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 48, a. 2; q. 46, a. 5, 3um.

⁸⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *225 [*Supplement*, 95]. Lonergan references Romans 5:20: "when sin was abundant, grace was superabundant" [*ubi autem abundavit delictum, superabundavit gratia*].

element of Christ's satisfaction is his interior act flowing from his immediate vision of God and love for the Father. This interior act includes a commensurate detestation of sin, sorrow over sins, and resolve to redeem us from sin. In each is the formality of supernaturality since Christ is a divine person operating in an assumed human nature. Third, since the interior act informs the exterior act, it is through Christ's exterior act that we can apprehend the humility, obedience, and love of a divine person as well as a detestation of sin, sorrow for our sins, and resolve to take away sins. Fourth, all of Christ's acts, interior and exterior, were positively and directly offered to the service and honor of God the Father. Fifth, Christ's satisfaction is far greater than the heinousness of all sins. Sin has a note of infinity since it offends God, but it is nevertheless an act of a creature and an ontological privation. Christ's satisfaction is a positive reality with an infinite quality because of the Father to whom it was offered and from the Son who offered it. Sixth, Christ's satisfaction did not go beyond God's intention, the obedience Christ owed to the Father, or the mode of operation proper to a divine person. Seventh, the satisfaction made by Christ and offered by us are analogical terms, and although satisfaction has been made by the Head there remains satisfaction to be made by the members.⁹⁰

6.3 Lonergan's Understanding of the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction

In April of 1959, Lonergan gave a lecture titled "Method in Catholic Theology."⁹¹

The content of that lecture corresponded very closely to the course *De intellectu et*

⁹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *225-228 [*Supplement*, 95-97].

⁹¹ Delivered to the Society for Theological Studies, Nottingham University. Originally published in *Method: Journal of Lonergan studies* 10:1 (Spring 1992), 3-26. Recently published as "Method in Catholic Theology," *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, 29-53.

methedo Lonergan was teaching in the Gregorian University from February to June 1959.⁹² In the lecture Lonergan discussed five precepts of method in Catholic Theology: (1) Understand, (2) Understand Systematically, (3) Develop Positions, (4) Reverse Counterpositions, (5) Accept the Responsibility of Judgment. All are evident in Lonergan's speculative understanding of Christ's satisfaction. However, his work is perhaps one of the clearest examples in his entire Latin theology of two of these five precepts: develop positions and reverse counterpositions. The precepts of developing positions and reversing counterpositions were previously worked out in *Insight*, then subsequently applied to the field of theology.⁹³

The formulation of theological discoveries can be divided into two classes: positions and counterpositions.⁹⁴ Positions are the result of intelligent inquiry and critical reflection, of what Lonergan calls "intellectual conversion."⁹⁵ Counterpositions are contradictory to positions and rooted in the lack of intellectual conversion. Positions head for development and counterpositions head for reversal. Counterpositions can be coherent with other counterpositions, providing a mask of authenticity, but once the contradiction of the counterposition is revealed the counterposition heads for its own reversal. Since the precepts of developing positions and reversing counterpositions are so clearly apparent in this chapter, my interpretation will identify where Lonergan is either

⁹² See editorial note in Lonergan, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, 29, n. 1.

⁹³ On the basic distinction between philosophical positions and counterpositions, see chapter 14 of *Insight* titled "The Method of Metaphysics," 413-414. In a 1962 lecture that was part of an institute on method, given at Regis College in Toronto, Lonergan explicitly stated that the same method applies to the field of theology. See Bernard Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method 1*, vol. 22 of the *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, eds. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 141.

⁹⁴ Lonergan, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, 37.

⁹⁵ Lonergan, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, 37-38. The later Lonergan, in *Method in Theology*, includes the lack of religious or moral conversion. *Method in Theology*, 249. The meaning of "intellectual conversion" is the appropriation of one's own rational self-consciousness, eliminating the myth that knowing is like looking. It is the self-appropriation in the knower that one's knowledge is a compound of experiencing, understanding (intelligent inquiry), and judging (critical reflection).

developing a position or reversing a counterposition as I consider the major elements in his speculative understanding of Christ's satisfaction.

I will focus on four major elements: (1) The integration of *satisfactio* and *poena*; (2) Christ's *poena* understood in terms of fittingness, not necessity; (3) The intelligible context to interpret the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work; and (4) The analogy to understand Christ's satisfaction.

This is certainly not to suggest that Lonergan's speculative understanding of Christ's satisfaction includes only these four elements. More could always be said in any interpretation, but there is not room to say everything. For reasons of space and relevancy to Lonergan's stated purpose to explain the historical causality of Christ, I have chosen these four.⁹⁶

6.3.1 The Integration of *Satisfactio* and *Poena*

For Lonergan, the Latin word *poena* can hardly be separated from any speculative (systematic) understanding of Christ's redemptive work.⁹⁷ But Anselm's disjunction *aut*

⁹⁶ For example, another element is Lonergan's understanding of *how* Christ's satisfaction is superabundant, and this is a development of Anselm's position. The theorem of the supernatural had not yet been developed in Anselm's time. As such, he conceived superabundancy in terms of supererogation. Christ's giving of his life was meritorious because it was excessive, in other words, essentially an *overpayment*. There is a difficulty with this approach. As Charles Hefling notes, the difficulty with such an argument is that excess implies that what exceeds and what is exceeded share a *common measure*. The implication is that merit before God does not depend on grace, since there is no distinction between the natural and the supernatural. For Lonergan, Christ's satisfaction is superabundant not because it was supererogatory in the Anselmian sense, but because Christ's satisfaction is to be measured in relation to grace, which is a judgment ultimately grounded in the Christological affirmation that Christ is a divine person operating in an assumed human nature. For an interpretation of this development see Hefling, "Lonergan's *Cur Deus Homo*," 148.

⁹⁷ Lonergan understands *poena*, punishment, in the technical sense used in medieval theology. In the order of divine justice, the punishment consequent upon sin is the privation of a good, and the privation of a good is the definition of evil. So Christ's suffering of *poena* is the suffering of evil. In the technical sense one can suffer the evil consequences of sin even though one is not guilty of the sin that gave rise to the consequences. The contemporary meaning of the English word "punishment" does not adequately convey this technical meaning. For example, as Charles Hefling points out, "We do not ordinarily think of all the ills [of societies, nations, world] that are consequent upon basic sin as punishments in quite the same sense

satisfactio aut poena implies that satisfaction and punishment are mutually exclusive.

Does Lonergan consider Anselm's disjunction a counterposition?

In my interpretation the answer is no. We would not have the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction had it not been for Anselm's speculative theory. Lonergan is not outright rejecting Anselm's disjunction. It is a position, but it is incomplete. Lonergan is advancing that position, not in the sense that he is the first to retrieve the notion of *poena*, but in the sense that his chapter demonstrates intelligent inquiry and critical reflection as to why *poena* cannot be separated from Christ's redemptive work. Although Lonergan appeals to the pre-Anselmian and post-Anselmian tradition, I interpret that the ultimate ground of why he judges that *poena* cannot be separated from Christ's redemptive work is based on his previous work in the third chapter of the *Supplement*, where he categorized certain teachings of the New Testament under the heading "Vicarious Suffering" (article 20). For Lonergan, the fact that scripture witnesses to the vicarious suffering of Christ is the authoritative reason why satisfaction and *poena* must be integrated in a speculative understanding of Christ's satisfaction. This is why Lonergan states that even though one could put forth a theory in which satisfaction would not necessarily include the suffering of evil, that theory would contribute little to a speculative understanding given that it is universally acknowledged that Christ, in accordance with God's will, suffered and died for us and for our sins.⁹⁸

as we think of imprisonment as the punishment for tax-evasion." Hefling, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement," 57.

⁹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *194 [*Supplement*, 81].

6.3.2 Christ's *Poena* Understood in terms of Fittingness, not Necessity

That Christ suffered punishment is, for Lonergan, a true judgment. For Lonergan there is a deeper question: if the slightest sufferings of Christ would have sufficed to make satisfaction for us to God the Father, which is a common and certain doctrine, then why did Christ suffer such *great* pain? To ask why is to anticipate an intelligibility. For Lonergan, there must be an intelligibility as to why Christ suffered such great pain. Why must there be an intelligibility? Christ's great pain is the suffering of an evil, and evil has no intrinsic intelligibility. So why is there an expected intelligibility?

To answer this let us start with a conviction Lonergan repeatedly recalls from scripture: the wisdom of God is revealed in Christ crucified. If Christ crucified was simply a matter of divine free choice, without any regard to divine wisdom, then there would be no "why," no "reason" in answer to the question, "Why did Christ suffer such great pain?" For Lonergan, if a contingent truth is not ordained by divine wisdom, then that contingent truth has no "why," no "reason."⁹⁹ Contingent truths simply become arbitrary facts. The fact that Christ suffered great pain is not a necessary truth, but a contingent truth ordained by divine wisdom. Contingent truths ordained by divine wisdom do have an intelligibility, but a non-necessary intelligibility, which is the

⁹⁹ In the Lonergan archives there is a set of notes dating back to the 1940s. In these notes Lonergan explicitly treats the problem of voluntarism. These notes are helpful for us to understand why Lonergan states that voluntarism ignores the significance of intelligibility. In these notes Lonergan states that contingent truth conceived as a product of free choice cannot be an object of scientific knowledge. If a contingent truth is grounded merely in a matter of divine free choice, without any connection to divine wisdom, then that contingent truth is a pure matter of fact, but there is no "why," no "reason" for that pure matter of fact. As such, there is no intelligibility, not even the non-necessary intelligibility that is *convenientiae*. The archival material is 6 pages treating voluntarism and the root of voluntarism, available in pdf file 32300DTE040/A323 at www.bernardlonergan.com. The remarks of Lonergan to which I refer are found on pg. 2.

meaning of *convenientia*.¹⁰⁰ And the reason there must be an intelligibility is grounded in Lonergan's position that in the order of this universe created by God, there is a reason (an intelligibility) *for everything* that exists or happens if it is ordained by divine wisdom.¹⁰¹ Since the wisdom of God is revealed in Christ crucified, there must be a reason, a non-necessary intelligibility as to why Christ suffered such great pain. This is why Lonergan is critical of voluntaristic and hypothetical approaches that try to explain Christ's great pain in terms of necessity. As Lonergan mentions in his notes from the 1940s on the problem of voluntarism, necessity is one thing and intelligibility another.¹⁰² This is why voluntarism, since it denies a link between contingent truth and divine wisdom, answers the question of why Christ suffered such great pain by resorting to what Lonergan calls "a divine decree of acceptance" (*beneplacitum divinae acceptationis*).¹⁰³ In my interpretation what this means is a conception of divine causality in the created order where such causality is linked to divine will without union to divine wisdom.¹⁰⁴ In other words, there is a difference between a "divine decree" and a "divine decree of acceptance." In the former, there is a union of intellect and will in God. In the latter it is

¹⁰⁰ Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 16.

¹⁰¹ In Lonergan's chapter on divine justice he stated that inasmuch as everything that exists or happens is ordained by divine wisdom a reason for its being can be assigned to it. *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 29].

¹⁰² 32300DTE040/A323, p. 3.

¹⁰³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *186 [*Supplement*, 77].

¹⁰⁴ I am borrowing the language of "union" from John H. Wright, S.J. Wright states: "The union of intellect and will in God, this actual conjunction of the intention of the divine will with the divine goodness known as shareable, is sometimes called 'an eternal divine decree,' the infallibly efficacious determination of divine causality to produce a definite effect." Wright also defines a "divine decree" as "the intentional union of the divine will with the divine goodness, inasmuch as God is willing this creature as acting and as ordered to Himself—actual causative knowledge." What Wright means by "shareable" is the divine idea, proceeding from divine wisdom, to order creation to a final cause in which creation "shares" in the very goodness of God. See John H. Wright, S.J., "Divine Knowledge and Human Freedom: The God Who Dialogues," *Theological Studies* 38 (1977), 462, 469.

only a matter of divine will, contrary to Aquinas's doctrine that the knowledge of God is the cause of all things.¹⁰⁵

The hypothetical approach prescind from the actual order of reality and seeks intelligibility in some hypothetical world so as to accord to this intelligibility the status of "necessity." For Lonergan, to seek intelligibility in a hypothetical world is an intrinsic contradiction. We know nothing of other possible worlds other than that these worlds are possible. But the divine will has chosen *this* world conceived by divine wisdom. So the intelligibility we grasp must attend to the present order of reality. This explains why Lonergan states, in his article on the notion of necessity, that later theologians (after Aquinas), rather than seeking understanding of Christ's suffering in terms of fittingness related to the actual order of reality "concocted supersubtle distinctions to show that Christ gave condign satisfaction in accordance with the full rigor of justice."¹⁰⁶ The "full rigor of justice" means retributive justice. But hypothetical concoctions are not based on reality. They fail to grasp *any* intelligibility because the only intelligibility we can grasp is the intelligibility in the actual, present order of reality.¹⁰⁷ Each of these approaches (voluntarism and hypothetical) is a counterposition in terms of methodology. Lonergan reverses the counterposition by arguing intelligently and critically that Christ's great pain is to be understood in terms of fittingness, not necessity.

¹⁰⁵ *ST*, I, q. 14, a. 8. In *ST*, I, q. 19, a. 4.

¹⁰⁶ "...subtilissimas inveniebant distinctiones ut demonstrarent Christum ex condigno et secundum rigorem iustitiae satisfacisse." *DBM*, *186 [*Supplement*, 77].

¹⁰⁷ This can also be understood if one considers Lonergan's cognitional theory, generally known as "critical realism." For Lonergan, as a critical realist, human beings *can* know reality. There is an isomorphism between the knower and the known, and the knower comes to know the known through the cognitional operations of experiencing, understanding, and judging. Stated in a form familiar to students of Lonergan, knowing is not "taking a good look." But since knowledge begins with the operation of experience, then sentient operations are required, and those operations must have corresponding objects. But in a hypothetical world, there are no such corresponding objects. Hence there is no knowledge of a hypothetical world, other than that it is possible. Such knowledge of a hypothetical world would need to be revealed. But we have no such revelation.

6.3.3 The Intelligible Context to Interpret the *Poena* Associated with Christ's Redemptive Work

Once one judges that *poena* can hardly be separated from Christ's redemptive work, and that this *poena* must be understood in terms of fittingness and not necessity, there arises the problem of understanding how this *poena* is intelligibly connected with Christ's redemptive work. This understanding, in and of itself, is not equivalent to an understanding of Christ's satisfaction. Lonergan will not get to that point until he takes up the sacramental analogy. But a starting point is to understand how *poena* fits in the picture. This problem is the same problem that later in *DVI* Lonergan calls the "problem of integration."¹⁰⁸ The problem of integration is clearly present in the *Supplement*, though Lonergan does not use this explicit phrase. The problem of integration involves choosing what in *DVI* Lonergan calls the correct "intelligible context" to interpret Christ's punishment.¹⁰⁹

My understanding of "intelligible context," in using this term to interpret Lonergan, is the meaning associated to a notion Lonergan introduced later in 1962 in a set of lectures on "The Method of Theology" delivered at Regis College in Toronto.¹¹⁰ In those lectures, Lonergan introduced the notion of the "dogmatic-theological context." Lonergan calls the dogmatic-theological context a "remainder concept," meaning all the rest that is relevant to understanding a topic. Therefore, the dogmatic-theological context refers to all of the other remaining factors that must be taken into account if a specific

¹⁰⁸ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 520.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 488.

¹¹⁰ The lectures are available in mp3 audio format at www.bernardlonergan.com, beginning with audio file 30200A0E060. A transcription of the lectures has been recently published in part 1 of *Early Works on Theological Method 1*.

theological conclusion is to be understood correctly.¹¹¹ In the first lecture, Lonergan underscores the importance of the dogmatic-theological context through the general example of heresy. He raises the following question: what is wrong with heretics? His answer is that a heretic may be saying something true from a factual context, yet at the same time the statement may be incompatible with the dogmatic-theological context, thus denying elements which implicitly or explicitly pertain to that context.¹¹²

Lonergan's judgment that the Latin word *poena* can hardly be separated from Christ's redemptive work is a theological conclusion grounded in the teaching of the New Testament. That theological conclusion, in order to be understood correctly, needs a proper intelligible context, what Lonergan later called a dogmatic-theological context.¹¹³ The intelligible context needs to account for remaining factors essential to properly interpreting the meaning of the *poena* associated with Christ's' redemptive work. What are the factors involved?

Let us begin with a statement Lonergan makes in *DVI* and then relate this to the *Supplement*. In Thesis 16 of *DVI*, on Christ's Satisfaction, Lonergan states that satisfaction, regarded formally, is the vicarious suffering and death of Christ understood

¹¹¹ See specifically audio file 30200A0E060 / CD/ mp3 302. Lonergan's notion of the dogmatic-theological context is certainly consistent with one of his tenets of what Catholic systematic theology involves, as defined by the First Vatican Council. Reason illuminated by faith, when it inquires diligently, reverently, and soberly, can reach with God's help an imperfect but extremely fruitful understanding of the mysteries of faith both from the analogy of what it [reason] naturally knows and from *the interconnection of the mysteries with one another and with man's last end* (DB 1796). A dogmatic-theological context is necessary if a mystery is to be understood through the interconnection of the mysteries with one another and with our last end.

¹¹² 30200A0E060 / CD/ mp3 302. Lonergan is speaking as a Catholic, primarily to Catholics. So he is referring to the dogmatic-theological context of the Catholic tradition.

¹¹³ Though Lonergan does not explicitly refer to an "intelligible context" in the *Supplement*, it is clear that his consideration of various disjunctions (for example, "either the justice of the cross or the justice of a judge") is in fact a consideration of various intelligible contexts. The proper intelligible context will include "all the rests" relevant to understanding a particular topic. The methodology is operative in the *Supplement*, though not adverted to explicitly.

according to some interpretation, some intelligible context. He identifies three elements in the intelligible context:

Now such an interpretation or intelligible context is a systematic theology, nothing else, and theology is not made systematic by fits and starts. The theology of sin and punishment is involved; likewise the theology of God's justice; and finally the theology of redemption should not be left out.¹¹⁴

The three elements identified in *DVI* are thus (1) the theology of sin and punishment, (2) the theology of God's justice, and (3) the theology of redemption. In the *Supplement*, Lonergan's methodology in arguing that the "justice of the cross" is the correct context in which to interpret the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work includes consideration of all three of these elements.

The first element, the theology of sin and punishment, is found in Lonergan's argument that there are distinctions that must be made in the relationship between sin and punishment. Here he follows Aquinas in identifying three types of punishment related to sin: simple, medicinal, and satisfactory. Christ was without fault, and he neither took on nor incurred fault. But he did voluntarily take on *poena*. Since Christ's *poena* was voluntarily taken on, and not imputed to him, then this *poena* cannot be interpreted as simple punishment. Medicinal punishment can also be ruled out. Christ neither sinned nor could sin. To speak of medicinal punishment for one who never sinned and cannot sin makes no sense. Therefore we are left with satisfactory punishment. In my interpretation, this whole discussion on the types of punishment is essentially Lonergan's integration of the theology of sin and punishment into the intelligible context.

The second element, the theology of God's justice, is found in Lonergan's argument that the following are compatible: (1) Christ made satisfaction by suffering, (2)

¹¹⁴ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 488

God directly willed Christ's satisfaction, and (3) God did *not* directly will Christ's passion. The first is a true judgment based on ecclesial doctrine. The second is a true judgment based on revelation.¹¹⁵ The third is a true judgment based on Lonergan's theological principle of divine justice. Anything directly willed by God must be a good. The passion represents the *poena* suffered by Christ, and since *poena* is an evil, it cannot be directly willed by God. What God directly wills must be a good, not evil. In short, the judgments are compatible due to Lonergan's understanding of divine justice.

The third element, the theology of redemption, is found in Lonergan's argument that in the suffering and death of Christ we can discern the meaning, mystery, law, and justice of the cross. In other words, Lonergan is introducing into the intelligible context the theology of redemption developed in the previous chapter. As we noted in that chapter, when the meaning of the cross is generalized with respect to the entire economy of salvation, we have the "law of the cross," what later in *DVI* Lonergan called the "intrinsic intelligibility" of redemption and whose essential meaning is the transformation of evil into a greater good through a victory of the will in self-sacrificing love. There are no less than eight references in article 29 ("The Punishment of Christ") to the "meaning of the cross"¹¹⁶ and/or the "meaning, law, mystery, and justice of the cross."¹¹⁷ The purpose of these references is to convince the reader that the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work is nothing other than the evil presupposed, voluntarily taken on,

¹¹⁵ Lonergan knows that scripture does not use the word "satisfaction," but scripture is clear that God directly willed Christ's saving work through his passion and death, and for Lonergan "satisfaction" is simply a concept employed in a speculative effort to understand how Christ's suffering and death are salvific. Logically then, God directly willed Christ's satisfaction.

¹¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *197 (3x), *199 [*Supplement*, 83 (3x) 84].

¹¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *196, *198, *199, *202 [*Supplement*, 83, 84 (2x), 85].

and transformed into a greater good through the law of the cross. What Lonergan is doing here is bringing into the intelligible context the theology of redemption.

Through a consideration of these three elements, Lonergan judges that that proper intelligible context to interpret the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work is the "justice of the cross." The meaning and law of the cross are grounded in divine wisdom. Understood in the context of divine justice, the meaning and law of the cross becomes the "justice of the cross." This intelligible context also aids our understanding of how Christ's redemptive work is related to sinners. Lonergan states that Christ's satisfaction merits the remission (*remissionem; remissio; auferenda*) of all sins and punishment alike.¹¹⁸ But the remission of sins is the definition of *pardon*. In the *Supplement*, Lonergan does not explicitly state that the remission of sins is the definition of pardon, but the notion of pardon is without doubt part of the intelligible context Lonergan is calling the "justice of the cross" given Lonergan's emphasis that Christ's satisfaction merits the remission of all sins and punishment alike. In *DVI*, Lonergan does explicitly state that the definition of pardon (*venia*) is the remission of an offense,¹¹⁹ and explains the intelligible context for interpreting Christ's vicarious suffering and death is "pardon being sought and granted, detestation and sorrow regarding the offense, remission of fault and punishment alike."¹²⁰ Therefore the "justice of the cross" means that the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work is to be understood as suffering and death

¹¹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *183 (3x) [*Supplement*, 76 (3x)]. Lonergan does note the distinction that through the sacrament of baptism, there is the remission of all sins and punishment alike, while in the sacrament of penance there is the remission of all sins but not punishment, though the latter is mitigated. Lonergan, *DBM*, *204 [*Supplement*, 86].

¹¹⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 507.

¹²⁰ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 490.

willingly taken on in the context of pardon sought and granted for the remission of both the guilt and punishment of sinners.

Lonergan's intelligent inquiry and critical reflection into the intelligible context in which to interpret the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work represents a development of the position Lonergan has already established: that satisfaction and *poena* must be integrated. The development is a response to the new question that arises once the position is established that Anselm's disjunction cannot be maintained. But Lonergan's intelligent inquiry and critical reflection into the intelligible context is not simply the development of a position. It also includes reversal of a counterposition.

The counterposition is the judgment that the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work is to be interpreted in the context of the "justice of a judge." This is an intelligible context taken from the world of jurisprudence, meaning retributive justice. Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the counterposition is the image of the Father suggested by the counterposition. The image is that of a vindictive Father who demands retributive justice for the sins of the human race, even if this means inflicting suffering and death on an innocent person. For Lonergan, such an image of the Father does an injustice to the image of the Father revealed by scripture.

Lonergan's reversal of the counterposition is found principally in article 30, "The Transference of Punishment to Christ." The title reflects what Lonergan considers the ground of the counterposition. The counterposition is only coherent if the one punished is in some way guilty of the sins committed. But Christ was without sin. So the way the counterposition gets around this problem is the judgment that our guilt, our liability for punishment, has been "transferred" (our "imputed") to Christ. Without a notion of this

transference, the counterposition does not have the cloak of coherence. Without a cloak of coherence, the counterposition would not survive.

In that article, Lonergan sets up his argument to reverse the counterposition by coming to what he states is the operative disjunction in the *actual order of reality*: either the justice of the cross or the justice of a judge. Lonergan's reference to the actual order of reality reveals his fidelity to a theological method that in *Insight* he describes as "the sobriety of Aquinas," referring to Aquinas's concern to come to knowledge of the actual world conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness, not a concern with hypothetical worlds.¹²¹ In the previous section we spoke of Lonergan's focus on the actual order of reality. Lonergan emphasized this in the Boston College Lectures on Mathematical Logic and Existentialism, as we noted in his chapter on divine justice. He emphasized this again in the 1958 Halifax lectures on *Insight*, where he stated the following in response to a question during an evening Q&A session:

With Scotus, unless you are asking about possible worlds, you are not doing science, because Scotus was concerned with necessary propositions that would be true in any possible world, and consequently, his discussions become scientific insofar as he is talking about any possible world. But you have an entirely different slant in Thomas. What Thomas is doing is seeking the intelligibility of *this world*, trying to see the wisdom of the divine plan and counsel in *this world* – just as the empirical scientist is not concerned with what the law of gravity *might* be, but with what de facto that intelligible law is in this world.¹²²

What Lonergan is implying in the *Supplement* is the following: if we attend to the actual order of reality conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine will, then there are two and only two possible *intelligible* contexts in the actual order of reality to interpret the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work. The reason why there are only two intelligible contexts goes back to Lonergan's understanding of divine justice.

¹²¹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 702.

¹²² Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 383 [emphases original].

Divine wisdom has conceived a world order in which human works can be reduced to one of two categories: good or evil. Logically then there are four possible relationships between good and evil, four suborders if you will within the one order of divine justice: (1) good follows good, (2) evil follows evil, (3) evil follows good, and (4) good follows evil. The first two suborders represent retributive justice, but the very first is not relevant here because Lonergan's purpose is to interpret the *poena* associated with Christ's redemptive work. The second suborder represents retributive justice, what Lonergan calls the "justice of a judge." The third suborder represents God's allowing of sin, and the evil consequences of sin, because it is good that there exist rational creatures that are truly free. The fourth suborder is restoration, natural or supernatural. Supernatural restoration is redemption in the proper theological sense. In this context, the "justice of the cross" is the third suborder linked to the fourth suborder (supernatural, not natural restoration).

All of the other three disjunctions fail in one way or another to harmonize with the actual order of reality. The original Anselmian disjunction "either satisfaction or punishment" cannot be maintained since the pre-Anselmian tradition, in their reading of scripture, always maintained that Christ suffered punishment. That Christ suffered and died implies that Christ suffered punishment. This is a fact of history. Facts of history are part of the actual order of reality. This rules out the first disjunction. The second disjunction, "either punishment undergone by Christ or punishment undergone by sinners," lacks precision. In the actual order of reality there are different types of punishment. This disjunction invites misinterpretation of Christ's punishment in the actual order of reality, hence Lonergan's desire to transpose this into the categories of

justice. So this rules out the second disjunction. The third disjunction, “either punitive expiation or punishment,” suggests that the suffering of evil itself is directly willed by God, contradicting Lonergan’s theological principle of divine justice.¹²³ God never directly wills evil, so the disjunction contradicts the actual order of reality conceived by divine wisdom. This rules out the third disjunction.

The problem of the counterposition is not a failure to recognize the contingent truth of Christ’s vicarious suffering, but choosing the wrong intelligible context to interpret this truth. If the context is wrong, an incorrect understanding is sure to follow. Each of Lonergan’s five arguments against the counterposition, in its own way, reverses the counterposition by exposing the counterposition’s lack of coherence with the Catholic dogmatic-theological context. Consider a specific example. In article 30, on “The Transference of Punishment to Christ,” we reviewed Lonergan’s five arguments. In the fourth argument he states that those who see in the passion and death of Christ the justice of a judge, and not the justice of the cross, do an injustice to God the Father, to Christ himself, and to Christ’s example and precept. My focus here is on injustice to the Father:

Furthermore, according to this opinion [the counterposition], even though Christ himself repudiated the law of retaliation and preached the wisdom of the cross, God the Father would seem to have ignored this wisdom and followed that discredited law instead.¹²⁴

The counterposition suggests that the Father does not follow His own precept spoken through the Son. Why would Lonergan point out this contradiction? First, notice that there is a presupposition here that Christ’s spoken precept is the *Father’s* wisdom.

¹²³ This is why Lonergan agrees with Rivière that Christ’s sufferings in themselves cannot be the direct object of the divine will. The problem with the theory of punitive expiation is not that it fails to account for the fact of Christ’s punishment, but it integrates that fact into an intelligible context that is inconsistent with the actual order of reality conceived by divine wisdom.

¹²⁴ “Ulterius, secundum hanc opinionem, quamvis Christus repudiarit legem talionis et praedicarit sapientiam crucis, Deus Pater hanc sapientiam ignorasse videtur et illam legem esse secutus.” *DBM*, *206 [*Supplement*, 87].

What is the basis of this presupposition? It is Lonergan's Catholic dogmatic-theological context, specifically the relationship between two mysteries: the mystery of the Trinity and the mystery of the Incarnation. In Lonergan's understanding of the immanent Trinitarian relations, the Word does not speak: the Word is spoken by the Father.¹²⁵ And the Son is sent to the world by the Father, not to teach his own doctrine (the Son's), but that of the Father.¹²⁶ It is a counterposition, a contradiction with Lonergan's dogmatic-theological context, to suggest that the Father ignores the wisdom of Christ's example and precept, since that very example and precept is to be interpreted as the Father's doctrine spoken through the Son. This is the cardinal point. Lonergan makes the same point in Thesis 12 of *DVI*, titled "The Knowledge of Christ:"

The reason why Christ ought to be believed in is that no discontinuity is acknowledged between God the Father and the words that Jesus the man speaks. 'For he whom God has sent utters the words of God' (Jn 3:34).¹²⁷

In exposing the counterposition's implication that the Father is unjust, Lonergan is freeing the meaning of Christ's satisfaction from what Charles Hefling terms extrinsic legalism and questionable morality.¹²⁸ Consider the following statement from *DVI*.

What Lonergan states there reflects accurately his thought in the *Supplement*:

To put it very briefly, then, those who say it was under God's retributive justice that God the Son was flogged and crucified and died are assuming one of two things: *either* (1) that the Son had fault or took on fault, or *else* (2) that God's retributive justice proceeds on the sole basis that wrongdoing exists, leaving out any consideration of fault, original or actual or taken on, in the one who is punished. The first assumption is not catholic. The second is either immoral or amoral. Hence it is not easy to see how the conclusion differs from blasphemy.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 353, 369, 473; Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 64.

¹²⁶ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 451; Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 64.

¹²⁷ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 385. There he also states that it is contradictory to the intention of the evangelists to understand the intimate continuity between the Father and the Son in terms of the ontological, the moral, and the religious, *but to the exclusion of knowledge*. Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 386 [emphasis mine].

¹²⁸ Hefling, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement," 72.

¹²⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 534 [emphases original].

Given Lonergan's desire to counter conclusions which are immoral or amoral, one might ask why Lonergan sticks to the language of *poena* in the first place, since this language would seem to invite the very misinterpretations he abhors, such as the theories of penal substitution and satisfaction. We need to remember that Lonergan, as he later stated in *Method*, understood himself to be a Roman Catholic with "quite conservative views on religious and church doctrines."¹³⁰ His conservative orientation is evident in the *Supplement*. He accepts the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction and he sticks to the traditional language of "punishment." On the other hand he is trying to redeem the interpretation of that language from aberrations.¹³¹

For Lonergan, these aberrations are not the product of intelligent inquiry and critical reflection (judgment), but the product of a symbolic apprehension where images and feelings predominate. When feelings predominate, the speculative theologian may arrive at an interpretation of Christ's *poena* faithful to the theologian's own psychic experience but not faithful to the Catholic dogmatic-theological context. In *DVI*, he states that a conception of the Lord's suffering and death in terms of substitution and satisfaction is, in itself, a symbolic apprehension and nothing else.¹³² In my interpretation, the symbolic apprehension is the root of the "fictions" Lonergan mentions in his fourth argument in article 30, where he criticizes those who try to "explain realities by means of fictions" (*realissima per fictiones explicare*).¹³³ The symbolic apprehension in and of itself is not the problem. Every person and every culture cannot escape the

¹³⁰ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 332.

¹³¹ Associating the language of "punishment" to Christ's redemptive work may be repugnant to the sensibilities of some contemporary readers. The purpose of this dissertation is not to make a judgment whether Lonergan should stick to such language, but to understand his use of such language.

¹³² Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 535.

¹³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *207 [*Supplement*, 88].

reality of symbolic apprehension. It may surprise some readers that in *DVI* Lonergan even states that this symbolic apprehension which sometimes conceives Christ's physical sufferings in terms of substitution or satisfaction can be praiseworthy if it produces fruit in the concrete context of Catholic life.¹³⁴ The problem *is to confuse symbolic apprehension as theory*. For Lonergan, the notions of penal substitution and satisfaction are not counterpositions at the level of symbolic apprehension. They become counterpositions when these notions are passed off as theory.

6.3.4 The Analogy to Understand Christ's Satisfaction

The Council of Trent compared Christ's satisfaction to the satisfaction a penitent makes in the sacrament of penance. But Trent did not develop this analogy. Lonergan adopts and develops this analogy. In doing so Lonergan is developing a position.

To develop the sacramental analogy Lonergan makes a distinction between the interior and exterior acts of Christ's satisfaction, analogous to the distinction between contrition and penance (satisfaction) in the sacrament. Satisfaction given by a penitent stems from contrition as exterior act stems from interior act.

Lonergan understands Christ's interior act as Christ's detestation of sin, his sorrow and grief for our sins, and his firm determination to take away sin. Lonergan gives most attention to the sorrows of Christ and uses the authority of Aquinas to defend his position that Christ grieved for the sins of all people. But Lonergan also defends his position through theological reasoning. And this theological reasoning is very much dependent on positions Lonergan developed prior to the *Supplement* regarding the ontological and psychological constitution of Christ. The principal site of that

¹³⁴ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 536

development is found in *De constitutione Christi ontologica et psychologica*, now published in English as *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*.¹³⁵

Chalcedon's definition that Christ is one person operating in two natures, divine and human, is an ontological explanation of the Incarnation. But for Lonergan, correlative to the ontological constitution of Christ is the psychological constitution of Christ. Just as Christ is one subject, ontologically of two natures, Christ is also one subject, psychologically of two consciousnesses, one divine and one human.¹³⁶

In *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, Lonergan makes the following assertion with respect to the *human* consciousness of Christ: "Christ as man, through his human consciousness and his beatific knowledge, clearly understands, and with certainty judges, himself to be the natural Son of God and true God."¹³⁷ The statement applies to Christ *as man*, that is, prescinding from the divine nature.¹³⁸ But Christ as man also acquired knowledge through the operations of experiencing, understanding, and judging, like any other human being. Therefore Christ *as man* had two types of knowledge. In *DVI* Lonergan introduced two terms for these two types:

Living on this earth, Christ had human knowledge both *effable* and *ineffable*, besides his divine knowledge. As a beholder, he immediately knew God by that ineffable knowledge which is also called beatific, and in the same act, though mediately, he also knew everything else that pertained to his work. As a pilgrim, however, he elicited by effable knowledge those natural and supernatural cognitional acts which constituted his human and historical life.¹³⁹

¹³⁵ Bernard Lonergan, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, vol. 7 of the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, eds. Michael G. Shields, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, trans. Michael G. Shields (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002). *De constitutione Christi* was originally published in 1956 *ad usum auditorium*.

¹³⁶ Lonergan, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 7. See also "The Dehellenization of Dogma," *Second Collection*, 25.

¹³⁷ Lonergan, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 205.

¹³⁸ Lonergan, *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 205.

¹³⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 332 [emphasis mine]. The statement is found in Thesis 12 titled "Christ's Knowledge."

In *DVI* Lonergan states that effable knowledge can, in itself, be manifested in a human way. Ineffable knowledge on the other hand cannot *in itself* be manifested in a human way.¹⁴⁰ Ineffable or beatific knowledge is not mediated by anything sensible. Knowledge that was never mediated in the first place is not capable of being expressed, because expression is itself a mediation through the sensible.¹⁴¹ If this were all that we could say on the matter, we would seem to find ourselves in a contradiction. Christian theology affirms that Christ is the definitive source of revelation. As Charles Hefling notes, “revelation is the passage, as it were, from hiddenness to communicability.”¹⁴² Therefore revelation implies that Christ’s ineffable knowledge *is* communicated, but it cannot be communicated directly. How is it then communicated? It is communicated through effable knowledge. Christ needed effable knowledge to reveal, manifest, and communicate his ineffable knowledge in an incarnate way.¹⁴³ This does not mean that Christ needed effable knowledge to detest sin, grieve over our sins, and know that his work involved taking away our sins.¹⁴⁴ In the *Supplement* Lonergan clearly links Christ’s detestation, sorrow, and resolve to his immediate knowledge of God. This judgment is also supported by the passage quoted above, where Lonergan notes that

¹⁴⁰ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 334.

¹⁴¹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 334. See also Charles Hefling, “Revelation and/as Insight,” *The Importance of Insight: Essays in Honor of Michael Vertin*, eds. John J. Liptay Jr. and David S. Liptay (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 107.

¹⁴² Hefling, “Revelation and/as Insight,” 102.

¹⁴³ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 335.

¹⁴⁴ One might assume that Christ *as man*, who has ineffable knowledge through the beatific vision, would be immune to sorrow. Not true. As Lonergan notes in the *Supplement*, Christ’s immediate vision of God is an immediate vision of divine goodness, but that immediate vision of divine goodness also means that Christ had a more profound understanding of sin than anyone else in history. When this profound understanding of sin is juxtaposed with the great love for God and neighbor that Christ also had through his immediate knowledge of God, one can understand why our sins were the cause of the most intense grief for Christ. In brief then, Christ’s ineffable knowledge did not prevent experiencing sorrow. In fact it did the opposite. *DBM*, *216 [*Supplement*, 92]. Lonergan also noted as such in *DVI*, Thesis 12 (Christ’s Knowledge), when he stated that “this opposition and contrariety, so far from taking away suffering, itself makes for suffering instead, since suffering consists in contrariety.” Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 340.

Christ's ineffable knowledge not only includes beatific knowledge, but also knowledge of *everything else pertaining to his work*. But Christ did need to learn, over time, *how* to express what he knew, how to express his interior act. For Lonergan, Christ's voluntary acceptance of his suffering and death represents this expression, analogous to how in the sacrament of penance one does penance to concretely express one's contrition.

Even though Lonergan does not explicitly use the words ineffable and effable knowledge in the *Supplement*, these notions are implicit.¹⁴⁵ How so? Recall that for Lonergan, Christ could have exercised this interior act in three ways: (1) through his immediate knowledge of God and consequent volition, neither of which depend upon sentient operations; (2) through acquired knowledge and "interior sensibility" (*sensibilitatem interiorem*) added to his immediate knowledge of God, both of which *do* depend on sentient operations; or (3) through an expression of the interior act via exterior senses and physical movements. This third way includes the first two but makes the interior act a more completely human act.¹⁴⁶

In my interpretation, the first way corresponds to "ineffable" knowledge. Ineffable knowledge is beatific knowledge, and such knowledge does not depend on any sensitive operations. This meaning is implicit in the first way. The second way corresponds to "effable" knowledge since it refers to acquired knowledge dependent upon sentient operations. The third way corresponds to Christ's outward expression of

¹⁴⁵ The language Lonergan uses in the *Supplement* appears to be somewhat of a middle ground, a transition if you will from the developments he made prior to the *Supplement* in *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ* and the technical terminology of "ineffable" and "effable" knowledge introduced subsequent to the *Supplement* in *DVI*. In my interpretation, common sense would conclude that had Lonergan written the *Supplement* after *DVI*, he would have retained the technical terminology we find in *DVI*. I believe this is further evidence confirming our working hypothesis that the *Supplement* was completed, at least in draft form, prior to *DVI*.

¹⁴⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *218 [*Supplement*, 92-93].

his effable knowledge because the expression depends on exterior senses and physical movements.

There is further evidence in the *Supplement* that what Lonergan means is what he later meant using the terminology of ineffable and effable knowledge. This is found in his explanation of why it was appropriate for our Lord to accept his passion and death as an outward expression of his interior sorrow:

The more deeply one plumbs the depths of the human spirit, the more difficult it is to find nouns and verbs and other commonly used signs to give correct and adequate expression to one's interior mind and heart. And if this is true of ordinary men it is all the more so in the case of Christ, when we touch upon his love for the Father and for us, his detestation of sin, his sorrow for our sins, and his intention of redeeming us. So immense and so excellent were these realities that they could not even be intimated, let alone fully expressed, except by some supreme act.¹⁴⁷

I interpret realities that “could not even be intimated” to Christ’s ineffable knowledge. I interpret “some supreme act” to Christ’s voluntary acceptance of his suffering and death. That supreme act is Christ’s effable knowledge given concrete, outward, and proportionate expression.

Next we will consider Lonergan’s understanding of Christ’s exterior act. Again, Christ’s exterior act stands to his interior act as penance stands to contrition:

Thus, just as the satisfaction given by a penitent stems from contrition which is defined as “interior sorrow and detestation for sin together with the intention of not sinning in the future” (DB 897), so in a similar way Christ's satisfaction stemmed from his detestation of sin, his sorrow and grief for our sins, and his firm determination to take away sin.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ “Quo enim magis ad profundiora humani spiritus acceditur, eo minus apta fiunt nomina verbaque et caetera usitata et communia signa ad veram adaequatamque interioris mentis expressionem. Quod si in aliis hominibus verificatur, multo magis ibi agnoscendum est, ubi agitur de dilectione Christi hominis erga Patrem suum et erga nos, de eius detestatione peccatorum, de eius dolore pro nostris peccatis, de eius proposito nos redimendi. Quae quidem omnia tanta et talia erant ut, nisi per supremum quod facere potest homo, vel innui, multo minus exprimi, non poterant.” *DBM*, *221-222 [*Supplement*, 94].

¹⁴⁸ “Quae cum ita sint, sicut satisfactio paenitentis ex contritione procedit quae ‘animi dolor ac detestatio est de peccato cum proposito non peccandi de caetero’ (DB 897), ita secundum similitudinem quamdam satisfactio Christi ex detestatione peccati, ex dolore de nostris peccatis, ex proposito denique firmissimo peccata auferendi processit.” *DBM*, *217 [*Supplement*, 92]. Cf. DS 1676, ND 1622.

What Lonergan means here is that satisfaction is not *just* a feeling, not *just* the state of one's interior mind and heart. Satisfaction involves a concrete act that flows from one's interior mind and heart. As act, satisfaction gives concrete expression to contrition. For Lonergan, the exterior act is not to be confused as the interior source or principle of Christ's satisfaction. But Christ's satisfaction would not be satisfaction in the proper sense without this concrete expression.

Lonergan's understanding of the exterior act is also what Charles Hefling calls an expression of meaning and value incarnately conveyed.¹⁴⁹ Hefling is referring to what the later Lonergan termed "incarnate meaning."¹⁵⁰ "Incarnate meaning" is one of many different carriers of meaning (others being linguistic, intersubjective, symbolic, and artistic). It is the meaning of a person, of his way of life, of his words, or of his deeds.¹⁵¹ In Lonergan's notes for an institute given in 1964 at Georgetown University, there is an explicit correlation of Christ's passion to incarnate meaning.¹⁵² The meaning and value Christ incarnately conveyed flowed from his immediate knowledge of God, his great love of God, and his great love of neighbor. The greater one's love of God the greater is one's love of neighbor.¹⁵³ So the entire context in which to understand Christ's exterior act is meaningless unless we understand the intensity of Christ's interpersonal relationships with both God the Father and with humanity. This is why we should interpret Lonergan's understanding of Christ's satisfaction along the lines of interpersonal relations rather than

¹⁴⁹ Hefling, "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement," 71.

¹⁵⁰ Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method 1*, 380; Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 73

¹⁵¹ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 73

¹⁵² Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method 1*, 380.

¹⁵³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *216 [*Supplement*, 92].

commercial transactions. This notion of understanding Christ's satisfaction along the lines of interpersonal relations is explicit in *DVI*, yet clearly implicit in the *Supplement*.¹⁵⁴

6.4 The Function of the Chapter in the Wider Context of the *Supplement*

In the *Supplement*, why does Lonergan develop a speculative understanding of the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction? In *DVI* his justification for adding a separate thesis on Christ's satisfaction was the fact that in his opinion Catholic thought on Aquinas's five ways was so deeply settled that there was no need for further elaboration than what he had already presented in Thesis 15. But then he stated that when it comes to satisfaction, opinions differ, and accordingly he presents a separate thesis.¹⁵⁵ Although one could argue that in this era of Lonergan's career, Catholic theologians gave "pride of place" to the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction,¹⁵⁶ I take Lonergan at his word that in *DVI* his principal reason for including a separate thesis on Christ's satisfaction is grounded in his concern over conflicting interpretations. In my interpretation this is also the case with the *Supplement*. Lonergan is clearly sensitive to the fact that the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction has wildly varying interpretations, some of which he considers blasphemous. It seems reasonable that Lonergan would want to take up the challenge to "redeem" the understanding of Christ's satisfaction.

¹⁵⁴ In *DVI* Lonergan states: "What then is this satisfaction? It is the furthest conceivable opposite of offense against God. It is compensation, as it were, for offense, where compensation is thought of along the lines of interpersonal relationship, not commercial transaction." *De Verbo Incarnato*, 492.

¹⁵⁵ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 484.

¹⁵⁶ Charles Hefling argues that *DVI* in some ways represents Lonergan's rewriting of the textbook by Charles Boyer that Lonergan had used in teaching Christology prior to the use of his own textbook (*DVI*). Hefling goes on to state that like Boyer's, Lonergan's textbook "gives pride of place to 'satisfaction,' the idea that Anselm is famous (or notorious) for introducing into Christian theology." See Hefling, "Lonergan's *Cur Deus Homo*," 152. In my opinion Boyer's textbook does suggest a "pride of place" accorded to Christ's satisfaction in Boyer's section on redemption. The third of four articles in that section is on Christ's satisfaction and this article receives by far the largest treatment, accounting for almost 50% of the section (25 of 52 pages). See Carolus Boyer, S.J., *De Verbo Incarnato*, ad usum auditorum, 2nd edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1952).

Given that Lonergan includes a chapter on Christ's satisfaction, an interpretive question is the following: how does this chapter advance Lonergan's stated purpose to explain the historical causality of Christ? I will begin with a brief consideration of the location of the chapter. I judge that given Lonergan's decision to include a chapter on Christ's satisfaction, he located that chapter in such a way as to also make the chapter relevant to his stated purpose of explaining the historical causality of Christ. I base this interpretation on the location and content of two statements which bracket the present chapter. The first statement concludes the previous chapter:

There is a third step. In no other way does God draw good out of evil than according to the meaning, the law, the mystery, and the justice of the cross. Nor does God himself impose this voluntary transformation of evil into good upon others without himself, "who should be first in every way" (cf. Col 1:18), doing first what he requires of others for the sake of his glory.¹⁵⁷

Prior to this "third step" Lonergan described two other steps in the same article.¹⁵⁸

Lonergan's description of the third step is extremely brief. I interpret the brevity to a judgment that the statement functions as a transition to the next chapter. The second statement is found in the last paragraph of the present chapter:

Seventh, although Christ superabundantly atoned for all the world's sins, it by no means follows that we are relieved of the duty of offering satisfaction for our sins. The satisfaction made by Christ and that offered by us are not univocal, but analogical terms; hence while satisfaction has been made by the Head, there still remains satisfaction to be made by the members. How this is to be understood will be explained later when we come to treat of the effects of the redemption.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ "Cui altero gressui addendus est tertius. Nam non aliter Deus e malis facit bonum quam secundum rationem, legem, mysterium, iustitiam crucis; neque ipse Deus aliis ita hanc voluntariam mali in bonum transmutationem imponit, ut ipse, in omnibus primatum tenens, prius non faciat quod ab aliis in suam gloriam poscat." *DBM*, 179 [*Supplement*, 74].

¹⁵⁸ The first was a consideration of the general principles of divine justice. The second was the application of these principles to the meaning of the cross to arrive at a notion of the "justice of the cross."

¹⁵⁹ "Septimo, quamvis Christus superabundanter pro omnibus totius mundi peccatis satisfecerit, minime sequitur nos non debere pro nostris peccatis satisfacere. Nam satisfactio Christi et satisfactio nostra non univoce sed analogice dicuntur; et ideo peracta satisfactione in Capite, remanet peragenda satisfactio in membris. Quod quidem quemadmodum intelligendum sit, postea declarabitur cum de effectibus redemptionis agatur." *DBM*, *228 [*Supplement*, 97]. Lonergan's reference to the "effects of the redemption" is a reference to the next chapter.

There is a common theme in both statements: the correlation between what God has done first through Christ and what we are asked to do in cooperation with Christ. In the first statement we find the first instance in the *Supplement* where Lonergan introduces the notion that God does not ask us to do what God himself is unwilling to do first. This is consistent with a judgment he makes in the next chapter: we have been justified by Christ but we have not yet wholly appropriated salvation.¹⁶⁰ Redemption is an ongoing historical process involving human cooperation. The second statement takes the same theme and applies it to the concrete example of offering satisfaction. The two statements reveal an intent to make the chapter relevant to Lonergan's stated purpose.

That intent is concretely realized in the next chapter. As we will see, Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ derives in part from his understanding of the Body of Christ, Head and members. Lonergan will use the example of satisfaction as a "work" that is shared by the Head and the members, though it is done first by the Head. To avoid a Pelagian interpretation he will state that Christ's satisfaction is an *efficient cause* of both our willing to make satisfaction and our act of making satisfaction.¹⁶¹ In addition to the "work" of satisfaction, he will discuss our cooperation with Christ in terms of sacrifice, meritorious obedience, and intercessory prayer. In summary, Lonergan uses the category of satisfaction to explain the historical causality of Christ, but not to carry the full weight of that explanation.

¹⁶⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *230 [*Supplement*, 97].

¹⁶¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *259 [*Supplement*, 110].

6.5 Summary

For Lonergan, the passion of Christ, *qua* satisfaction, is the outward expression of an interior act where that interior act is Christ's detestation for sin, sorrow because of our sins, and resolute determination to take away the sins of the world. Lonergan has retrieved the pre-Anselmian tradition that Christ did indeed suffer punishment, but understands that *poena* as an outward expression of an interior act, of what grieved Christ. As such, Lonergan grounds his understanding of Christ's satisfaction in the realm of interiority, that is, in Christ's conscious intentionality and meaning flowing from his love for the Father and his love for sinners. In other words, Lonergan understands Christ's satisfaction in terms of interpersonal relationships, not commercial transactions.

Lonergan also reverses the counterposition which interprets Christ's satisfaction in the context of retributive justice. As an orthodox theologian, Lonergan accepts the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction and the traditional language of *poena*. But it is clear he is motivated to redeem the meaning of that doctrine, and language, from disturbing aberrations, some which he is not hesitant to label blasphemous. I find his interpretation both orthodox and yet reasonable to modern sensibilities regarding the violence of the cross, even though the language of "punishment" may be repugnant to contemporary readers. We have to remember that Lonergan was writing in the late 1950s. If he were writing today, perhaps he would avoid such language given his understanding of Christ's satisfaction. Or perhaps he would not. But I do believe that Lonergan's speculative understanding of the *poena* associated with the satisfaction Christ offered to God the Father on our behalf is a brilliant achievement and example of his commitment to the Leonine injunction *vetera novis augere et perficere*.

Chapter 7: The Work of Christ in History¹

7.1 Introduction

Lonergan's final chapter explicitly addresses the historical causality of Christ. The chapter has no title in the Latin typescript. Our interpretation will recall material from previous chapters since each of those chapters contributes, in the *ordo doctrinae*, to Lonergan's explicit treatment of the historical causality of Christ. The chapter includes articles 35-45: (35) The Work of Christ, (36) Agents Acting Through Intellect, (37) The Social Agent, (38) The Historical Agent, (39) Christ the Agent, (40) Christ the Exemplar, (41) Christ the Head, (42) Christ the Historical Agent, (43) The Mediator in Heaven, (44) The Purpose of the Incarnation, and (45) Why the God-man?

7.2 A Brief Description of Articles 35 – 45

7.2.1 Article 35: The Work of Christ²

Lonergan begins the article recalling a Lucan conception of redemption:

The redemption hoped for and waited for by devout Jews (Lk 2:38, 24:21) was a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for the glory of his people (Lk 2:32), because the blessed Lord God of Israel in his tender mercy and in accordance with his covenant and his oath to Abraham visited and redeemed his people, so that, delivered from the hands of their enemies, they might without fear serve God in holiness and justice in his presence all their days (Lk 1:68-78).³

¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *229-294 [*Supplement*, 97-125]. This title reflects that of the author, not Lonergan. Lonergan did not provide a chapter title for articles 35-45.

² "Articulus XXXV. De Opere Christi," *DBM*, *229-235 [*Supplement*, 97-100].

³ "Quam pii Iudaei sperabant exspectabantque redemptionem (Lc 2, 38; 24, 21), lumen erat ad revelationem gentium et gloria plebis suae (Lc 2, 32), cum benedictus Dominus Deus Israel per viscera misericordiae suae secundum testamentum suum et iusiurandum Abrahae factum visitaret redemptionemque faceret plebis suae ut, de manu inimicorum liberati, sine timore Deo servirent in sanctitate et iustitia coram ipso omnibus diebus suis (Lc 2, 68-78)." *DBM*, *229 [*Supplement*, 97].

He then makes a distinction between the means and the end of redemption.

Payment of the price, sacrifice, meritorious obedience, and vicarious suffering refer only to redemption as a means (*medium*) or, better yet, as a principle (*principium*).⁴ In terms of end, he makes two points. First, there is redemption already achieved through the remission of sins, the gratuitous justification by God's grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Second, there is the redemption still hoped for: namely, the heavenly prize, the beatific vision, and ultimately the second coming of the Lord and redemption of our bodies.⁵ Therefore, since the redemption is ongoing, Lonergan argues that a further study of the work of the Lord is necessary:

If, therefore, we consider the word redemption itself, or if we reflect that in neglecting the end we have a poor knowledge of the means, and that ignoring the effect we have a poor knowledge of its cause, we must now undertake a broader and fuller survey of the work of the Lord.⁶

The broader and fuller survey is left for subsequent articles. The aim of the present article is to provide a foundation for that survey. This foundation amounts to a biblical synthesis of the end or purpose correlative to the work of the Lord:

...(1) the kingdom of God and (2) salvation in Christ, whereby being freed from (3) sins and (4) the Jewish Law and worship, we have access to (5) God who is faithful and just (6) with confidence, since (7) through our personal acts (8) we are incorporated into Christ and the People of God.⁷

Lonergan describes each of these aspects through extensive references to scripture. First, from a New Testament perspective, Christ's purpose is first and foremost the kingdom of God. Arriving in this kingdom is what salvation means. Before arriving

⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *229 [*Supplement*, 97].

⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *229-230 [*Supplement*, 97].

⁶ "Sive ergo ipsam vocem redemptionis respicimus, sive ratiocinamur parum cognosci vel medium neglecto fine vel causam praetermisso effectu, et latius et plenius iam oportet opus Domini considerari." *DBM*, *230 [*Supplement*, 97-98].

⁷ "...(1) regnum Dei (2) salutemque in Christo positam, unde (3) a peccatis et (4) a lege cultuque iudaico liberati, (5) ad Deum fidelem iustumque (6) cum fiducia accessum habemus, si quidem (7) per actus personales (8) Christo populoque Dei incorporamur." *DBM*, *230 [*Supplement*, 98].

in this kingdom, we are sinners, enemies of God. Through this kingdom, we are liberated from sin, from the power of darkness, and from the body itself.⁸ Second, God is both faithful and just. The blessing promised to Abraham is to be realized. There is now also the promised Holy Spirit and the future promise of the *parousia*, eternal life, participation in the divine nature, a new heaven and earth. God is also the justifier of the one who has faith in Christ. Justified by faith, we are both at peace with God and can approach God with confidence. Finally, through Christ, we become adopted children of God and receive the Holy Spirit as a pledge of our inheritance. We are not enrolled in Christ without personal repentance and faith. Once enrolled, we are one body in Christ and ought to love one another as Christ has loved us. This Body of Christ is the Church.⁹

7.2.2 Article 36: Agents Acting Through Intellect¹⁰

A cause is whatever influences another in its existence. An effect is whatever depends upon another in its existence. As cause and effect are correlative, so are influence and dependence:

Such influence or dependence is not perceptible but intelligible. Therefore one who has a picture of oxen huffing and puffing as they strain at pulling a plow does not know what causal influence is; but one who makes a true affirmation that there is an intelligible relation of dependence in the plow as moved does know this influence in its true reality.¹¹

Furthermore, one must not confuse the intelligible with the necessary. Non-necessary causality is no less true, real causality. The reality of causality is based on

⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *231-233 [*Supplement*, 98-99]. Lonergan adds that the Jewish Law, though good in itself, was unable to liberate those enslaved to sin. The Law gave knowledge of sin but it was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin. Only through the blood of Christ are we freed of sin that we may then serve the living God.

⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *233-235 [*Supplement*, 99-100].

¹⁰ “Articulus XXXVI. De Agente per Intellectum,” *DBM*, *236-239 [*Supplement*, 100-101].

¹¹ “Qui influxus vel dependentia non sensibilis est sed intelligibilis. Quare influxum causalem nescit qui boves aratrum trahentes imaginatur nitentes atque anhelantes; et eundem influxum cognoscit verum et realem qui in aratro moto intelligibilem dependentiae relationem vere affirmat.” *DBM*, *236 [*Supplement*, 100].

intelligibility, not necessity. An example is human cooperation. Mutual understanding and agreement is the foundation of this cooperation. In fact, cooperation is virtually the whole of what is human causality. It is causality because mutual understanding is intelligible and mutual agreement is reasonable. However, it is not necessary causality.¹²

Lonergan then distinguishes three kinds of causality: (1) an intrinsic cause influences that *by reason of which (ut quo)* something is what it is, (2) a final cause influences *for the sake of which (ut cuius gratia)* it is, and (3) an agent cause is that *by which (ut a quo)* a thing is produced.¹³

The remainder of the article focuses on the agent cause. Agents are subdivided into agents acting through nature and agents acting through intellect. The agent acting through nature (1) acts in accordance with either an innate or naturally acquired form, (2) is at the mercy of nature to fulfill any requisite conditions for the cause to produce the effect, (3) is limited to producing effects proportionate to its form, and (4) can only influence objects in spatiotemporal proximity. The agent acting through intellect (1) acts in accordance with an intentional form (*formam intentionalem*) to produce an effect, (2) can understand requisite conditions and thus has the potential to fulfill those conditions, (3) is limited only to the extent it lacks a perfect intellect, and (4) can influence other agents beyond its own spatiotemporal proximity if it understands the conditions for extending its influence and sees to their fulfillment. Causal influence extended through others is real causality predicated of the originating agent since there remains an intelligible relation of dependence in the created effect on the originating agent.¹⁴

¹² Lonergan, *DBM*, *236 [*Supplement*, 100].

¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *237 [*Supplement*, 100].

¹⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *237-238 [*Supplement*, 100-101].

7.2.3 Article 37: The Social Agent¹⁵

Virtually everything we produce is produced through and for others.¹⁶ We are proportionate causes inasmuch as have in our minds the idea to produce an effect. We are actual causes when we have the power to actually produce the effect. Actual causes are more commonly found in persons linked together than in a single individual.¹⁷

Therefore, effective human agency is based primarily on social agency. Social agency is based on common understanding of the situation, common willingness to fulfill requisite conditions, and common assistance in actually fulfilling those conditions. The effect of social agency is preservation, improvement, or worsening of the external and/or cultural levels of an existing human good of order.¹⁸

Since a social agent is comprised of many persons linked together with common understanding and agreement about a possible course of action, this common understanding and agreement precedes any effects produced by the social agent. For Lonergan, this common understanding and agreement is *already* a human good of order. By implication, a social agent is always working from an existing human good of order. This means that a social agent is *de facto* a historical agent. It also means that even though social agency freely determines the future, this agency depends very greatly on the past.¹⁹

¹⁵ “Articulus XXXVII. De Agente Sociali,” *DBM*, *240-243 [*Supplement*, 101-103].

¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *240 [*Supplement*, 101].

¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *241-242 [*Supplement*, 102].

¹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *242 [*Supplement*, 102].

¹⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *243 [*Supplement*, 103].

7.2.4 Article 38: The Historical Agent²⁰

A historical agent is one who causally influences the external or cultural level of a human good of order.²¹ A historical agent is (1) more or less historical, depending on the duration of the effect; (2) partial or total, depending on whether the effect is part or whole of the good of order; (3) an agent *per se* or *per accidens*, depending on whether the effect occurs according to or beyond the agent's intention; (4) a proportionate or actual cause, depending on whether the agent conceives an idea or also implements it; (5) an originating or conservative cause, depending on whether the agent is the first to conceive and implement an idea or only safeguards implementation; (6) a restorative or destructive cause, depending on whether the effect improves or worsens the good of order.²²

The absolute first historical agent is God. God infallibly orders, chooses, and affects the divine plan. God does not impose necessity upon things, but conditioned necessity. Conditioned necessity does not take away freedom. This plan of divine wisdom governs the course of events through secondary causes and in accordance with their natures (cf. Articles 10-11). This implies a role for human beings in the divine plan:

What divine wisdom has ordered and divine goodness has chosen comes into existence through human beings who understand, judge, and agree. Since, then, God is the principal agent, man is only an instrumental agent; but because man is an instrument that acts through intellect, he is called ministerial.²³

Among originating agents, some are more historical because they have a more lasting influence on future action. The greatest historical agent is the Incarnate Word.²⁴

²⁰ “Articulus XXXVIII. De Agente Historico,” *DBM*, *244-248 [*Supplement*, 103-105].

²¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *244 [*Supplement*, 103].

²² Lonergan, *DBM*, *244 [*Supplement*, 103].

²³ “Quod ergo ordinat divina sapientia eligitque divina bonitas, hoc per homines intelligentes, iudicantes, consentientes fit. Quia ergo Deus agens principale est, homo non est nisi instrumentale; quia autem homo instrumentum est quod per intellectum agit, ministeriale dicitur.” *DBM*, *246 [*Supplement*, 104].

²⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *248 [*Supplement*, 105].

7.2.5 Article 39: Christ the Agent²⁵

Christ acts as both God and man. As God, he does what the Father and the Spirit do. As man, he acted during his earthly life and continues to do so from heaven.²⁶

He who acts in two different ways has two principles of action, divine and human, so that as God he acts in one way and as man in another. As God he does some things that he does not do as man, since man has not created a man. Other things he does both as God and as man, in such a way that there are two operations ordered to each other, but one effect produced.²⁷

These two operations are ordered to each other through divine command and human obedience. To command is to move another through reason and will. To obey is to be moved in accordance with the reason and will of another. God commands inasmuch as in his goodness he chooses what his wisdom ordains. Christ as man obeys inasmuch as he knows the actual order of reality in the secondary object of his beatific vision and wills this same order to be carried out. Christ's obedience is true and genuine obedience. The divine command was simultaneous with Christ's obedience, though prior to that obedience in nature, causality, and precept.²⁸

Lonergan then refutes possible objections. Among these objections is the notion that the divine command imposed necessity on Christ's obedience. Lonergan counters that God's knowledge and wisdom impose only conditioned necessity. However, conditioned necessity does not eliminate freedom. As such, Christ's knowledge had

²⁵ "Articulus XXXIX. De Christo Agente," *DBM*, *249-253 [*Supplement*, 105-107].

²⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *249 [*Supplement*, 105].

²⁷ "Dupliciter ergo agentis duplex est agendi principium, divinum et humanum, ut aliter ut Deus agat et aliter ut homo. Et aliqua facit ut Deus quae ut homo non fecit, si quidem homo hominem non creavit. Alia autem facit tum ut Deus tum ut homo, ut duae sint operationes inter se ordinatae sed unus sit effectus productus." *DBM*, *249 [*Supplement*, 105].

²⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *249-251 [*Supplement*, 105-106]. On the nature of command and obedience, Lonergan references *ST*, II-II, q.104, a. 1 c. On the nature of Christ's obedience, Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 47, a. 2, 1m.

through his beatific vision did not force his will. In fact, his impeccable will was *already* willing to obey whatever specification Christ obtained through his beatific knowledge.²⁹

Finally, since Christ freely obeyed, he was a ministerial instrument for carrying out the ordinations of God's wisdom and the decision of God's will. Because Christ was an agent acting through intellect, he acted by commanding and exercised his influence through others (for example, the ministers of the sacraments).³⁰

7.2.6 Article 40: Christ the Exemplar³¹

An exemplar can be understood in two ways: (1) as what an agent looks at when operating through intellect; or (2) as belonging to a dispensation, an ordering of reality, such that the exemplar is to be imitated by others in the same dispensation. In the first way, Christ is an exemplar when we look to him to imitate him. In the second way, Christ has wrought our salvation by way of an exemplar.³²

Lonergan's focus is on understanding this second way, through (1) the principle of the dispensation itself, (2) the determination of this principle as realized in Christ, and (3) the application of this determination as realized in us.³³

The principle of the dispensation itself comes from God's ordination and decision that what is done in Christ ought to be done in others. The determination of this principle is derived from Christ's life. The principle, as realized in Christ, is grounded on his knowledge of all actual reality.³⁴ Christ knew this principle, accepted this principle, and

²⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *252 [*Supplement*, 106-107]. Lonergan references *ST*, II-II, q. 171, a. 6, 3m.

³⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *253 [*Supplement*, 107].

³¹ "Articulus XL. De Christo Exemplari," *DBM*, *254-257 [*Supplement*, 107-109].

³² Lonergan, *DBM*, *254 [*Supplement*, 107]. Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 56, a. 1, 3m; q. 49, a. 2, 2m.

³³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *254 [*Supplement*, 107].

³⁴ Lonergan references *ST*, III, q. 10, a. 2.

understood its consequences. In accordance with this principle, it was impossible for Christ to determine anything in regards to himself without determining the same with regard to us. This principle governed all Christ's activity such that he might be a fitting exemplar for all.³⁵

The application of this determination as realized in us is grounded on divine intention and is confirmed by example. For example, we are loved with a similar love in which the Father loves the Son. The Father's love for the Son is proceeding Love itself, the Holy Spirit. According to the principle of exemplarity, this same love has us as its term: we receive sanctifying grace, are made adopted children of God, and have dwelling within us the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit.³⁶ Likewise, the ontological constitution of Christ is an exemplar. Christ operates according to the pattern of a divine person operating in a lower nature. We operate in a similar manner: we receive sanctifying grace, the infused virtues, gifts and movements of the Spirit. Finally, we are called to imitate Christ; in particular, to complete what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ.³⁷

Lonergan concludes by affirming that Christ's exemplary causality is true causality:

...there are two kinds of causality: one that is merely apparent, as in the case of the oxen pulling a plow, in which causality is known only inasmuch as the effort of the oxen is imagined; then there is the other causality that is real and true, which is known in those same oxen inasmuch as the movement of the plow is understood and affirmed to be dependent upon them. Now in Christ there is no such merely apparent causality, but only this real and true causality that is grasped by those who are intelligent and truly affirmed by those who are rational.³⁸

³⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *254-255 [*Supplement*, 107-108].

³⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *255-256 [*Supplement*, 108].

³⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *257 [*Supplement*, 108-109].

³⁸ "...duplicem esse causalitatem: aliam mere apparentem, quae v. g. in bobus aratrum trahentibus eatenus cognoscitur quatenus ipsum bovum nisum imaginamur; aliam autem veram et realem, quae in iisdem bobus cognoscitur quatenus motus aratri a bobus dependere et intelligitur et vere affirmatur. Iam vero in Christo exemplari illa causalitas mere apparens non habetur, sed haec vera et realis et ab intelligentibus perspicitur et a rationalibus vere affirmatur. Et hoc ad nostrum propositum sufficit prorsus." *DBM*, *257 [*Supplement*, 109].

7.2.7 Article 41: Christ the Head³⁹

The members of the Body of Christ are members of one another. The principal member is Christ the head, and what is done in Christ is now done in and for the whole body.⁴⁰ This causal aspect proper to the head is not to be confused with efficient or exemplary causality. Lonergan uses Christ's satisfaction to make the point:

Because Christ has made satisfaction for sins, he is an exemplar of what ought to occur in his members. Besides, Christ's satisfaction itself is in different ways an efficient cause of our willing to make satisfaction and of our act of making satisfaction. And there is nothing to prevent us from attributing this exemplarity and efficient causality to Christ the head, so long as we do not exclude that third aspect that is *proper* to the head alone, namely, that through Christ's satisfaction we have already made satisfaction.⁴¹

Though Christ as head exercises causality proper to the head, and though this work is done in and for the whole body, this fact does not exclude work on our part.⁴²

Lonergan makes several points to obviate misunderstandings of this causality proper to the head. First, the union between head and body must not be exaggerated as to turn it into a substantial union. Second, Christ's work on our behalf does not exclude work on our part. Third, we must rule out an exaggerated distinction that would repeat Pelagianism or deny the redemption as means, that is, denying what is sometimes called objective redemption (*redemptio obiectiva*) since objective redemption refers to the work of Christ done *for the sake of* the members. Fourth, we must reject rationalism that tries

³⁹ "Articulus XLI. De Christo Capite," *DBM*, *258-266 [*Supplement*, 109-113].

⁴⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *258 [*Supplement*, 109].

⁴¹ "Quia ergo Christus pro peccatis satisfecit, exemplar est eius quod in membris ideo fieri oportet. Praeterea, ipsa Christi satisfactio diversis modis est causa efficiens ut ipsi satisfacere velimus et actu satisfaciamus. Neque quidquam prohibet quominus etiam haec exemplaritas et efficientia Christo capiti attribuantur, modo non excludatur tertium quod proprium capitis rationem dicit, nempe, per ipsam Christi satisfactionem nos iam satisfecisse." *DBM*, *259 [*Supplement*, 110].

⁴² Though Christ made satisfaction for the body, penitents ought to make satisfaction for themselves (DB 904, 905, 922, 924; DS 1689, 1692, 1712, 1714 ; ND 1630, 1633, 1652, 1654). Though Christ merited for us, we also should merit (DB 809, 843; DS 1545, 1583 ; ND 1946, 1983). Though Christ offered sacrifice once and for all, the sacrifice of the Mass is truly expiatory (DB 940, 950; DS 1743, 1753; ND 1548, 1557). And though Christ lives forever to make intercession on our behalf, we also ought to pray. Lonergan, *DBM*, *260 [*Supplement*, 110].

to prove the causality of Christ as head through necessary reasons or by the light of reason alone. Fifth, we must also reject semi-rationalism that argues that if we presuppose the fact that the mystery of redemption has been revealed by God we can then produce proofs. Sixth, God could have forgiven all sins without Christ's vicarious satisfaction. Seventh, Christ's death was not simply a matter of God's will since God's will follows God's wisdom as the norm of divine justice.⁴³

Now divine wisdom ordains that necessary effects result from necessary causes and contingent effects from contingent causes. The causality proper to the head is contingent causality. Therefore, the causality proper to the head cannot be understood according to necessary reasons, but only according to reasons of fittingness:

This being the case, we do not follow those theologians who are entirely preoccupied with deducing necessary conclusions from an hypothesis of condign satisfaction or any other hypothesis; rather we subscribe to the method of St. Thomas who looked at the concrete work of Christ and put down as many reasons for it as he could, whether reasons of necessity or of appropriateness. This method can be easily seen both in a lengthy series of articles and in a single outstanding article.⁴⁴

Having treated doctrinal and methodological errors, Lonergan turns to understanding the causality proper to the head. He offers six elements. First, as the members of a body work not for themselves alone but for the whole body, Christ made satisfaction not for himself but for us, did not merit primarily for himself but for us, did not offer sacrifice for himself but for us, and lives forever interceding not for himself but for us. Second, these actions are vicarious because the head and members are unified by love. Third, as individuals achieve objectives through cooperation, it is in keeping with

⁴³ *DBM*, *260-263 [*Supplement*, 110-112].

⁴⁴ "Quae cum ita sint, non eos sequimur theologos qui toti occupantur ut ex hypothesi condignae satisfactionis vel alia hypothesi qualibet conclusiones necessarias deducant, sed methodum amplectimur S. Thomae qui concretum opus Christi consideravit et quotquot in eo inveniuntur rationes sive necessitatis sive convenientiae quantum potuit enumeravit. Quam methodum facile perspicis tum in longiore articulorum serie tum in uno solo articulo eoque eximio." *DBM*, *263 [*Supplement*, 112]. The series of articles is *ST*, III, qq. 46-56. The outstanding article is *ST*, III, q. 1, a. 2.

human nature that individuals attain salvation through others. Fourth, as we are often involved in sin by reason of the sins of others, it is appropriate we are restored through the good offices of another. Fifth, since through one person sin and death entered the world, it is appropriate that through one person grace and justification is offered. Finally, just as in the realm of the secular we go to the person most skilled in what we need, the same is appropriate in the realm of the sacred. Among all people there is no one who can more appropriately bring us back to God than the Word-made-flesh. It is appropriate therefore that Christ be the one to acquire the merit of obedience for us, to make satisfaction for our sins, and to offer for us an expiatory sacrifice.⁴⁵

7.2.8 Article 42: Christ the Historical Agent⁴⁶

In this article Lonergan explains the causality related to Christ as historical person. Christ influenced history while he was alive and continues to do so to the end of time. Christ's agency, as a historical person, is in the category of efficient causality. Through this agency Christ brings members into the body so as to apply to them his merit, the freedom resulting from satisfaction for sin, the fruits of his sacrifice, and the benefit of his intercession. Through this agency, Christ also perfects those members by enabling similar operations of merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, and intercession.⁴⁷

Lonergan distinguishes three aspects of Christ's agency as a historical person: (1) the effect of the agency as a whole, (2) the effect directly intended by Christ, and (3) the effect indirectly intended by Christ.

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *265-266 [*Supplement*, 112-113]. On the effectiveness of vicarious action, Lonergan references *ST*, I-II, q. 28, a. 1; q. 109, a. 4, 2m.

⁴⁶ "Articulus XLII. De Christo Agente Historico," *DBM*, *267-275 [*Supplement*, 113-117].

⁴⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *267 [*Supplement*, 113].

The effect as a whole is the total human good of order, past, present, and future.⁴⁸

This effect is part of the order of the universe produced by God as prime agent according to divine wisdom and justice. There is, however, a distinction between the historical order of justice and the personal order of justice (cf. articles 11-12). The distinction is the basis for a related distinction between what Christ directly and indirectly intends:

Accordingly, the total historical effect, considered in itself, is good inasmuch as it is ordered to the future life in heaven; and therefore one who directly intends to effect this right ordering, by that very fact indirectly intends the advancement of the total historical effect...

Christ's action is directly aimed at ordering human life on earth to the future life in heaven. Since, however, this ordering liberates man from evils and turns him towards true good with the result that the human good of order in itself is greatly improved, this improvement itself is necessarily intended indirectly by Christ as an historical agent.⁴⁹

Lonergan then explains the qualities of Christ's historical agency. Christ is the *most* historical agent since his intended effect perdures to the end of the world. Christ is a *total* historical agent not because he directly controls the total human good, but rather because he directly influences it in principle. Christ is an historical agent *per se* because he knows all actual reality and produces a total historical effect commensurate with that knowledge. Nothing produced by Christ is beyond his intention. Finally, Christ is a *restorative* historical agent. He directly intends restoration of the image of God.⁵⁰

The article ends with a consideration of the means Christ uses as historical agent. First, all social or historical action presupposes an existing good of order. In the case of Christ, this is the lengthy preparation of the Jewish people, their expectation of a

⁴⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *267 [*Supplement*, 114].

⁴⁹ "Quapropter, totus effectus historicus secundum se eatenus est bonus quatenus in vitam futuram atque caelestem ordinatur; et ideo qui directe intendit hanc rectam ordinationem efficere, eo ipso indirecte intendit totius effectus historici profectum..."

Directe enim actio Christi eo tendit ut vita humana et terrestris in vitam futuram atque caelestem ordinetur. Cum tamen ipsa haec ordinatio ita hominem e malis liberet eumque in verum bonum convertat ut ipsum humanum ordinis bonum secundum se maxime proficiat, ipse hic profectus indirecte a Christo agente historico intendatur necesse est." *DBM*, *268 [*Supplement*, 114].

⁵⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *270-271 [*Supplement*, 115].

Messiah, the cultural achievement of the Gentiles, and their recognition of human impotence.⁵¹ Second, all social or historical action is achieved through others who understand and agree. Thus Christ's kingdom is propagated through others, specifically through preaching of the gospel, through faith, and through repentance. The preaching of the gospel itself is another example of social and historical action since the gospel is preached through the apostolic mission, succession, and tradition.⁵² Third, Christ acts specifically through his members.⁵³ Fourth, Christ acts socially and historically through his members not as isolated individuals, but as one body.⁵⁴ Fifth, although Christ's actions are mediated socially and historically, his actions are nevertheless personal: adapted to how human persons actually communicate. As such, his words and deeds make perceptible to us the Word of God.⁵⁵ Sixth, Christ's actions mediated through his body extend not only to instructing our minds and drawing our hearts to Christ but also to bringing about and deepening the interior renewal of the person through the grace of the sacraments. The sacraments trace their origin to Christ and confer grace *ex opere operato* (DB 844, 851; DS 1601, 1608; ND 1311, 1318).⁵⁶ Finally, there is a distinction between Christ's human power *qua* human, and this human power as an instrument of his divinity. Christ's human power *qua* human works contingently and produces contingent

⁵¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *271 [*Supplement*, 115].

⁵² "Quod in actione Christi perspicuum est cuius regnum propagatur per evangelium, per fidem, per paenitentiam; quod evangelium non praedicatur nisi missione, successione, traditione apostolica; quae fides non habetur nisi ex auditu; quae paenitentia per baptismum Christi in remissionem peccatorum et donum Spiritus sancti fructificat." *DBM*, *271-272 [*Supplement*, 115-116].

⁵³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *272 [*Supplement*, 115].

⁵⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *273 [*Supplement*, 116].

⁵⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *273-274 [*Supplement*, 116].

⁵⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *274 [*Supplement*, 117].

effects. However, as an instrument of divinity, this human power effects what God infallibly knows, effectively wills to be done, and irresistibly causes to be done.⁵⁷

7.2.9 Article 43: The Mediator in Heaven⁵⁸

Christ's agency as a historical person is agency as efficient causality. So is Christ's agency now performed from heaven seated at the right hand of the Father. The purpose of the article is to explain this second aspect of Christ's efficient causality.

Lonergan begins by citing a number of scriptural passages to categorize the nature of the ongoing work of Christ now originating from heaven. First, Christ is the one mediator between God and humanity (1 Tim 2:5), the mediator of a new and better covenant (Heb 8:6, 9:15, 12:24). Second, having risen, Christ lives on interceding on our behalf (Heb 7:25; Rom 8:34; 1 Jn 2:7). Third, Christ maintains his priesthood forever (Heb 7:24). He offered one sacrifice for all sins, and by this single offering perfected for all time those who are sanctified (Heb 10:12, 14). He entered into heaven, where he now shows himself in the presence of God on our behalf (Heb 9:24) as the Lamb that was slain (Rev 5:6-12, 13:8).⁵⁹ In brief, then, Lonergan frames this ongoing work of Christ in terms of mediation, intercession, and everlasting sacrifice.

This celestial mediation, intercession, and everlasting sacrifice finds its true image (cf. Heb 10:1), not merely its shadow, in the Eucharist.⁶⁰ Through participation in the Eucharistic mystery the members of Christ's body draw near to God with confidence.

⁵⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *275 [*Supplement*, 117].

⁵⁸ "Articulus XLIII. De Mediatore Caelesti," *DBM*, *276-279 [*Supplement*, 117-119].

⁵⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *276 [*Supplement*, 117].

⁶⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *276 [*Supplement*, 117].

Lonergan explains that this drawing near expresses in a spatial metaphor what scripture refers to as reconciliation. Reconciliation is the mission of Christ through whom all are reconciled to God and to one another. This work of reconciliation comes from the Father through the Son and is accomplished in the Holy Spirit.⁶¹ Lonergan ends the article by further elaborating on the meaning of reconciliation:

The entire work of Christ is summed up in this reconciliation. Just as the human good of order refers to the steady stream of particular goods, coordinated operations, and interior habits and external institutions as all being closely knit together and vivified in a concrete synthesis through interpersonal relationships, so also is the kingdom of God, the Church, Christ's body and *pleroma*. For this kingdom, this body, is a supernatural good of order in which are found the particular goods of grace and glory, the operations by which we do everything in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (Col 3:17), the infused virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit, and all the institutions of the Church. All of this is held together through interpersonal relationships, since to be in this body and a member of this kingdom is nothing other than what St. Paul so often calls being "in Christ" or "in the Spirit."⁶²

7.2.10 Article 44: The Purpose of the Incarnation⁶³

The purpose of the incarnation is to redeem the human race. In the Nicene Creed the Son is said to become incarnate for us and for our salvation. Since Christ is the head of the Church and is said to have first place in everything (Col 1:18), Lonergan asks whether this contradicts "for us and for our salvation." In other words, is Christ ordered to us or are we ordered to him? Lonergan's answer is based on the principle that what is

⁶¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *277-278 [*Supplement*, 118].

⁶² "Qua reconciliatione comprehenditur totum Christi opus. Sicut enim bonum ordinis humanum ita bonorum particularium profluvium dicitur et operationes coordinatas et habitus interiores exterioraque instituta, ut tamen haec omnia relationibus interpersonalibus concreta quadam synthesis et colligantur et vivificantur, ita etiam regnum Dei, seu ecclesia, seu corpus pleromae Christi. Hoc enim regnum, hoc corpus, supernaturale quoddam ordinis bonum est, in quo inveniuntur et bona particularia gratiae et gloriae, et operationes quibus omnia facimus in nomine Domini Iesu Christi (Col 3, 17), et virtutes infusae donaque Spiritus sancti et institutiones omnes ecclesiae; quod tamen totum relationibus interpersonalibus continetur, si quidem huic corpori inesse hocque regnum participare nihil est aliud quam quod saepissime nominat S. Paulus in Christo esse et in Spiritu." *DBM*, *278-279 [*Supplement*, 118-119].

⁶³ "Articulus XLIV. De Fine Incarnationis," *DBM*, *280-284 [*Supplement*, 119-121].

said to belong to another is for the other. Since we belong to Christ, we are ordered to him as our end, not the other way around.⁶⁴

Loneragan then explains how one can understand this judgment. He begins with a distinction between a means and an end. A means is a relative good. If the means shares in or communicates the very goodness of the end then it qualifies as a secondary end. If it does not, it is merely a means and is relinquished once the end is produced. If a means is also a secondary end, it is loved for its own sake out of superabundant love for the primary end. Furthermore, a secondary end can consist of many related parts. If so, one who wills a secondary end also wills its parts and its ordering.⁶⁵

The primary end of redemption is the divine goodness itself. The secondary end includes all created things in their ordering to one another as conceived by divine wisdom. Christ loves this secondary end out of superabundant love for the primary end. This secondary end goes by more than one name:

Again, this secondary end is also called the external glory of God, or the order of the universe, which is the most excellent thing in creation and shares more perfectly in the divine goodness and more perfectly reflects it than any other creature whatsoever.

Besides, according to sacred Scripture this same secondary end is the Body of Christ, head and members, as all things in heaven and on earth are brought together and reconciled in him (Eph 1:10; Col 1:20).⁶⁶

Since Christ loves the secondary end out of superabundant love for the primary end, he not only loves both head and members as parts of his body, but also wills them duly ordered such that the members are subordinate to the head.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *280 [*Supplement*, 119].

⁶⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *280-281 [*Supplement*, 119].

⁶⁶ "Praeterea, hic finis secundarius etiam dicitur gloria Dei externa, vel ordo universi qui est optimum in rebus creatis et perfectius participat divinam bonitatem et repraesentat eam quam alia quaelibet creatura. Praeterea, idem finis secundarius secundum sacra eloquia est corpus Christi, caput et membra, secundum quod in Christo omnia instaurantur atque reconciliantur sive quae in terris sive quae in caelis sunt in ipso (Eph 1, 10; Col 1, 20)." *DBM*, *281-282 [*Supplement*, 119-120].

7.2.11 Article 45: Why the God-man?⁶⁸

Loneragan states that to ask “why?” is to ask about a cause.⁶⁹ Causes are intrinsic or extrinsic. Extrinsic causes are both the agent and the end. With regard to Christ, the intrinsic causes are dealt with in his ontological constitution. His extrinsic cause, the agent, is the triune God in God’s external operation.⁷⁰ A final cause is divided into primary and secondary. The primary end is the divine goodness itself. The secondary end is the external glory of God, the order of the universe, and the Body of Christ wherein all things are restored and reconciled in Christ.⁷¹

Loneragan then asks the following question: why was a divine person subsisting in a human nature required to accomplish this end? His answer is that the Son of God became man “...to communicate God’s friendship to his enemies in due order.”⁷² *Friendship* is mutual benevolent love in the sharing of some good. *To love* is to will good to someone. *Benevolent* love is to will good to another. *Mutual* benevolent love is had when many will some common good, each to the others. *Divine* friendship is mutual benevolent love with respect to that which is good by its very essence. This friendship is *communicated* to intellectual creatures contingently and in time: first in hope, in possessing the indwelling Holy Spirit as a pledge of their inheritance; then in the beatific vision. Sinners are *enemies* of God since they are tainted by either original or mortal sin.

⁶⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *283 [*Supplement*, 120].

⁶⁸ “Articulus XLV. Cur Deus homo,” *DBM*, *285-294 [*Supplement*, 121-125].

⁶⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *285 [*Supplement*, 121].

⁷⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *285 [*Supplement*, 121].

⁷¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *285 [*Supplement*, 121].

⁷² “...ut amicitia divina inimicis ordinate communicetur.” *DBM*, *285 [*Supplement*, 121].

God's friendship is communicated to these enemies *in due order*, according to the plan conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness.⁷³

He then explains the theological principles he will use to deduce reasons for the God-man: (1) the principle of cause, (2) the principle of continuity, and (3) the principle of the extension of friendship. The principle of cause is that God customarily acts through secondary causes. The principle of continuity is that God customarily acts according to the nature of things and the laws of nature, physical or human. The principle of the extension of friendship is that a friend loves his or her friend's friends, even so far as to love one's enemies for the sake of one's friend.⁷⁴

Lonergan applies these principles to the economy of salvation. He understands this economy as a movement away from evil (the *terminus a quo*) to the state of friendship with God (the *terminus ad quem*). With respect to the *terminus ad quem*, he applies both the principle of cause and the principle of the extension of friendship. Only a divine person is a friend of God according to divine friendship. A divine person, in and of itself, is not a secondary cause. To preserve both principles, it is fitting to have a divine person subsisting in a human nature. One who in his own right enjoys God's friendship, if he is human, also enjoys all the supernatural gifts. This leads to the second reason. Such a person is a proportionate exemplary cause according to which these gifts can be communicated to others.⁷⁵ The third reason is to have an intermediary through which God's enemies, once they are turned into friends, come to have love for God. If they have love for the man who is God then they have love for God himself.⁷⁶

⁷³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *285-286 [*Supplement*, 121].

⁷⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *288 [*Supplement*, 122]. On friendship, Lonergan references *ST*, II-II, q. 23, a. 1, 2m.

⁷⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *289-290 [*Supplement*, 123].

⁷⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *291 [*Supplement*, 123].

Lonergan then turns his attention to *how* the intermediary turns enemies into friends. Unless human psychological and social laws are suspended, contrary to the principle of continuity, humans cannot be turned from evil to good except according to the law of the cross. It is thus appropriate that the God-man prescribe the law of the cross and exemplify the law by performing his proper work according to this same law.⁷⁷

Finally, in accordance with the teaching that no one comes to the Father except through Christ (Jn 6:44), in addition to the God-man's display of love and inducement in others to return this love, he must enable them to actually do so. This requires the supernatural gifts of grace.⁷⁸

Lonergan begins to explain how the God-man produces these supernatural gifts. The God-man is a divine person, and so communicates grace abundantly. Where sin abounded, grace was all the more abundant (Rom 5:20). Lonergan begins to explain why grace is superabundant. His explanation, though likely unfinished, ends the *Supplement*:

But grace is above all superabundant if a divine person brings it about that men work for themselves but also himself works for them, as the head working for the members, a priest working for his people, a shepherd for his sheep, a king for his subjects, a deputy for those whom he represents, a friend for his friends. It is appropriate that it be so, because men ordinarily do not act by themselves but through others, because they fall into sin not only through their own vices but also through those of others, and because, even when elevated and assisted by grace, their actions on their own behalf fall short of perfection.

It is appropriate, therefore, that an intermediary friend should make superabundant satisfaction for sin.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *292 [*Supplement*, 124].

⁷⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *293 [*Supplement*, 125].

⁷⁹ "Sed in primis superabundat gratia, si divina persona non solum facit ut homines pro se faciant sed etiam ipsa pro iis agit, sicut caput pro membris, sacerdos pro populo, pastor pro ovibus, rex pro subditis, vicarius pro repraesentatis, amicus pro amicis. Quod quidem fieri convenit, tum quia homines communiter non per se sed per alios agunt, tum quia in peccata impelluntur non solum suis vitiis sed etiam alienis, tum quia ipsi pro se etiam gratia elevati atque adiuti nisi imperfecte non agunt. Convenit ergo amicum intermedium superabundanter pro peccatis satisfacere." *DBM*, *294 [*Supplement*, 125].

7.3 Lonergan's General Understanding of Historical Causality

Before we interpret Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ, it is appropriate to begin with an interpretation of his general understanding of historical causality itself. We will treat his general understanding of history, then his general understanding of causality. Then we will bring these two together.

7.3.1 History

Throughout his career, Lonergan made the distinction between the history that is written (*Historie*) and the history that is lived and written about (*Geschichte*). He appropriated this distinction from the German Historical School.⁸⁰ In the *Supplement*, his concern is with the latter: the history lived, the world of human affairs. The history lived, from an empirical level, is the totality of human thoughts, words, and deeds. In an early essay he equated this empirical level to the material object of history.⁸¹

Lonergan's understanding of history is not strictly equivalent to the empirical level of history. Just as there is a difference between empirical data as data and empirical data as intelligible, Lonergan anticipates a particular intelligibility in the empirical data of history. His heuristic structure to anticipate this intelligibility is the human good of order.

Let us recall the structure of the human good of order. The human good of order is simply the good of order as it pertains to human affairs. The human good of order is comprised of (1) the cultural good, which is essentially the interior roots of human

⁸⁰ Lonergan, "Analytic Concept of History," *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 11 (1993), 9, original ca. 1937-38; "The Philosophy of History," *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1958-1964*, 54; *Topics in Education*, 76 n. 77, 130; *Method in Theology*, 175; *Early Works on Theological Method I*, 234; "Healing and Creating in History," 100.

⁸¹ Lonergan, "Analytic Concept of History," 9.

activity located in the human intellect and will but understood in its social context; (2) the social good, or what Lonergan calls the “external good of order,” which includes the external institutions and coordinated operations which order particular goods and aim at securing these goods on a continuous basis; and (3) the continuous and secure flow of particular goods.

The cultural level is superior and the most influential level. In culture one finds the intrinsic principle of human development: the desires of the human mind to make and to become all things. At the level of culture one also finds the common meanings and values governing a way of life. The cultural level influences the external good of order, and the external good of order determines the particular goods produced, how they are produced, and how they are obtained. On the other hand, human beings are impotent to heal evils at the cultural level. As cultural good is superior, cultural evil is the most hideous of all evils. Since cultural good is ultimately rooted in interiority, human beings are impotent against such evil through their own powers. This is why Lonergan stated in his first chapter that it is precisely cultural evil that calls for a heaven-sent redeemer.⁸²

No doubt then that for Lonergan, culture is the basic unit in thinking about history. He appropriated this from Christopher Dawson.⁸³ Dawson once remarked that culture is the fundamental social unit upon which all other social phenomena depend.⁸⁴

⁸² Lonergan, *DBM*, 43 [*Supplement*, 18].

⁸³ Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 251-252. Specifically, Lonergan appropriated Dawson’s notion of “regional culture.” Lonergan appropriated this notion before 1959. He had read Dawson in the 1930s. He cites Dawson’s description of a regional culture as an extended area of communication influencing a common way of life. This may be a reference to *The Age of the Gods*, but the editors of the transcription have not found a specific reference in that text. However, in another text, Dawson explicitly argues that anthropologists are coming to recognize the “new concept of Culture,” rather than the state, as the ultimate social unit of history since it is the fundamental social reality on which all the other social phenomena are dependent. Christopher Dawson, *The Dynamics of World History*, ed. John J. Mulloy (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 19-20.

⁸⁴ Dawson, *The Dynamics of World History*, 19-20.

Lonergan's heuristic structure amounts to a structure that anticipates the intelligibility of any culture. As a heuristic structure, it does not specify the particular meanings and values of a culture, what social institutions are in place there, nor the particular goods valued by that culture. Nevertheless, the human good of order, as a heuristic structure, is an intelligible set of terms and relations anticipating the intelligibility of the history that is lived, the world of human affairs, where the basic unit of history is culture. This structure functions as Lonergan's formal object of history. Using the human good of order as a formal object, he abstracts from the empirical level of history to grasp the intelligibility of the history that is lived within human cultures.

However, the intelligibility anticipated is not simply the static structure of a given culture at a given place and time in history. On one hand, we can think of a human good of order as a snapshot of a culture at any given place and time. But cultures develop and cultures decline. So history is a flow, a process. To explain this dynamic element, Lonergan developed his threefold approximation of progress, decline, and redemption, as we interpreted from his first chapter. Without redemption, historical decline would win out due to moral impotence. With redemption, the line of progress is restored.

Lonergan considers all three approximations as always operative in history. Since the redemptive vector is operative, the *net* effect in history is progress. This does not mean that every culture at every given point in history is necessarily progressing. The judgment is a theological one. Through Christ, God has introduced a redemptive vector into human history according to the divine plan. The divine plan cannot be frustrated. So from a theological perspective, Lonergan holds the general view that history is one of net progress. So when he refers to progress in the "total" human good of order, he is

referring to a net process and is not suggesting that every culture at every point in time in history is progressing.

Let us name this progress *human development*. Human development is a matter of fact that can be verified empirically through the study of cultural development.⁸⁵ This could be verified at particular places and times in history even prescind from the redemptive vector. But given that God's redemptive vector has entered into human history, Lonergan holds the theological position that the net effect in history is ongoing human development. This is a long-range view. In specific cultures, and specific times, there may still be decline. But in the long-range view, he affirms that there is human development because there is a redemptive vector operative in history which has restored the net line of progress. So to understand history is to understand human development. As such, Lonergan's general understanding of history amounts to an answer to the following question: what makes human development what it is?

To understand human development, one does not need to account for every single human thought, word, or deed in history. Just as the intelligibility of the circle does not depend on the empirical accidents of radius, color, or thickness, the intelligibility of human development does not depend on every thought, word, or deed. For Lonergan, data not relevant to a specific intelligibility one is seeking is called the "empirical residue."⁸⁶ To grasp the intelligible from the empirical one abstracts from the incidental.

⁸⁵ Bernard Lonergan, "Essay on Fundamental Sociology," unpublished (1934), 5. The text is available at www.berndardlonergan.com at file 71309DTE030. See also "Theology in its New Context," *Second Collection*, 59; "Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness," 5.

⁸⁶ On the notion of empirical residue, see Lonergan, *Insight*, 50-56. Here Lonergan's "scissors metaphor" is helpful for interpretation. The lower blade constitutes the data. The upper blade constitutes the heuristic principle(s) orienting the investigation toward the intelligibility anticipated in the data. The same scissors-like action applies when one is seeking a theory of history from the data of history. In the 1959 lectures on education Lonergan remarked that the scientific approach to general history has to be of the same type as the history of science, in other words a coming together of data and principle(s) which grasp the

This abstraction is the selectivity of intelligence. The same method applies to Lonergan's approach to understanding human development. What makes human development what it is is not based on every thought, word, or deed. What makes human development what it is is based on the intelligible relations of thoughts, words, and deeds producing effects in history where those effects amount to improvements in the human good of order.

Although Lonergan understands history through a social structure, the human good of order, he does not ignore individual human development. Quite the opposite. He understands individual development as mediated through social development. No person lives in a metaphorical vacuum. It is through community that one comes to appropriate one's self, to know one's self.⁸⁷ As we noted in our interpretation of Lonergan's first chapter, there is indeed such a thing as constant human nature. But there is also variable human history, and this historical dimension is also constitutive of persons as persons.

This historical dimension is what Lonergan later meant by the term "historicity."⁸⁸ The notion of historicity affirms that (1) meaning plays a constitutive role in human living, and (2) meaning develops in history because meaning develops in cultures. So meaning itself is a function of historical process. Human beings are embedded in this process. As Lonergan noted in his second chapter, with the possible exception of the mystics, no person is so individual as not to be related essentially to the historical process.⁸⁹

intelligibility in the data. Data alone lack significance. Principles alone lack reality. It is the coming together of the two that a science is developed. See *Topics in Education*, 251. On the scissors metaphor, see *Insight*, 600.

⁸⁷ Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method I*, 257. The development of the individual is mediated by a concrete community located in a concrete place at a concrete time in history. Lonergan stated that it makes all the difference in the world whether you or born in this place or that, in this time or that. See *Early Works on Theological Method I*, 59.

⁸⁸ Lonergan, "Philosophy of History," 72; "Natural Right and Historical Mindedness," 170-171.

⁸⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 84 [*Supplement*, 34].

7.3.2 Causality

Lonergan stated that a cause is whatever influences another in its existence and an effect is whatever depends upon another in its existence.⁹⁰ Causality is an intelligible relation of dependence of a created effect as influenced by a cause. The change is in the effect, not the cause. There is no change in the cause *qua* cause.⁹¹

In his explanation of causality, it is clear that Lonergan wants to refute the error of understanding causality through picture-thinking. Causality is a reality and is therefore intelligible. However, to know causality is not had merely by the cognitional operation of experience (perception). Knowledge of causality is had through the further operations of understanding and judgment. Picture-thinking is a misunderstanding that knowledge is perception and so it fails to grasp the reality of causality. In explaining how one knows causality, Lonergan is simply adhering to his own cognitional theory.⁹²

Among Aristotle's four causes, the efficient cause is perhaps most open to misunderstanding. Efficient causality is known not because one "sees" physical contact. Efficient causality is known because (1) one grasps an intelligible relation of dependence in an effect as "moved" by a cause, and (2) one subsequently judges this intelligible relation to be true. Efficient causality *may* involve physical contact. However, the reality of efficient causality is not exclusively physical.⁹³

⁹⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *236 [*Supplement*, 100].

⁹¹ Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom*, 90.

⁹² In Lonergan's cognitional theory one does not come to a true knowledge of any reality by what he often referred to as "taking a good look." Objective knowledge is the fruit of authentic experiencing, understanding, and judgment. The same holds true for knowledge of causality. As he later stated in *Method*, "genuine objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity." See *Method in Theology*, 292, 265.

⁹³ A misinterpretation of efficient causality is that it must be physical or corporeal. Aquinas counters this by teaching that in addition to corporeal contact there is also "spiritual" contact. See *ST*, q. 48, a. 6, ad 2.

Lonergan's explanation of what causality is applies to any form of causality. Furthermore, any effect is not dependent on a single cause. Near the time he wrote the *Supplement*, Lonergan often appealed to the classical Aristotelian definition of science as "a certain knowledge of things through their causes" (*certa rerum per causas cognitio*).⁹⁴ To know things through their causes is obtained by analysis, by resolving a thing into its causes. This resolution applies only to created realities. There are no causes in God.

Furthermore, since in created realities there is distinction between essence and existence, there is a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic causality. An intrinsic cause is that by *reason of which* a thing is what it is. It is the formal cause. It is intelligible in itself. So intrinsic causality is a means of knowing why a thing is what it is, prescinding from extrinsic causality. Extrinsic causality applies when there is a distinction between the essence of a thing and its existence. This distinction is constitutive of every created being. However, no created being can activate its own existence. One needs recourse to extrinsic causality to grasp the intelligibility of the being's existence. This is equivalent to the metaphysical principles that potency and act are not intelligible in themselves.⁹⁵ They are intelligible in the other, in the extrinsic causes. Extrinsic causes are final, efficient, and exemplary cause. So although one can speak of intrinsic causality or intrinsic intelligibility, this does not exhaust the intelligibility of created realities.

Turning back to efficient causality, an agent acting through intellect can exert this type of causality without physical contact by moving another agent acting through intellect, specifically through the other agent's reason and will. This movement can be

⁹⁴ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 59; See also *Early Works on Theological Method I*, 445; *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, 49, 83-85, 91.

⁹⁵ Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 207.

extended through space and time in a causal series. If the agent's influence is extended through space and time in a causal series, then human cooperation is constitutive of this causal series. Even if an agent's ability to produce an effect depends on the free consent of others, the causality is no less real. There is still an intelligible relation of dependence in the created effect on the originating agent.

Since we have introduced the notion of a causal series it is appropriate we explain this in more detail. Lonergan distinguishes two types of causal series: accidental and proper. An example of the former is Abraham (*A*) begetting Isaac (*B*), and Isaac (*B*) begetting Jacob (*C*). In this accidental causal series there are only two real relations of dependence: *B* depends on *A*, and *C* depends on *B*. The relation of *C* to *A* is not a real relation of dependence. The relation of *C* to *A* is of a conditioned to a condition. Abraham is not a cause but a condition of begetting Jacob. Furthermore, in an accidental causal series there is no reality of mediate efficient causality since the relation of *C* to *A* is not a real relation of dependence.

An example of the latter is the typist (*A*), the typewriter (*B*), and the typescript (*C*). In this causal series there are *three* real relations of dependence: *B* depends on *A*, *C* depends on *B*, and *C* depends on *A* even more than on *B*.⁹⁶ *C* depends on *A* even more than on *B* because only *A* is by nature proportionate to creating the effect even though *A* uses a secondary (instrumental) cause (*B*).⁹⁷ *A* is the mediate efficient cause of *C*.

⁹⁶ Lonergan, "On God and Secondary Causes," 55. The "proper causal series" also correlates to what Lonergan describes, in *Grace and Freedom*, as "serial cooperation." Serial cooperation (*A* to *B*, *B* to *C*) involves not two but three *actiones* producing one effect. The third *actio* is the cooperation; it is the operation of the higher cause (*A*) in the operation of the lower (*B*). See *Grace and Freedom*, 303-304.

⁹⁷ "An efficient cause is principal inasmuch as the perfection of its form either equals or surpasses the perfection of its effect. It is instrumental inasmuch as the perfection of its form is surpassed by the perfection of its effect." Bernard Lonergan, *De ente supernaturali: Supplementum schematicum*. (Montreal: College of the Immaculate Conception, 1946). English translation, *The Supernatural Order*,

7.3.3 Historical Causality

In one of Lonergan's early essays on history he understood the relationship between human causality and human development as "the making and unmaking of man by man."⁹⁸ The essence of the phrase would stay with him throughout his career. In one of his later essays he stated that it is *in* history that "man's making of man" occurs.⁹⁹ Each person does not make himself or herself in an individual sense of "making." Even though each of us has the use of free will, we do not make ourselves out of ourselves. This is a metaphysical impossibility because of the principle that anything moved is moved by something else, *quidquid movetur ab alio movetur*. This is a familiar scholastic tag that Lonergan appropriated from Aquinas. It is explicitly employed in his early theory of history and implicit in his view of history offered in the *Supplement*.¹⁰⁰ No contingent effect is its own cause.¹⁰¹

Lonergan's understanding of human solidarity, developed in his first chapter, exemplifies the principle that anything moved is moved by something else. Any person's thought, original or otherwise, depends upon external experience and beliefs handed on from previous generations. Since action follows thought, everything we do is to some degree based on the influence of the past, for better or for worse. This is the ground of Lonergan's notion of human solidarity. Human progress is progress of the whole, not

trans. Michael Shields, S.J. (Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute, 1992), 20. *De ente supernaturali* will be published in vol. 19 of the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan.

⁹⁸ Lonergan, "Analytic Concept of History," 10.

⁹⁹ Lonergan, "Natural Right and Historical Mindedness," 171.

¹⁰⁰ Lonergan, "Analytic Concept of History," 11; See *ST*, I, q. 2, a. 3.

¹⁰¹ "Just as motion in the cause as such implies an infinite series of movers with no first mover, so motion in the self-determining agent as agent involves an infinite regress of the self-determination." Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom*, 68-69.

progress of the individual.¹⁰² As Lonergan explained in his first chapter, the human good of order is an immense accumulation of insights, discoveries, and decisions of the past.¹⁰³ This explains why in his last chapter he judges that even though social agents freely determine the future, this very determination, to the extent that it is common and effective, depends very greatly upon the past.¹⁰⁴ Thus, historical causality depends very greatly on the past even though it can freely determine the future.

How does historical causality freely determine the future? The answer ultimately depends on the fact that there are creatures who are agents acting through intellect. In his first chapter, Lonergan laid the foundation for his explanation of such an agent. There he discussed human nature, specifically the human mind, as that which can make and become all things.¹⁰⁵ In the last chapter this agency is explained in a more systematic fashion: according to the category of the agent acting through intellect who can understand the requisite conditions needed to be fulfilled for an effect to be produced and who can see to the fulfillment of those conditions. Of course, it is much more likely that conditions are fulfilled through human cooperation than by a single individual.

The requisite conditions governing the production of an effect are to be understood in accordance with Lonergan's theory of emergent probability. Lonergan's second chapter provides an explanation why there are conditions in the first place and

¹⁰² As he noted in "Essay on Fundamental Sociology," there is of course the fact that new ideas are introduced into history by the creative genius. However, this is the exception, not the rule, and so the creative genius is but an instrument of society. See "Essay on Fundamental Sociology," 2

¹⁰³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 11 [*Supplement*, 6]. Readers familiar with *Insight* may notice the importance of this judgment to Lonergan's discussion of belief in chapter 20 of *Insight*. The vast majority of any person's knowledge is belief, not immanently generated knowledge. See *Insight*, 726.

¹⁰⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *243 [*Supplement*, 103]. Lonergan would make the same point years later in *Method*: "We shape our life only in interaction with the traditions of the communities in which each of us happens to be born, and in turn these traditions themselves are but the deposit left to us from our predecessors." See *Method in Theology*, 80-81.

¹⁰⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 9 [*Supplement*, 5].

why these conditions can be understood. Conditions are regulated by innate laws which govern the operation of each individual thing according to its nature, as well as the whole complex or series of natural laws, both classic and statistical, which govern the universal order of reality. An agent acting through intellect can understand these conditions precisely because they *are* intelligible. The conditions are intelligible because they are intelligently related to the intelligible operation of this universe conceived by divine wisdom. Since they are intelligible they can be known. And if they can be known it is possible they can be fulfilled through intentional human agency.

Just as emergent probability governs events in the natural world, it does as well in the world of human affairs. At the heart of emergent probability is the notion of the scheme of recurrence. The human good of order itself is a scheme of recurrence. The external situation influences the members of the order, each of which is an agent acting through intellect. This in turn influences the human will of the agent to change the situation for the better. As Lonergan noted in his second chapter, there would not be improvement if the human intellect looked only at the present order and could not imagine an improved, yet future, human good of order. If others can be persuaded by the new ideas originated by the individual agent, there can then be mutual understanding and agreement on a future course of action. If this is realized, the situation is improved. When this change is complete, the cycle starts over. We have a scheme of recurrence. Since the human mind wants to become and make all things, there is no reason why this scheme of recurrence, this progressive cycle if you will, should come to an end.¹⁰⁶

Given the foregoing, let us summarize Lonergan's general understanding of historical causality. The "historical" in historical causality refers to the developing

¹⁰⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 9 [*Supplement*, 5].

human good of order. The “causality” in historical causality refers to an intelligible relationship of dependence in the developing human good of order (the historical effect) on any and all influences (historical causes). Historical influences can and often do originate from a single agent. This is the originating agent, an agent as potential cause. However, in the vast majority of cases an agent becomes an actual cause through the free consent of others, through human cooperation, because no single person can fulfill all of the requisite conditions to produce the intended effect.

Since historical causality involves more than one cause, to understand historical causality amounts to resolving the development of the human good of order into its causes. Resolving this development into its causes would explain how the human good of order develops. Since to know causality in the general sense is to make a true affirmation that there is an intelligible relation of dependence in an effect as influenced by a cause, then to know a *historical* cause is to make a true affirmation that there is an intelligible relation of dependence in an improvement within the human good of order on a particular historical influence.

As we noted earlier, the category of efficient causality is particularly problematic if one does not explain the nature of the agency involved. Efficient causality, as with any of the Aristotelian causes, is a metaphysical category. It is abstract and necessarily vague. But human history is concrete. To grasp a concrete understanding of historical causality one needs an explanation commensurate with the concrete nature of history itself. Lonergan’s categories of individual, social, and historical agency serve this purpose. These categories add further specification to the Aristotelian categories, bringing these vague metaphysical categories down to earth. These categories of agency

amount to a sociology, both of knowledge and of action. Of knowledge, because of the social nature of human thought. Of action, because virtually everything we do is done either through others or for others. So historical causality is essentially a social dynamic. It is fundamentally communitarian since the vast majority of actual causes are had through mutual understanding and agreement. The key here is *actual* causality. Certainly there is the causality related to the individual agent. At a minimum, the individual agent is a potential cause. However, to become an actual cause is a different matter. When it comes to improving the human good of order, actual causes are in the vast majority of times the product of social agency.

7.4 The Historical Causality of Christ: Preliminary Remarks

Lonergan's approach to understanding the historical causality of Christ is by way of analysis. He resolves Christ's work in history into its causes. The articles "Christ the Exemplar," "Christ the Head," "Christ the Historical Agent," and "The Mediator in Heaven" are Lonergan's way of resolving the work of Christ into its causes.

The triune God is, of course, the absolute first historical cause of every historical effect. This simply reflects the *ad extra* doctrine. The judgment also proceeds from the metaphysical distinction between the effectiveness of God and God's instruments: "the cause of a cause is a cause of the effect" (*causa causae est causa causati*).¹⁰⁷ Since God is the cause of every other cause, God is the cause of the effect. So God is the first and principal efficient cause of any created effect. But why is God the cause of all created causes? Because a created being cannot move from potency to act by its own resources.

¹⁰⁷ Lonergan, *The Supernatural Order*, 127.

Act is greater than potency.¹⁰⁸ The created being must be moved from potency to act by another cause in order to actually produce an effect. God is the only efficient cause proportionate to producing action itself. Hence the fundamental theorem of divine concurrence: “God operates in everything that operates” (*Deus operature in omni operante*).¹⁰⁹

Now we turn to Christ. Christ acts as both God and man. As God, Christ shares in this divine agency of God. Whenever Lonergan speaks of Christ acting as God, he is referring to the divine knowledge, will, and power through which Christ acts and where these attributes of knowledge, will, and power are common to the three divine persons. At this point we have yet entered into any causal series. There is no causal series between God as first cause and Christ acting as God. They are the same.

We enter into a proper causal series, with respect to divine causality, the moment we begin speaking of Christ acting *as man*. Christ, acting as man, is a secondary cause. There may or may not be additional secondary causes, that is, human agents through which Christ as man mediates his work. If not, the work is proper to Christ. In this case the causal series is (1) God as first cause, which includes Christ acting as God; (2) Christ acting as man, as a secondary cause; and (2) the created effect.

If there are additional secondary causes, the work is not proper to Christ alone but the effect is proportionate only to Christ. In this case the causal series is (1) God as first cause, which includes Christ acting as God; (2) Christ acting as man, as a secondary cause; (3) other secondary causes who are ministerial agents of Christ; and (4) the created effect. Here Christ is mediate efficient cause in relation to his ministerial agents. The

¹⁰⁸ Lonergan, *The Supernatural Order*, 123.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom*, 304.

work is not strictly proper to Christ since Christ is mediating his work through other secondary causes. But the created effect is proportionate only to Christ. His ministerial agents exert true causality, but only instrumental causality. So there is a proper causal series here. Nevertheless, Christ is more the cause of the effect than his agents.

In Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ, there is always operative some causal series. Which one depends on the context. To explain this I will use the notion of stages in the work of Christ in history. The work of Christ in history of course presupposes the Incarnation, and Lonergan's final article on *cur Deus homo* addresses this specifically. For now I intend to focus on Christ's work in history.

There is an implicit structure operative in Lonergan's thought of how Christ's work in history unfolds. This structure is one of stages. There are three basic stages implicit in Lonergan's thought. The first is what Catholic dogmatic theology traditionally understands as objective redemption: the work proper to Christ alone, yet done for the sake of all. The second is the first stage of subjective redemption: the work of Christ to apply to his members the fruits of his objective redemption. The third is the unfolding of subjective redemption: the ongoing work of Christ in history mediated through the members of his body. This third element can also be understood as the perfection of the members through the production of similar operations in the members, as are produced in the head, according to exemplary causality.

In all three stages, the work is the work of Christ. The first is the principle of the second, since objective redemption is the principle of subjective redemption. The second is the principle of the third, since the application of Christ's objective redemption is the principle of the unfolding of subjective redemption.

Lonerger's final chapter is, for the most part, an explanation of this third element: the unfolding of subjective redemption in history. Lonergan's motive is evident from the very beginning of the chapter. He stated that what was said in his third chapter about the price paid, sacrifice, meritorious obedience, and the vicarious suffering of Christ refers only to redemption as means (*ut medium*), or, better, as a principle (*ut principium*). Lonergan prefers the term *principium* since what he said in his third chapter, considered in itself, corresponds to objective redemption. However, redemption as means cannot be reduced to objective redemption. Christ's objective work is better understood as a *principium*, since a principle is what is first in some order. Lonergan's primary objective in his final chapter is to understand what follows from this *principium*. Hence his call for a broader and fuller survey of the work of the Lord.

Let us take our bearings. Lonergan understands the historical causality of Christ in terms of objective and subjective redemption. He rarely uses this explicit language. In fact, he never mentions subjective redemption and he mentions objective redemption only one time. But the distinction is implicit and it is a practical way to frame our interpretation. Furthermore, in this chapter Lonergan understands subjective redemption primarily in terms of Christ's *extrinsic causality* in history. Christ's intrinsic causality refers to his ontological constitution. This is not his focus. He had already treated this in *De constitutione Christi ontologica et psychologica* (1956).

Now we will turn to specific aspects of Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ. It is appropriate to begin with final causality.

7.5 The Historical Causality of Christ: Final Causality

The end for the sake of which Christ acts in history is the historical effect intended by Christ in accordance with the divine plan of redemption. When any end is for the sake of which an agent acts, the end is not simply an end but a final cause. The primary end of redemption is the divine goodness itself, the good by essence. Lonergan does not explicitly correlate this primary end with the beatific vision but this is what he means.¹¹⁰ This end lies outside the field of history and is not our direct concern. Our concern is with the secondary end of redemption as final cause, since this end is found within the field of history. Our interpretation here will include (1) references to the secondary end whether implicit or explicit, (2) an interpretive synthesis of these references, and (3) an interpretation of how this secondary end is a final cause in Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ.

7.5.1 References to the Secondary End of Redemption

References to the secondary end are found in the first, second, third, and sixth chapters of the *Supplement*. The references are implicit until the final chapter. In the introduction of the first chapter Lonergan follows scripture in judging that the hidden plan of God's will is to gather all creation in heaven and earth under one head, Christ. The end in history is equated to the gathering up of *earthly* realities.¹¹¹ Lonergan appropriates Aquinas's teaching that "...the purpose of the universe is a good existing in

¹¹⁰ In his treatise on the Triune God, he makes the same distinctions between primary and secondary ends where the former is clearly the beatific vision. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 489, 491, 495, 511.

¹¹¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 1 [*Supplement*, 1].

it, namely, the order of the universe itself.”¹¹² In the first chapter he also states that the end of creation is to manifest divine goodness.¹¹³

In the second chapter he states that the order of the universe is a good of order and the intrinsic end of the universe.¹¹⁴ He reiterates that the justice of God is grounded in divine wisdom, in its exercise to the just choice of a wise order, and in its effects is found in created things inasmuch as they are wisely and justly ordered among themselves and in relation to their ultimate end which is God himself.¹¹⁵ There is again a judgment that the ultimate end to which all things are directed is to manifest the divine goodness.¹¹⁶

In the third chapter, redemption as end is described as that state in which we are freed from the power of darkness, from sin, from punishment, from the fear of death, by which we have received the promise, are reconciled to God, are justified, enjoy the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and adoptive sonship, are saved in hope, and are able to approach God with confidence.¹¹⁷ Here there are no references to eschatological effects. Lonergan is describing redemptive effects in history. He goes on to explain the distinction between redemption as end and redemption as means. As end, it is to restore all things in Christ. As means, it is the payment of the price, sacrifice, meritorious obedience, and Christ’s vicarious suffering and death.¹¹⁸

At the beginning of the final chapter Lonergan provides a biblical synthesis of the historical effect correlative to the work of the Lord. The effect is described as the Kingdom of God, the Body of Christ, and the specific salvific effects which are had

¹¹² “...‘finis quidem universi est aliquod bonum in ipso existens, scilicet ordo ipsius universi.’” *DBM*, 6 [*Supplement*, 3]. This is a citation from *ST* I, q. 103, a. 2 ad 3m.

¹¹³ Lonergan, *DBM*, 24 [*Supplement*, 11].

¹¹⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28]. Lonergan references *ST*, I, q. 47, a. 3; q. 103, a. 2, ad 3m.

¹¹⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 69 [*Supplement*, 29].

¹¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 77 [*Supplement*, 31].

¹¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, 127 [*Supplement*, 52].

¹¹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 142 [*Supplement*, 58].

through incorporation into this body. Then he states: “The reader of the New Testament understands that Christ’s end or purpose is first and foremost the kingdom of God...To arrive in this kingdom is what salvation means...”¹¹⁹ Later he makes the distinction between the effects directly and indirectly intended by Christ. Christ directly intends to order human life on earth to the future life in heaven. This ordering liberates us from evil to the good such that the total human good of order is greatly improved. Christ indirectly intends this improvement. He then explains the secondary end of redemption in terms of reconciliation, expressed through the spatial metaphor of drawing near to God. The entire work of Christ is summed up in this reconciliation which is had within the Body of Christ.¹²⁰ Next we come to his explanation of the purpose of the Incarnation. There he describes the secondary end as all created things in their due order to one another, the external glory of God, and the order of the universe. This same end is the Body of Christ, head and members, as all things in heaven and on earth are brought together and reconciled in him.¹²¹ In the final article he reiterates that the end is divided into primary and secondary. The secondary end is the external glory of God, the order of the universe, and the Body of Christ wherein all things are brought together and reconciled in him.¹²²

7.5.2 Toward a Synthesis

References to the secondary end of redemption reveal three contexts. The first is anthropological from an individualistic perspective. The second is anthropological from a social perspective. The third is cosmological.

¹¹⁹ “Qui ergo novum testamentum legit, in primis finem Christi regnum Dei esse intelligit...Quod in regnum pervenire salus est...” *DBM*, *231-232 [*Supplement*, 98].

¹²⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *278-279 [*Supplement*, 118-119].

¹²¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *281-282 [*Supplement*, 119-120].

¹²² Lonergan, *DBM*, *285 [*Supplement*, 121].

Anthropological and Individual: The secondary end is a new state (*status*) of the human person: liberation from darkness, from sin, from punishment, from fear of death, and by which the person receives the promise of eternal redemption, justification, the gift of the Holy Spirit, adoptive sonship, salvation in hope, reconciliation, and interior renewal which includes restoration of the image of God.

Anthropological and Social: The secondary end is the Kingdom of God, the Body of Christ, the Church.¹²³ Through the Body of Christ we are reconciled to God and to one another. This context includes improvement in the total human good of order since the members of the body, now converted from enemies of God into friends of God, perform good works which improve the overall human situation.

Cosmological: The secondary end is the order of the universe, the external glory of God, all created things in their ordering to one another, the restoration and reconciliation of all things in Christ, and the manifestation of divine goodness.

Now we move towards a synthesis. The notion of *order* is common to all three contexts. The secondary end of redemption can thus be understood through the following synthesis. In terms of order, the secondary end refers to a restoration of (1) the interior order of the human person, (2) the order of human history, and (3) the order of the universe itself. The Body of Christ, which is a supernatural human good of order, is an end in itself through which these restorations are obtained. I argue that for Lonergan the

¹²³ In the *Supplement* the two are equivalent, reflecting Lonergan's thought in the late 1950s. After the Second Vatican Council he changed his position. "When I was a student of theology, the kingdom of God was identified with the church, and that is something that has been eliminated by Vatican II. The church is God's instrument, one of God's instruments, in this world for promoting the kingdom of God with regard to the whole world." Excerpt from Lonergan's lectures on Method in Theology at Boston College, July 3-12, 1968, as quoted in *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1958-1964*, 26, n. 51. See also *Method in Theology*, 363-364.

secondary end is the Body of Christ, the Church, and I will explain how the end understood in this way synthesizes all of these contexts.

Within Lonergan's notion of order, a part exists for the whole and the whole for the part. In his first chapter he cited Aquinas's teaching that the universe as a whole is not only a good of order but as a whole is a more perfect participation in and reflection of the divine goodness than any individual creature. His second chapter made the teaching even more explicit. Since what is best in creation is the good of order of the universe, this order is itself directly intended by God.¹²⁴ The order of the universe encompasses all created realities in their ordered relationship to one another. The key here is relationality. The order of the universe is not simply an aggregate of parts where intelligibility is found only in each separate part. The ordering itself is intelligible. This ordering is understood by Lonergan as a hierarchical order in which vertical finality is operative, as we explained in our interpretation of his second chapter. The point is that each part of the universe does not exist for its own sake. Each part is related to the whole for the sake of the whole. As Lonergan stated in *Insight*, the actual order of the universe includes the excellence of every other good within the universe. To will any good is to will the order of the universe.¹²⁵

The order of the universe includes the world of human affairs, the total human good of order. In *De ratione convenientiae*, this is the "historical order of the universe" (*ordine universi historico*).¹²⁶ In the *Supplement*, it is the "historical order of justice." Thus history itself can be understood as an order within the order of the universe. History is related to the universe as a part to the whole.

¹²⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, 68 [*Supplement*, 28].

¹²⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 721.

¹²⁶ Lonergan, *De ratione convenientiae*, 9.

Individuals are inherently part of this historical order. Individuals can also be understood in terms of their own intrinsic ordering. In Lonergan's first chapter, he explained that if wisdom and goodness are for each individual most valuable by reason of their intrinsic excellence, then in addition to the external order and its progressive development there is another, "...an interior order, in which our sensitive part is subordinated to reason, and weak human reason is in turn subordinated to the supreme being, supreme truth, and supreme good."¹²⁷ Without this right ordering the sensitive element is in control. If the sensitive element is in control an animal is in control.

We come now to the heart of the matter. Because of sin, human beings, *qua* individuals, are disordered. For now we are prescinding from the healing effect of grace. This disorder can be understood as corruption of the intrinsic order of the individual. Sin gives rise to the evil consequences of sin which then corrupt and disorder the order of history itself. Since a part exists for the sake of the whole, when one part is corrupted the whole is corrupted. Since the historical order of the universe has been corrupted by the evil consequences of sin, the whole universe has been corrupted. But if one corrupted part leads to the corruption of the whole, then restoration of that part leads to restoration of the whole. Through the Body of Christ, which restores the individual as well as the historical order, the universe itself is restored. Understanding this relationship between the individual, historical, and cosmological order is critical to understanding why

¹²⁷ "...ordo homini interior ut pars sensitiva rationi subdatur et debilis humana ratio summo enti, summo vero, summo bono subordinetur." *DBM*, 27 [*Supplement*, 12]. Lonergan is describing his understanding of that aspect of interior renewal Aquinas understood as "justification." Aquinas explains that the inner change implied in the notion of justification borrows its name not from charity or faith, but from justice since the word implies a general rectitude of order in the interior disposition of a human being: *ST* I-II, q. 113, a. 1, ad 2. In Lonergan's own dissertation we find an appropriation of this same teaching: "The justice of justification is the rectitude and the order of the internal disposition of man; it involves the subordination of the rational element to God and of the irrational element to the rational. The process of justification is a transition from the state of injustice or disorder to the state of justice." See *Grace and Freedom*, 394; Lonergan cites *ST* I-II, q. 113, a. 1.

Lonergan can mention, in the same breath, that the secondary end of redemption is the external glory of God, the order of the universe, and the Body of Christ wherein all things are brought together and reconciled in him.

We can now focus more specifically on the Body of Christ in itself. This body is a supernatural human good of order. Like any human good of order we can expect to find in this body the following levels: (1) particular goods, (2) the social or external good of order, and (3) the cultural good. The supernatural gifts of grace, the infused virtues, the gifts and movements of the Spirit correspond to particular goods. The external institutions of the Church and the operations of its members correspond to the external good of order. The interpersonal relationships as well as the shared meanings and values of the members correspond to the cultural good. Shared meanings refer to mutual understandings and judgments on reality. Shared values refers to mutual judgments on what ends are truly good and worthy to be chosen.

Through these interpersonal relationships the members are reconciled to one another and to Christ. As Lonergan explained in his answer to *cur Deus homo*, through loving the God-man one comes to have love for God. Through loving Christ the members are reconciled to God. Lonergan stated that the entire work of Christ is summed up in this reconciliation. The secondary end of redemption, interpreted as the Body of Christ, is consistent with this statement. The Body of Christ is a supernatural community reconciling the members to God and to one another.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ This supernatural human good of order is what in *De Verbo Incarnato* Lonergan describes as the “supreme good” into which human evils are transformed. This supreme good is “the whole Christ, head and members, in this life as well as in the life to come...” Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 553. In Lonergan’s most developed systematics of the Trinity, he understands this supreme good as a “state or situation of grace” (*statum seu situationem gratiae*) referring to many distinct subjects together in a divine-human interpersonal situation in which the divine persons and the just are in one another as those who are known are in those who know them and those who are loved are in those who love them. Thus in

Since the Body of Christ is the end for the sake of which Christ acts in history, there is no doubt that Lonergan would judge it as God's will that all become members of Christ's body.¹²⁹ However, this does not mean that the Body of Christ, as end, is meant to replace what Lonergan understands as the total human good of order. The Body of Christ is not meant to eliminate or replace the total human good of order, but to transform that order, to transform human history through the leavening of human history.¹³⁰

This leavening of human history is indirectly intended by Christ. Recall that the Body of Christ, as end, is directly intended to prepare members of the body for the future life in heaven. But it is also intended, albeit indirectly, to improve the overall human situation. Through the good works of the members, the Body of Christ introduces and propagates a redemptive vector into human history to leaven human history. This vector is redemptive and absolutely supernatural because it is conceived by divine wisdom, is chosen by divine goodness, and is affected by divine causality with the intent to transform cultural evil into cultural good. The redemptive vector leavens human history by transforming cultural meanings and values operative in history to more closely approximate God's meanings and values revealed in Christ.

7.5.3 Final Causality and Christ's Intentionality

The secondary end of redemption, as final cause, is the end for the sake of which Christ acts in history. The key here is "for the sake of." We are not interested in the

Lonergan's theology he makes a distinction between the habit of grace and the state of grace. The former is a physical accident received in the soul of the just. The latter is a social, interpersonal reality between human persons, *qua* community, and the divine persons of the Trinity. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 517.

¹²⁹ In "Finality, Love, Marriage," he describes this in terms of the mystical body's "intussusception" of human personalities. What he means is that Christ, as head of the mystical body, operates with the intention of taking into his body all persons. See "Finality, Love, Marriage," 22.

¹³⁰ Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," 22.

secondary end as end, but as final cause. There is a difference. Any end, in and of itself, is not a final cause. It is simply an end. In and of itself an end is what Lonergan once termed the end in *ordo executionis*, the end in the order of execution.¹³¹ We are interested in how Lonergan understands the secondary end of redemption not simply as an end but an end *qua* final cause, the end in *ordo intentionis*.¹³² To interpret him on this aspect of the historical causality of Christ, three points are particularly relevant.

First, a final cause is not simply an end as cause. A final cause is the *good* as cause.¹³³ In other words, there is final causality in the strict sense if and only if that for the sake of which the agent acts is truly a good end. Second, the end must be an apprehended end. Without the end as apprehended, there would be no such thing as final causality. Third, the end as apprehended is the efficient cause of the act of appetition.¹³⁴ This third point is important because one can easily confuse final causality with efficient causality in the effort to understand the intentionality of the agent. The point here is that there is a difference between (1) the relationship of the good as cause to the end as apprehended, and (2) the relationship of the end as apprehended to the willingness to attain the end. The former is understood by Lonergan according to final causality. The latter to efficient causality. We can apply these general elements to interpret how final causality operates in Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ.

First, there is no difficulty with judging that the secondary end of redemption is a good. The secondary end is a supernatural good, and this is in fact why it is an end and not merely a means. Second, this secondary end is apprehended by Christ. Christ

¹³¹ Lonergan, "On God and Secondary Causes," 59.

¹³² Lonergan, "On God and Secondary Causes," 59.

¹³³ Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," 19; "On God and Secondary Causes," 59.

¹³⁴ Lonergan, "On God and Secondary Causes," 59.

apprehends the secondary end of redemption because he apprehends the divine plan as part of his apprehension of the actual order of reality. He apprehends the actual order of reality as a secondary object of his beatific knowledge.¹³⁵ This end as apprehended is perhaps the key element to understanding the historical causality of Christ under the aspect of final causality. Since a final cause is a real cause, then according to Lonergan's own definition we should anticipate an intelligible relation of dependence in a created effect as influenced by the end as cause. If this were not the case, Lonergan's general understanding of causality would not apply to final causality, but this is inadmissible. Final causality refers to an intelligible relation of dependence in an effect as influenced by a cause, as with any type of causality.

The third element helps us to interpret what this created effect is. The created effect is the end as apprehended by Christ. Recall that an agent acting through intellect acts in accordance with an intentional form (*formam intentionalem*).¹³⁶ Here the *formam intentionalem* is not the likeness of the thing understood, since the thing (the effect) is not yet produced. It is the term of an act of understanding which devises the form intended in the thing to be produced and which, as understood, guides operation to produce the effect.¹³⁷ Christ as man is an agent acting through intellect. The intentional form in

¹³⁵ Lonergan affirms that Christ knows this end. "...for through his immediate vision of God he [Christ] knows all actual reality as the secondary object of that vision, and thus the total historical effect produced by him [Christ] comes about not beyond but according to his intention." [...nam per visionem Dei immediatam in obiecto secundario omnia actualia cognovit, et ideo totus effectus historicus ab eo productus non praeter sed secundum intentionem eius oritur]. *DBM*, *270 [*Supplement*, 115]. Lonergan's judgment that Christ knows the intended historical effect is based on the judgment that Christ experiences the beatific vision in his human knowledge. It is *not* a judgment that presupposes the work of Christ and then deduces that Christ must know the intended end to perform his work oriented to this end. As Lonergan notes in Thesis 12 of *De Verbo Incarnato*, we cannot infer from Christ's work how much knowledge Christ needed to perform his work. Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 400.

¹³⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *238 [*Supplement*, 101].

¹³⁷ See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 593. Here Lonergan discusses the two ways in which "form" may be in the intellect. In the first way, a form can be in the intellect as the likeness of a thing understood in the one who is understanding (in this way, the form is the principle of the act of understanding). In the second

Christ is the secondary end of redemption as apprehended by Christ. This intentional form is the created effect dependent on the secondary end as final cause. This effect resides in Christ's human intellect. The effect is not located in Christ's will. Christ's willingness to achieve the end is to be understood as an effect of efficient causality, where the cause is the end as apprehended. In other words, the end as apprehended is the efficient cause of the act of appetition. As such, the final cause can be understood as the immediate cause of the efficient cause of willing the end.

Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ, under the aspect of final causality, is indeed related to Christ's intentionality as one would expect. But given his general understanding of final causality operative in intellectual agents, he would not conflate final causality and efficient causality. The secondary end of redemption, as apprehended by Christ, governs his intentionality according to final causality not in the sense that it moves his will to desire the end, but in the sense that there is an intentional form in his intellect according to which the secondary end of redemption is produced. This intentional form includes the means to the end, where the means can be understood as the inauguration, propagation, and perfection of the Body of Christ in history. Christ's intentionality is what is first in order of his historical causality, and that intentionality, understood according to final causality, is an intentional form residing in Christ's human intellect. This secondary end of redemption, as final cause, is mediated into Christ's intentionality through this intentional form such that it is a true judgment that the secondary end of redemption is that for the sake of which Christ acts in history. Without the intentional form, we could not make this judgment.

way, a form can be in the intellect not in the sense of something pre-existing by which understanding takes place, but rather by which, when understood, the one understanding operates. Lonergan cites Aquinas, *De veritate*, q. 3, a. 2.

A clarification is in order. We explained that Christ knows the divine plan of redemption because he knows the actual order of reality conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness. And Christ knows the actual order of reality because he has the beatific vision. Christ's apprehension of the actual order of reality is not located in his divine knowledge. It is located in his human knowledge. It is Christ as man who has the beatific vision, not Christ as God. However, Christ's beatific knowledge, in and of itself, is not an apprehension of the actual order of reality and thus not an apprehension of the secondary end of redemption. It is an apprehension and enjoyment of the divine goodness itself. Through this apprehension Christ also apprehends the actual order of reality, the divine plan, and thus the secondary end of redemption. This is why Lonergan identifies Christ's knowledge of the actual order of reality as a "secondary object" of his beatific vision. He wants to affirm that Christ apprehends the actual order of reality through the beatific vision, but simultaneously he also wants to affirm that the beatific vision in the strict sense of the word is the apprehension of the divine goodness itself, prescinding from any apprehension of the order of reality proceeding from the decision of divine goodness.

Finally, we should take up the nature of Christ's willingness to carry out this actual order of reality. This will serve as a transition to our next section where we treat Christ's objective work. Though Lonergan would consider Christ's willingness to pursue the end intended as a product of efficient causality (internal to Christ) because of his general understanding of final causality in intellectual agents, he also noted how such efficiency is intimately connected with finality.¹³⁸ The point is that despite the technical distinction between the end as apprehended and this same apprehension as the efficient

¹³⁸ Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," 19.

cause of Christ's willingness, it is hard not to associate Christ's intentionality, under the aspect of final causality, with Christ's willingness (obedience) to fulfill the divine command. And so another clarification is in order.

Christ's human obedience to carry out the means to attain the end as apprehended is not ultimately grounded on Christ's human knowledge. His obedience is grounded on his love for the Father. As such, his obedience is not blind obedience, not obedience in any pejorative sense, but obedience flowing from his love of a person for who that person is, not on what that person commands. What the Father commands, which is the divine command common to the three divine persons, is that Christ the man carry out the ordination of divine wisdom and goodness which Christ apprehends as end. The motivation to carry this out is not based on the ordination itself, but on the love for the one commanding the ordination. Therefore, the obedience we associate with Christ's intentionality cannot properly be understood simply by affirming that Christ apprehends this end and the end as apprehended is the cause of Christ obedience. Christ's intentionality, in terms of willingness, is ultimately grounded in Christ the man's love for the Father. Christ's human knowledge *adds specification* to Christ's intentionality. This is why Lonergan stated that the impeccable will of Christ was always willing to obey before seeking a specification from his knowledge of reality.¹³⁹ In fact, Lonergan even stated that Christ the man did not know of other possible world orders conceived by divine wisdom. He only knew the actual world order chosen by divine goodness from among the possibilities conceived by divine wisdom. So Christ the man could have certainly wondered whether or not, in another world, he could have been spared the burdensome condition of giving his life for the salvation of others. But he accepted this

¹³⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *251-252 [*Supplement*, 106].

actual order of reality out of his love for the Father, out of his knowledge not of the plan *per se*, but of his knowledge of, and love for, the goodness of the Father.

We now turn to the historical causality of Christ proceeding from Christ's intentionality. That which first proceeds is Christ's objective work, otherwise known as objective redemption.

7.6 The Historical Causality of Christ: Christ's Objective Work in History

Christ's objective work in history was treated by Lonergan in his third chapter. This work considered in and of itself corresponds to what the Christian tradition terms objective redemption. This is not the focus in Lonergan's final chapter, but it is certainly presupposed and he does touch on it in his article "Christ the Head." That article explains the transition from objective redemption to subjective redemption because it explains how "...what is done in Christ is now done in and for the whole body" (*quod in Christo perficitur, hoc iam in toto et pro toto perficitur*).¹⁴⁰

What is done *in Christo* is objective redemption, although Christ does his objective work not primarily for himself but for others. That work, when it is now done in and for the whole body, applies to subjective redemption and thus assumes unification of head and members. We will treat that in the next section. For now, the point is that the objective work of Christ considered in itself prescinds from (1) any unification of head and members such that the members appropriate this objective work, and (2) any unification of head and members such that Christ's ongoing work is mediated through the members by similar operations produced in the members.

¹⁴⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, *258 [*Supplement*, 109].

Since the work of Christ produces effects, the objective work of Christ produces objective effects in Christ himself. Lonergan understands these effects through the categories of the payment of the price, meritorious obedience, satisfaction, sacrifice, and intercession. The power of the resurrection, which was also a category in his third chapter, is not ignored. It is operative in Christ's objective work understood through the category of intercession. Celestial intercession or mediation proceeds from Christ's ascension to the right hand of the Father, and the ascension proceeds from the resurrection. So the "power" of the resurrection is not simply the power of the resurrection in and of itself, but the full meaning bound up with the fact of Christ's resurrection: that Christ has now been made Lord and Savior, that Christ is now the eternal High Priest sitting at the right hand of the Father, that Christ is interceding forever on our behalf. This is why Lonergan stated, in his third chapter, that scriptural passages on the resurrection are not only meant to call to mind the means of redemption but also the Mediator of our salvation.

In relation to those who are saved, this objective work of Christ is not redemption in act but redemption in potency, as offer, as work done for the sake of every person in human history without implying that every person in history is saved. In Christ himself, this redemption is in act, meaning that it is a true effect regardless of whether any person accepts the offer of salvation.

Salvation comes through the appropriation of Christ's objective work. For Lonergan, at this time in his career, this appropriation is initiated when one enters into the Kingdom of God, the Church, since he equated these two when he wrote the *Supplement*. However, the work of appropriation is still the objective, proper work of Christ.

7.7 The Historical Causality of Christ: Christ's Objective Work Applied to the Members

The article "Christ the Head" functions as a bridge from objective redemption to subjective redemption. The work of Christ resolved into the cause titled "Christ the Head" not only recalls Christ's objective work but it is primarily meant to explain the application of Christ's objective work to his members such that what has been done in the head is now done in and for the whole body.

Lonergan faces a challenge to explain this causal relationship. There is no ready-made metaphysical category for explaining the causal relationship. He certainly does not want to use the categories of efficient or exemplary causality:

It is true that Christ is the efficient cause of our performance of salutary works...It is true that Christ is the exemplar of Christian life...but it is not true that Christ's entire work on our behalf is reduced to the category of efficient and exemplar causality, since redemption as a means, or, as it is sometime called, objective redemption, means more than that.¹⁴¹

What Lonergan is essentially explaining here is that if Christ's work, such as satisfaction, is appropriated such that the body has *already* made satisfaction, then it is meaningless to understand this causal relationship in terms of efficient or exemplary causality. For efficient and exemplary causality are only meaningful in reference to the production of similar operations in the members. This is a judgment made by Lonergan which is only meaningful if one understands Lonergan's context informing his judgment on what aspects of the work of Christ qualify as efficient causality. This needs a bit of explanation.

¹⁴¹ "Verum est Christum esse causam efficientem ut nos opera salutaria ponamus...Verum est Christum esse exemplar vitae christianae...sed verum non est totum Christi opus pro nobis ad rationem efficientis et exemplaris reduci, cum plus dicat redemptio ut medium seu, uti quandoque nominatur, redemptio obiectiva." *DBM*, *261 [*Supplement*, 110-111].

Lonergan resolves the historical causality of Christ into its causes. How each “cause” is to be interpreted through classical metaphysical categories depends on the context in which one is trying to understand the work under investigation. Lonergan understands the work of the Lord with a view towards the end intended, the big picture if you will. This is more easily explained through example. Take the example of grace. On the one hand, we could say that Christ’s communication of grace is proper to Christ alone, which it is. We could also say that this communication falls under the category of extrinsic causality, which it does. The causal sequence, in this context, is Christ as cause and the reception of grace as effect. In this context, the causal relationship can be understood according to efficient causality since that *by which* one receives grace is Christ’s communication of grace. In this context, Christ’s work is not mediated through others. Christ is the only cause. The work is proper to Christ.

This, however, is not Lonergan’s context. His context is wider. His is an enlarged context which includes Christ’s purpose for communicating grace. In the more limited context, the communication of grace does liberate the sinner from bondage to sin. In the wider context, this liberation enables the members to mediate Christ’s work. The purpose is to liberate the one who receives grace from the bondage of sin so as to set up similar operations of satisfaction, merit, sacrifice, and intercession in the members of Christ’s body. Recall how Lonergan began his final chapter. He recalled how the evangelist Luke understood the purpose of redemption. Liberated from their enemies, God’s people are free to serve God in holiness and justice. Likewise, liberated from sins, God’s people are free to serve God in holiness and justice. Serving God is had by mediating Christ’s ongoing work in history.

Christ mediates his ongoing work in history, through his members, by producing similar operations in the members. These similar operations perfect the Body of Christ and improve the total human good of order. In this wider context, the causal sequence does not “stop” in the recipient but rather the recipient is a secondary cause to mediate Christ’s work in history. Therefore, in Lonergan’s framework the criteria for using the category of efficient or exemplary causality depends on whether Christ’s work is proper to Christ or mediated through secondary causes. When the work is done in Christ, it is work proper to Christ, objective redemption. When that work is applied to others, it is still work proper to Christ even though faith and repentance are required. However, faith and repentance are not the efficient cause of the application of Christ’s objective work. They are conditions for such application. When that work is done through Christ’s members, it is not work proper to Christ alone. In this case, what is “proper” to Christ is the proportionality of the effect. But the work is mediated through secondary causes. In all three stages, it is the work of Christ. In all three stages, there is an effect correlative to the work as cause. However, in the first two stages the intelligible relation between cause and effect involves no mediation.

The foregoing explains why Lonergan reserves the categories of efficient and exemplary causality to the work of Christ which is mediated through others, that is, when there is a proper causal series from Christ as man, to his ministerial agents, to the created effect. In the application of Christ’s objective work to his members, there is no notion of mediation. Therefore neither efficient nor exemplary causality apply.

Nevertheless, there is a causal relationship when what has been done in Christ is now done in and for the whole body. The challenge for Lonergan is to explain this causal

relationship without recourse to either efficient or exemplary causality. How then is the application of Christ's objective work to be understood?

The causal relationship in the application of Christ's objective work is a mystery. We cannot understand this mystery perfectly. We can understand it imperfectly and analogically. The key analogy for Lonergan is the unification of two or more through the love which is called friendship. A friend is a second self, "half of one's soul."¹⁴² Therefore two or more persons can be as one through the unification of love.¹⁴³ Since friends are one through a union of love, then a friend can do "something" for another friend, and that "something" is a reality, not just a notion. There is a real effect. Using this analogy to understand the relation of head and members, Lonergan explains how one can understand, imperfectly and analogically, why what is done in Christ is now done in and for the whole body.

In brief, then, the historical causality of Christ involves a form of causality not to be confused with efficient or exemplary causality. It is a cause absolutely proper to Christ, that is, not mediated through further secondary causes. It presumes unification of head and members for the cause to be activated. Christ's objective work is the cause. Application of his work is the effect. How is the cause activated? It is activated through union with Christ when one becomes a member of Christ's body. In Lonergan's thought, this unification in and of itself is not a cause in the strict sense. It is a *condition* for the application of Christ's objective work.

For Lonergan, this unification is initiated through the sacrament of baptism. If we lose sight of Lonergan's context we can misinterpret him, particularly when we try to

¹⁴² *ST*, I-II, q. 28, a. 1; q. 109, a. 4, 2m.

¹⁴³ *ST*, III, q. 48, a. 2, 1m.

reconcile what the Church has taught regarding the causes of justification. The Council of Trent taught that the efficient cause of justification is God, the meritorious cause is Christ, and the instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism (DB 799; DS 1529; ND 1932). Lonergan is consistent with Trent, though when it comes to the sacrament of baptism he does not explicitly refer to this sacrament as an instrumental cause. He holds this view implicitly. In his final chapter he had called to mind the teaching that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato* (DB 851; DS 1608; ND 1318). As an instrumental cause, the sacrament in and of itself does not possess the power to confer grace. In Lonergan's notes he distributed in 1940-1941 for the course *De sacramentis in genere*,¹⁴⁴ he explains that sacraments act by signifying because Christ acts by signifying when he commands the effect of the sacrament.¹⁴⁵ Signification, on its own, does not possess the causal power proportionate to the effect. Again, we have recourse to the reality of mediate efficient causality. No instrumental cause in and of itself is proportionate to creating an effect. Baptism confers grace not because of the mechanics of the sacrament itself, but because Christ has commanded that through this sacrament grace be conferred.

¹⁴⁴ There are two sets of notes, the first titled "De sacramentis in genere: supplementum" consisting of 12 pages, and the latter titled "SUPPLEMENTUM: De sacramentis in Genere, e H. Lennerz, §§174-261," consisting of 14 pages.

¹⁴⁵ In a section of the first set of notes, subtitled *Synthesis Thomistica de Causalitate Sacramentorum*, Lonergan writes: "The foundation and first principle is that Christ the Lord as man stood forth in such a way as an efficient instrumental cause joined to the divinity that he could do all that pertained to reaching the goal of the incarnation (*ST*, III, q. 13, a. 2)." Then, anticipating the question of what "efficient instrumental cause" means, he writes that if you ask about the nature of this *efficientia instrumentalis* the answer is that "spiritual beings do not act in blind spontaneity but by commanding..." He then expands on his answer in the next section titled *Crisis Sententiarum*, writing: "There are two kinds of agent: an agent acting through intellect (this kind can choose from opposites, and puts forth its effect by commanding), and an agent acting by nature (this kind produces its effects in blind spontaneity, when the conditions for acting have been fulfilled). Now since the being of a sacrament is the being of a sign, and since action follows being, the conclusion is immediate that sacraments act by signifying. But only the one who commands the effect acts by signifying; therefore sacraments are the instruments of God who commands grace." See Bernard Lonergan, *De sacramentis in genere*, 8-11, translations by F. Crowe as cited in *Christ and History*, 42.

7.8 The Historical Causality of Christ: Christ's Work Mediated through the Members

7.8.1 Preliminary Remarks

Christ's ongoing work in history is mediated through the Body of Christ. One aspect of this ongoing work is the set of similar operations of satisfaction, merit, obedience, and intercession produced in the members. Through these similar operations the members not only mediate the work of Christ in history but are themselves perfected as members of the body. Christ directly intends this perfection because he directly intends that the members be prepared for the future life in heaven. The members can only be perfected if they become members in the first place. Therefore, Christ also intends to propagate the Body of Christ in history.

According to the principle of continuity, it is fitting that the Body of Christ is realized on earth not in an apocalyptic fashion, but rather through propagation. This propagation, if it is to conform to the principle of continuity, fittingly involves communication of, and conformation to, Christ's message. The former necessitates the preaching of the gospel. The latter necessitates faith and repentance. This propagation proceeds from Christ as mediate efficient cause and is realized within a social dynamic. The gospel is preached, understood, and actualized through human cooperation which depends on mutual understanding and agreement. This causal sequence is not a necessity, but it is intelligible and fitting given the principle of continuity. Any single person is a potential cause. Actual causes, however, are typically social agents.

Lonergan understands the propagation and perfection of the Body of Christ through the categories of efficient and exemplary causality. Propagation is primarily through efficient causality. Perfection involves both, but Lonergan's emphasis is on exemplary causality. As such, we will treat his understanding of Christ's ongoing work in history according to the division of efficient and exemplary causality.

Christ's efficient causality is operative in two ways:

One is that which he now performs in heaven seated at the right hand of the Father and living for ever interceding on our behalf...The other action is that which he performed twenty centuries ago in Palestine but which has never ceased to have an influence on history in the past and will continue to do so always, to the end of time.¹⁴⁶

In the next three sections we will treat Christ's efficient and exemplary causality. The first two sections are related to Christ's efficient causality, divided according to the distinction in action Lonergan describes in the above passage. The third section will treat Christ's exemplary causality.

7.8.2 Christ's Efficient Causality as Historical Agent

As a historical person, Christ is an agent who exerted and continues to exert efficient causality. This agency originated at a particular place and time in history. This is the work of Christ in history which Lonergan resolves into the specific cause "Christ the Historical Agent." He does not mean that Christ's historical causality is limited to the work strictly associated to the historical Jesus. When he speaks of Christ as a "historical" agent he is referring to the agency associated with Christ acting specifically as a historical

¹⁴⁶ "Nam alia est quae nunc de caelis ab eo exercetur, qui ad dexteram Patris sedet semper vivens ad interpellandum pro nobis, uti sequenti articulo dicetur. Et alia est quae ante viginti saecula olim in Palaestina peracta est, sed modo historico omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem iugiter et influxit et influet." *DBM*, *267 [*Supplement*, 113].

person. He is not implying that other categories of Christ's agency are not historical. They are also historical since they produce historical effects.

Historical agency can be individual or social, but it is highly unlikely that individual agency will create a lasting effect without social agency. Lonergan certainly knows that originating ideas come from the creative genius or the creative minority, to use Toynbee's terminology.¹⁴⁷ However, ideas are rarely actualized without the cooperation of others. For Lonergan, human cooperation is the foundation of virtually the whole of human causality.¹⁴⁸ We need to explain why he holds this position.

Human beings desire particular goods. They desire these goods on a recurrent basis. A human being is also an agent acting through intellect, meaning that he or she can understand the conditions which need to be fulfilled in order to produce an effect. The effect desired is the recurrent availability of particular goods. What determines the conditions? God's governance of the actual world order ultimately determines the conditions. For Lonergan, the intelligibility of actual world order is explained through the theory of emergent probability. It is thus emergent probability which governs any requisite conditions for a potential cause to be an actual cause.

There is however an overriding condition which precedes any particular condition whatsoever. Lonergan noted earlier in the *Supplement* that no created being is capable of unconditioned operation.¹⁴⁹ What he means is that every finite efficient cause is conditioned. Finite causes are conditioned in two ways. First, to exercise efficient causality assumes the fundamental conditions that there is an object, a patient if you will, upon which the finite cause acts in the first place. However, no finite cause is capable of

¹⁴⁷ Toynbee, *A Study of History*, 533.

¹⁴⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *236 [*Supplement*, 100].

¹⁴⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 74 [*Supplement*, 30-31].

creating. God alone can create. Second, every finite cause presupposes the fulfillment of other, specific conditions which place the cause and the object of its influence in an appropriate relationship such that the cause can actually produce an effect in the object. Unless these conditions are fulfilled, a finite cause cannot produce an effect.¹⁵⁰ It is true that *another* finite cause can fulfill one or more of these conditions. But that finite cause is also operating according to efficient causality, and so its efficient causality is also conditioned. Going down this route ends up in an infinite regression and so we can judge with Lonergan that no finite cause is proportionate to fulfilling the conditions. Only God is proportionate to fulfilling the conditions.¹⁵¹ Hence the judgment that no created being is capable of unconditioned operation.

Furthermore, and this is the critical point, it is very rare for all the requisite conditions to be fulfilled by a single agent. Even though any one of us can be a cause in potentiality, it is another matter to be a cause in actuality. We need others to fulfill the conditions so that we can be *actual* causes in the production of a recurrent series of particular goods. This is why human causality, especially in modern cultures which have so many series of particular goods, is so dependent on human cooperation. There are conditions for any created cause to produce an effect, and those conditions are not so low in number or trivial in nature that a single person can fulfill all the requisite conditions.

The foregoing is an interpretation of why, in Lonergan's thought, human causality is essentially a communitarian enterprise. Since there are no divine afterthoughts in the design and governance of world order, the principle of continuity can be used to understand Christ's efficient causality as a historical agent. Christ's agency as a

¹⁵⁰ Lonergan, *The Supernatural Order*, 123.

¹⁵¹ The implication, as noted by Lonergan in *De ente supernaturali*, is not only that God creates and conserves, but God also applies every finite cause to its action. See *The Supernatural Order*, 123.

historical person is not exempt from the practical need of human cooperation to fulfill requisite conditions such that potential causes become actual causes. Therefore, it is fitting that Christ's work is mediated through others who understand and agree. Since Christ is an agent acting through intellect he can and does influence other agents acting through intellect, resulting in a proper causal series. The causal series began in Palestine. The series radiates outwards, in space and time, through generation after generation. In this series, Christ acting as God remains the principal efficient cause. And Christ acting as man is the principal secondary cause.

These are true judgments regardless of the time elapsed, the space traversed, or the number of secondary causes involved in the causal series. In Lonergan's understanding of causality, the reason why the principal cause is precisely principal cannot be defended in terms of spatiotemporal proximity. The inclination to use this as a criterion is a product of picture-thinking, of allowing the imagination to control how one is to understand the axiom "God operates in everything that operates." Causality is real because there is a real relation of dependence in an effect as influenced by a cause. This is true regardless of whether God uses secondary causes or not, or how many secondary causes are involved in the causal sequence. God is really, and not in name only, the efficient cause of every event.¹⁵² When we apply this to the agency of Christ the historical person, it is not only true that he is the principal secondary cause of the causal sequence, but it is equally true that he remains the principal secondary cause no matter the time elapsed, no matter the space traversed, no matter the number and generations of secondary causes who mediate his work in history. The intelligible relation of dependence can always be traced back to Christ the historical person as cause.

¹⁵² Lonergan, "On God and Secondary Causes," 62.

The foregoing provides a general explanation of why a principal cause remains a principal cause even in a causal series that traverses time and space. Since history is concrete, Lonergan does not leave us with a vague notion of how to understand this causal series. He explains the nature of the agency. The ultimate ground of the reason why Christ the historical person remains principal cause in the causal series is because Christ is an agent acting through intellect. A single idea from a single agent acting through intellect can effectively determine a flow of human operations in history. As an agent acting through intellect, Christ influences other agents acting through intellect. He informs an indefinite number of acts of the will through history. As such, this aspect of Christ's historical causality is real and ongoing. It is to be interpreted as a proper causal series beginning with the agency of Christ the historical person (*A*), mediated through others (*B*), producing historical effects (*C*). The historical effects are the propagation and perfection of the Body of Christ. Christ is the mediate efficient cause. His members are ministerial agents (secondary causes). The effect is only proportionate to Christ, therefore the effect depends more on Christ than on the members.

Though the effect depends more on Christ than on Christ's members, Christ's agency is adapted to human persons:

In addition, Christ's action, although mediated socially and historically, is personal and is adapted to human persons. For the Word became flesh in order to be for human persons an expressive sign of a divine person (cf. Art. 3). Since human knowledge begins from the senses, the Word of God became perceptible.¹⁵³

Governing this statement is the principle of continuity. It was appropriate that Christ's agency be mediated through others according to the nature of human

¹⁵³ "Praeterea, actio Christi, quamvis socialiter et historice medietur, et personalis est et humanis personis accommodatur. Verbum enim caro factum est ut personis humanis fiat signum divinae personae expressivum (cf. art. III). Cum enim humana cognitio a sensu incipiat, Dei Verbum factum est sensibile." *DBM*, *273-274 [*Supplement*, 116].

communication. Human communication is based on signs and symbols, as Lonergan explained in his first chapter. He explained there that the first and basic medium of human communication is the human body. The body, as a medium of communication, is constitutive of what Lonergan later described in *Method* as “incarnate meaning:”

Incarnate meaning combines all or at least many of the other carriers of meaning. It can be at once intersubjective, artistic, symbolic, linguistic. It is the meaning of a person, his way of life, of his words, or of his deeds. It may be his meaning for just one other person, or for a small group, or for a whole national, or social, or cultural, or religious tradition.¹⁵⁴

In that first chapter, Lonergan also elaborated that if the whole body manifests the hidden movements of the soul, then articulate speech and its transmission admits of a far greater development and specialization.¹⁵⁵ He is referring here to what he later described in *Method* as “linguistic meaning:” meaning mediated through speech or writing.

In Lonergan’s first chapter, in his article on signs and symbols, he did not provide an explicit definition of the “meaning” (*sensus*) of signs.¹⁵⁶ We do have an explicit definition in *Insight*, which is consistent with a later definition in *Method*.¹⁵⁷ In each text, in so far as meaning is simply cognitive, what is meant is the real. The real is known through experience, understanding, and judgment. The term of meaning is the meant, the known. A formal act of meaning is conceptualization, but a full act of meaning includes judgment on whether that conceptualization is true. An instrumental act of meaning is an expression, a sensible manifestation of a full act of meaning, for example through gestures, deeds, speech, or writing.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁴ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 73.

¹⁵⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, 20 [Supplement, 9].

¹⁵⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 22 [Supplement, 10].

¹⁵⁷ Lonergan, *Insight*, 329-330, 592-594; *Method in Theology*, 73-79, 356.

¹⁵⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 592; *Method in Theology*, 74.

Christ's communication of incarnate meaning, which includes linguistic meaning, is an instrumental act of meaning, a sensible manifestation of his full act of meaning. This communication then informs the very meaning of the Body of Christ. Christ communicates his individual meaning to his members, and this meaning is meant to become common meaning. The Body of Christ is a community, and community is not just a group of people in spatiotemporal proximity, but an achievement of common meaning.¹⁵⁹ Just as a full act of meaning in the individual involves experiencing, understanding, and judging, common meaning includes the common field of experience, common understanding, and common judgment. In terms of constitutive or effective meaning, we add the elements of decision and action. In this regard, common meaning includes common commitment and common action intended to achieve a course of action proceeding from a common understanding and agreement (judgment).

Thus, Christ's efficient causality includes the communication of meaning, but in a way fittingly commensurate with the nature of human communication because of the principle of continuity. Christ's communication of meaning is meant to produce common meaning within the Body of Christ. That common meaning is not simply cognitive meaning, but constitutive and effective meaning. The members mediate Christ's agency in history to produce actual effects in accord with Christ's intentionality. These effects are the propagation and the perfection of the Body of Christ, and improvement in the overall human situation.

Though Christ is the mediate efficient cause in this proper causal series, the members of the body cannot perform works as a secondary cause without the assistance of grace. One might expect therefore that the *Supplement* would include a significant

¹⁵⁹ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 79.

treatment of grace. This is not the case, at least in my interpretation. This is easily explained. There are two primary reasons.

First, Lonergan is not one to rehearse significant developments which he had already addressed in his corpus. To produce a theology of grace, in and of itself, is a significant and difficult undertaking. Prior to the *Supplement*, he had already written a substantial systematic theology of grace, *De ente supernaturali*.¹⁶⁰ He did not feel the need to rehearse what is otherwise a large systematic effort.

Second, Lonergan's explanation of the historical causality of Christ focuses on extrinsic causality. He would consider the imperfect and analogical understanding of grace operative within the human person as knowledge known through intrinsic causes, just as he had stated that the intrinsic causes of Christ are dealt with in the treatise on Christ's ontological constitution.¹⁶¹ For example, in *De ente supernaturali*, Lonergan's first thesis assumes the doctrine that intellectual creatures can and do obtain God as he is in himself. The purpose of the thesis is to explain how this is possible.¹⁶² The thesis *already assumes* the uncreated communication of divine nature to intellectual creatures. If one is focused on extrinsic causality, the focus will then be on the uncreated communication of the divine nature rather than the intrinsic causes of grace, as is the focus of *De ente supernaturali*. Not surprisingly, the *Supplement's* treatment of grace

¹⁶⁰ Lonergan composed *De ente supernaturali* in 1946 for his course on grace, "*De Gratia*," given at the Jesuit Seminary, Toronto, during the academic year 1947-48. This is Lonergan's most extensive and systematic treatment of grace.

¹⁶¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *285 [*Supplement*, 121].

¹⁶² The first thesis of *De ente supernaturali* reads as follows: "There exists a created communication of the divine nature, which is a created, proportionate, and remote principle whereby there are operations in creatures through which they attain God as he is in himself." Lonergan, *The Supernatural Order*, 1. The created communication of the divine nature is sanctifying grace. Sanctifying grace is the created, proportionate, and remote principle of the *proximate* principle, the habit of charity, by which there are operations which attain God *in se*. These operations are acts of charity in the will.

focuses on the uncreated communication of divine nature. That focus is most explicit in Lonergan's final article where he answers the question *cur Deus homo?*

In Lonergan's theology of grace, the uncreated communication of divine nature to intellectual creatures is the efficient (extrinsic) cause of the created communication of divine nature in the intellectual creature. In *De ente supernaturali*, this created communication (created, habitual grace) is explained as the remote principle of the habit of charity. In turn, the habit of charity is explained as the proximate principle of operations (acts) of charity by which God is attained as God is in God's self. In *De ente supernaturali*, Lonergan focuses on the intelligibility to be had in the intelligible relationships between the remote principle (habitual grace), the proximate principle (habit of charity), and the operation (act of charity). The focus is on intrinsic intelligibility, that which is intelligible in itself. This does not exhaust the intelligibility, since there is an extrinsic cause. However, one can treat this intrinsic intelligibility in its own right.

In the *Supplement*, Lonergan does not ignore the role of sanctifying grace, the infused virtues and gifts of the Holy Spirit, or sacramental grace. Yet there is a focus on the uncreated communication of the divine nature, the gift of the Holy Spirit. Even here, the most extensive treatment of uncreated grace in the *Supplement* is not meant to explain why God chooses to communicate grace in the first place. It is meant to explain why God chooses to communicate this grace through one who is both divine and human. *That* grace enables one to perform truly supernatural works is assumed. Lonergan had already worked out his own systematic understanding of this in *De ente supernaturali*. *Why* God chooses to communicate grace through a God-man is a different question. For Lonergan,

the answer to this “why” is one of the reasons for the God-man, part of his explanation of *cur Deus homo*.

Cur Deus homo is of course also the title of Anselm’s famous work.¹⁶³ It is inconceivable that Lonergan’s treatment of the question is not meant to provide a contrast to Anselm. It is not my purpose here to provide a full interpretation of Lonergan’s answer. My intent is to uncover how his answer informs his understanding of the historical causality of Christ.

The final article where Lonergan takes up the question *cur Deus homo* begins with the judgment that to ask “why?” is to ask about a cause. His question is not so much on how Christ as cause does what he does, but rather why Christ is the type of cause that he is. The question in a certain respect is related to the question of final causality. It is a question of why it is fitting that the end of redemption be brought about not just by one who is divine, but by one who is both divine and human.

Lonergan’s answer is that the Son of God became man to communicate divine friendship to God’s enemies in due order. The key to why this communication is from one who is both divine and human is the qualification *in due order*. Before we attend to this we will explain what this communication is in itself.

Divine friendship is the mutual benevolent love proper to the divine persons. It is the friendship in which the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit necessarily and eternally will divine good to each other. Since this willing of divine good is common to all three divine persons, it is the divine goodness itself, the good by essence which only

¹⁶³ St. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, trans. Sidney Norton Deane (Chicago: Open Court Publishing, 1903; Fort Worth, TX: RDMc Publishing, 2005). Lonergan’s source was the Latin text edited by Schmitt. See F. S. Schmitt, ed., *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946).

applies to God. Lonergan explained this in his first chapter. Friendship with God means that divine goodness itself, which is both eternal and proper to the divine persons alone, is communicated to intellectual creatures *in time* such that it then becomes common or shared by intellectual creatures. Specifically, this communication is communication of proceeding Love itself, the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit.¹⁶⁴ The distinction between communication of divine goodness itself and communication of proceeding Love is based on the scholastic distinction between essential and notional attributes of God.¹⁶⁵

God could have communicated God's friendship directly from heaven. However, the qualification that this communication is in *due order* is a qualification meaning that God works according to the divine plan of redemption conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness. Since this plan is in harmonious continuation with the actual order of reality, it is fitting that this divine plan of redemption be carried out through (1) secondary causes, (2) in accordance with their natures, and (3) in accordance with the nature of friendship. The first is the principle of cause. The second is the principle of continuity. The third includes the principle of the extension of friendship.

Without the last principle Lonergan would not be able to offer fitting reasons for the God-man. God communicates grace through the God-man because it is customary for God to act through secondary causes according to the principle of cause. However, this

¹⁶⁴ Lonergan, *DBM*, *286 [*Supplement*, 121].

¹⁶⁵ Essential and notional attributes are conceptually distinct but really identical. Essential attributes are those founded in the very formality of the divine essence. Notional attributes are those that imply one or another real relation and thus cannot be predicated of all the divine persons but only that person whose relation it is. To communicate God's friendship to human beings, understood in terms of *sending*, implies a real relation of origin. The Father and Son are properly called "notionally loving" inasmuch as they are the principle from which divine love proceeds. The Holy Spirit is properly named "proceeding love" or "notional love" because the term implies a relation of origin to the Father and the Son. Therefore, communication of divine friendship is communication of mutual benevolent love, and this communication is communication of "proceeding Love" itself, the Holy Spirit. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 263-265; 353-357; 413.

secondary cause cannot be a human person *simpliciter*. The principle of cause would be preserved, but that person would not be a friend of God by his own right. The principle of the extension of friendship is only preserved if this person is a friend of God by his own right. Only a divine person subsisting in a human nature preserves both of these principles. With respect to the communication of uncreated grace, Lonergan's answer to *cur Deus homo* not only explains why God chooses to communicate his goodness to finite creatures but also why he chooses to communicate it the way he does, that is, through a God-man. Ultimately, God communicates his goodness to finite creatures so that enemies of God can become friends of God. God communicates this grace through the God-man because it is fitting to do so in accordance with both the principle of cause and the principle of the extension of friendship.

The principle of continuity also adds to Lonergan's fitting reasons for the God-man. However, this has more to do with Christ as exemplary cause, not the efficient cause of the communication of uncreated grace. We will treat that when we come to our section on Christ as Exemplar. But before we do so I will return to Lonergan's understanding of sacramental grace.

Christ's action in history, mediated through the Church, brings about and deepens the renewal of the interior person through the grace conferred in the sacraments, grace *ex opere operato* (DB 844, 851; DS 1601, 1608; ND 1311, 1318).¹⁶⁶ Lonergan does not treat sacramental grace to any large extent. Again, since his focus is on extrinsic causality, his focus is on Christ as mediate efficient cause of the sacraments even though there are ministers of the sacraments operating as secondary causes. The ministers of the sacraments have the power to confer grace, but that power comes from Christ. There is a

¹⁶⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *274 [*Supplement*, 117].

proper causal series. The effect is only proportionate to the mediate efficient cause (Christ) even though a secondary cause (the minister) is operative. Christ as mediate efficient cause of sacramental grace is not to be thought of in terms of a mechanical causal sequence. The causal sequence in sacramental grace has nothing to do with bodily contact, nothing like an artisan using an instrument to produce a work of art. In Lonergan's understanding, the grace conferred in the sacraments is *grace ex opere operato* not because Christ's human nature is some sort of literal instrument but rather because Christ commands that grace be conferred through the sacraments. He can do so because he is not limited to acting on his own physical body, that is, not limited to physical causality. Christ is an agent acting through intellect. The causal power of the sacraments is rooted in Christ's intentionality, in Christ's command, not in his human nature. His human nature is the instrument of the signification.

In summary, Lonergan's explanation of Christ's efficient causality, as a historical person, is an explanation of how Christ propagates and perfects the Body of Christ in terms of extrinsic causality. In this regard, Christ, acting as man, is a ministerial historical agent of God. Those whom Christ works through are also ministerial historical agents. Some are also ministers of the sacraments. All are called to be ministerial historical agents in the sense that Christ intends to perfect them by producing in them operations similar to which Christ produces in himself. Through these operations the members are not only perfected, not only prepared for the future life in heaven, but turned from evil to good, from enemies of God to friends of God, such that through their good works they are ministers of Christ who improve the overall human situation according to Christ's intention.

7.8.3 Christ's Efficient Causality as Ongoing Mediator

Christ continues to work in history after his death, and Lonergan understands this through the category of efficient causality. There are three basic elements in Lonergan's thought: (1) Christ mediates a new and better covenant; (2) Christ lives on interceding on our behalf; and (3) Christ maintains his priesthood forever and his offering is one, complete, and everlasting sacrifice.

Lonergan's focus is on the third element. It is true that the members of the body are to offer sacrifice as Christ has offered sacrifice. For Lonergan, a sacrifice is a proper symbol of a sacrificial attitude.¹⁶⁷ Though each member of the body is to offer their entire life to God as an expression of his or her sacrificial attitude, Lonergan's focus is on the social dimension of the sacrificial attitude, the Eucharistic sacrifice. The Eucharist is the proper symbol of the sacrificial attitude of the members of the Body of Christ.¹⁶⁸

Why is this the focus? Lonergan wants to explain the historical causality of Christ in terms of reconciliation because, for Lonergan, the entire work of Christ is summed up in reconciliation. Reconciliation is expressed metaphorically as drawing near to God, or approaching God with confidence. The focus is thus on the Eucharist because the members draw near to God and to one another through participation in the Eucharist. This does not mean that Christ's work as historical person is not also oriented to reconciliation. The entire work of Christ, resolved into causes, is oriented to reconciliation. Since Lonergan is proceeding by way of analysis, he is selecting a category in which to discuss reconciliation. Reconciliation is an effect of participation in

¹⁶⁷ Lonergan, *De notione sacrificii*, 1. The text is available at www.bernardlonergan.com, 21900DTL040. *De notione sacrificii* will be published in vol. 19 of the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan.

¹⁶⁸ Lonergan, *De notione sacrificii*, 4.

the Eucharist. In the very mystery of the Eucharist the victim is the same and the principal priest is the same. Christ is now the eternal Priest at the right hand of the Father. It is appropriate that the category in which to explain the causal relationship between the work of Christ and the historical effect of reconciliation be under the heading of Christ as ongoing mediator.

The significance of interpersonal relationships is also clear in Lonergan's understanding of reconciliation. Reconciliation occurs through the interpersonal relationships which hold together and vivify the Body of Christ. From the outset of the *Supplement*, the importance of interpersonal relationships has been established based on Lonergan's understanding of the nature of any human good of order. Interpersonal relationships hold together and vivify any particular human good of order. The same is true for the Body of Christ. The Body of Christ is also a human good of order, but a supernatural order. So the relationships themselves are supernatural.¹⁶⁹ They are supernatural because they are ultimately grounded in the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit, proceeding Love itself. This is why Lonergan states that reconciliation comes from the Father through the Son and is accomplished *in* the Holy Spirit.

Lonergan's category of Christ as celestial mediator certainly accords with the creedal affirmation that Christ ascended into heaven. Here Lonergan is also establishing a causal link to the resurrection. He is implying that the power of the resurrection is a means of redemption rather than the death of Christ alone, in accordance with the

¹⁶⁹ This interpretation harmonizes with Lonergan's understanding of the purpose of the divine missions. Previous to the *Supplement* he stated: "...since the end of a mission involves cooperation on the part of others, a mission is carried out not so much that works be done as that new personal relations be initiated and strengthened. The end of the divine missions is not attained without the cooperation of human beings: 'He who created you without you will not justify you without you' [Augustine, *Sermo* 169]. Hence, in order to understand a divine mission, one must consider not only the works proper to the person sent but also the personal relations that the person initiates or strengthens in order that the end of the mission may be attained through the cooperation of others." See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 485.

doctrine established in his third chapter. In article 21 (“The Power of the Resurrection”) he stated that the redemption is brought about by a Mediator more than by a means, and is established upon the death *and* resurrection of Christ than upon the fact of his death alone.¹⁷⁰ The power of the resurrection includes the ascension to the right hand of the Father and the sending of the Spirit. Through this category, Lonergan is weaving into an explanation of Christ’s historical causality both the relevance of Christ’s resurrection and the relevance of Christ’s sending of the Spirit at Pentecost.

Finally, although Christ’s agency as celestial mediator is a work of Christ which originated outside of history, the effect is still within history. The work of Christ resolved in the particular cause of Christ as ongoing mediator is still constitutive of Christ’s historical causality. The effect is produced in history.

7.8.4 Christ’s Exemplary Causality

Lonergan’s explanation of Christ’s exemplary causality is not meant simply to explain how Christ’s members ought to imitate Christ. This is true but rather obvious. Lonergan’s point is that Christ’s exemplary causality is grounded in divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness, and as such reveals what he calls the “principle of the dispensation” (*principium oeconomiae*).¹⁷¹ The principle is a “...certain dispensation or ordering of reality in such a way that what is done with respect to the exemplar should of necessity be done with respect to the other members of that dispensation.”¹⁷²

¹⁷⁰ Lonergan, *DBM*, 142 [*Supplement*, 58].

¹⁷¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *254 [*Supplement*, 107].

¹⁷² “...quamdam oeconomiam seu rerum ordinationem ut, quod in exemplari factum sit, etiam in caeteris fiat necesse est; et sic Christus per modum exemplaris nostram salutem operatus est.” *DBM*, *254 [*Supplement*, 107].

The principle itself is clear from scripture. Those whom God foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son (Rom 8:29).¹⁷³ The principle is revealed through the life of Christ, both with respect to who Christ is and what Christ does. If we can determine the principle as concretely realized in the life of Christ, we can explain how it should fittingly apply to Christ's members. This is Lonergan's approach.

For Lonergan, there are three basic elements determined in the life of Christ that are also, by way of an exemplar, to be realized in Christ's members. These elements are based on (1) the Father's relationship to Christ, (2) who Christ is in himself, and (3) what Christ does.

The Father's Relationship to Christ: God the Father loves as his natural Son Christ the man. Since what is true concerning the exemplar himself ought to be true for us, then the Father loves us with a similar love. The Father's love for the Son is Proceeding Love itself, the Holy Spirit. Fittingly, this love is communicated to Christ's members according to exemplary causality. Through the sending of the Spirit the members receive created, sanctifying grace, and are made adopted children of the Father. Lonergan makes the link between uncreated and created grace by stating that the Holy Spirit has us as its "term" (*terminetur*).¹⁷⁴ The notion of adoption is a fitting analogy since it is an exemplar of filiation yet it preserves the distinction between a child of God according to nature (Christ) and children of God according to grace (Christ's members).

¹⁷³ Lonergan, *DBM*, *254 [*Supplement*, 107-108].

¹⁷⁴ *DBM*, *256 [*Supplement*, 108]. Lonergan's use of the Latin *terminetur* is based on his understanding of a divine mission. The mission of a divine person is wholly constituted by a divine relation of origin and nothing more. But what is predicated contingently of a divine person has no correspondence of truth without an appropriate created term, that is, a term external to God. To predicate that a divine person has been sent is a contingent predication for there is no absolute necessity that a divine person be sent. With respect to the mission of the Spirit, Lonergan is stating here that the uncreated gift of the Spirit is sent to us and the appropriate external term is created, sanctifying grace. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 457.

Who Christ is: Since Christ is a divine person operating in a human nature, Christ not only has human powers but also habits and acts which are supernatural. Again, since what is true concerning the exemplar ought to be true for the members, the operations of the members ought to be modeled on the pattern of a divine person operating in a human nature. As such, along with sanctifying grace the members receive the infused virtues, gifts of the Holy Spirit, and actual graces (movements of the Spirit).

What Christ does: Lonergan states that, according to the principle of exemplarity, it behooves us to complete what are lacking in the sufferings of Christ (Col 1:24). The members are to suffer with him so that they may be glorified with him (Rom 8:17).¹⁷⁵ Lonergan identifies the pattern of Christ's suffering, death, resurrection, and glorification as Christ's "principal acts" (*principalibus actibus*), though he notes that the principle of exemplarity applies to Christ's other actions as well.¹⁷⁶

This pattern implicitly refers to the law of the cross, which Lonergan explained in his fourth chapter. I have no doubt that for Lonergan *the* principal act of Christ which the members are to imitate is self-sacrificing love that returns good to evil done such that God can transform evil into good. In no other way does God draw good out of evil than according to this law. It is appropriate to refer to this principle act as the "law of the cross" precisely because the term "law" is the meaning of the cross *generalized* in such a way that it applies to Christ as well as to the whole economy of salvation. For Lonergan, the law of the cross is *the* governing principle in the economy of salvation.

Our choosing this law, understood according to exemplary causality, involves (1) grasping the intelligibility of this principle, (2) judging this principle to be true, and (3)

¹⁷⁵ Lonergan, *DBM*, *256 [*Supplement*, 109].

¹⁷⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, *257 [*Supplement*, 109].

judging this principle to be of utmost value and thus worthy to be chosen. This process is what Lonergan had, in “Essay on Fundamental Sociology,” described as an effective assent to the intellectual form.¹⁷⁷ This affective assent is an act of love for the intelligible form such that the individual or community is not merely swept up and predetermined by the physical flow of history. To be swept up by the physical flow of history is to be swept up in the reign of sin, to accept the *status quo*, as to either (1) shrink from the redemptive suffering that would return good to evil, or (2) perpetually return evil to evil in a vicious cycle of violence as if this would solve the underlying problem. Either way, the action performatively treats the absurd as if it were intelligible.

No doubt there are some, whether individuals, groups, or even nations, who do so without even realizing they are doing so. For them, to return good to evil is counterintuitive, folly, weakness. No doubt, there are those who see this approach for what it is: counterproductive and bound for failure. They know this intellectually, but they performatively choose to return evil for evil anyway, because returning good to evil is simply not a value, or perhaps not valuable enough. The law of the cross is not able to trump the other values they hold, even if those other values, from a theological perspective, are only apparent values. In no way am I suggesting that there are not cases where returning evil to evil may be necessary. For example, Lonergan’s understanding of the law of the cross is not one that suggests we should abandon our legal system, a system that returns the evil of punishment (for example, incarceration) to the evil of sin (for example, crime). In my interpretation, although Lonergan would acknowledge such cases, these are not to be used as argumentative examples to undermine the fact that God

¹⁷⁷ Lonergan, “Essay on Fundamental Sociology,” 2.

has revealed that, *all else being equal*, it is God's will that we return good to evil done in accordance with the law of the cross.

For Lonergan, at the very heart of subjective redemption is the liberation of human beings from a mindset that either (1) shrinks from redemptive suffering that would return good to evil, or (2) perpetually returns evil to evil in a vicious cycle of violence. Evil is an objective absurdity, and it invites a choice. For Lonergan, if we refuse to suffer evils willingly we deny that the absurd is absurd and therefore to be endured. Responding to evil with evil treats the absurd as if it were intelligible. The reign of sin only propagates. A real solution to the problem of evil is one that reverses this absurd propagation in history to improve the human situation. However, returning good to evil is counterintuitive to sinful human nature. As Lonergan notes in *DVI*, the law of the cross is recognized only through the Holy Spirit.¹⁷⁸ The one who has not been enlightened by the Holy Spirit, the one who does not have the mind of Christ, will judge that the law of the cross is folly.¹⁷⁹

The historical causality of Christ that overcomes this sinful mindset involves a proper causal series. This needs a bit of explanation. Since both the Head and members are agents acting through intellect, there is a causal series originating from divine wisdom, mediated through the agency of Christ as man, communicated to Christ's members, such that both Christ as man and his members perform operations according to the model that is the law of the cross. The communication of this law from God to Christ as man, and from Christ as man to Christ's members, are each instances of exemplary causality. The communication of grace through efficient causality makes it possible to

¹⁷⁸ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 574.

¹⁷⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 573.

return good to evil in the first place. The communication of grace, understood according to efficient causality, heals and elevates the human person to be able to perform such an operation. For Lonergan, this communication of grace has a wider scope. The communication of grace is not simply the communication of divine friendship under the aspect of efficient causality. Lonergan's answer to *cur Deus homo* reveals a deeper meaning. There is also revelatory grace, which is to be understood according to exemplary causality. The grace of revelation instructs the minds and hearts of the members as to how to act according to this law.

Christ's communication of the law of the cross, understood in terms of exemplary causality, complements Christ's communication of grace, understood in terms of efficient causality. In fact, a substantial influence underlying Lonergan's fitting reasons for the God-man is the influence of exemplary causality. It is fitting that human beings know this law, know it as precept, and have an example to follow. However, in order for it to be known and known as precept, it must be taught and believed. Human beings are incapable of knowing this law through immanently generated knowledge. Most importantly, human beings learn through linguistic and incarnate meaning. Even if we know this law, we are more likely to choose it if we have a leader, an exemplar who has chosen it first so that we might choose it too. The principle of continuity takes into account the nature of human communication and its relationship to human imitation. According to the principle of continuity, it was appropriate that divine agency communicate and exemplify this law incarnately in Christ. This is one of Lonergan's reasons for the God-man.

From the perspective of Christ, the law of the cross is communicated through linguistic and incarnate meaning. From the perspective of his members, it is received as intelligible and recognized as an utmost value. As an utmost value, it is a good worthy to be chosen. All this is had through the assistance of the Spirit. Since the Body of Christ is a supernatural good of order constituted by common meanings and values, the law of the cross is meant to become a common meaning and value of the Church. When the law of the cross becomes a common meaning and value, the members, collectively, are much more likely to be actual causes in transforming evil into good rather than merely potential causes. The reason goes back to the social nature of human causality. A member of Christ's body is more likely to be an actual cause when he or she is linked with others. Effective cooperation with Christ is fundamentally a social reality.

7.9 Summary

Loneragan made a distinction between redemption as end and redemption as means. In his final chapter, his focus is on the latter. Redemption as end is considered inasmuch as it lays the foundation for the study of redemption as means. As end, it is first in intention. As end, it is the created effect. Causality in history is not real unless there is a created effect, since there is no change in the cause as cause. For this reason, he stated at the beginning of the chapter that if we neglect the end we have a poor knowledge of the means, and that if we ignore the effect we have a poor knowledge of its cause. He starts with the end, the effect, in order to understand the means, the cause.

Understanding the means is equivalent to understanding the cause of redemption. God is the absolute first cause. God's agency entered human history through Christ.

Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ is essentially an understanding of God's entry into human history, into "man's making of man," mediated through Christ. Christ as God shares this ultimate agency with the three divine persons. Christ as man is a secondary, ministerial agent of God. All aspects of Christ's work prescind from Christ's intentionality and are oriented to redemption as end. The ultimate end is the divine goodness itself, outside of history. There is a secondary end within history, the Body of Christ. It is an end because it possesses the goodness of the primary end, and is loved by Christ for its own sake. The historical causality of Christ, as means to this end, is the inauguration, propagation, and perfection of his body in history. Through incorporation into his body, members are reconciled to God and to one another. This reconciliation restores the historical order of the universe. Since a part exists for the sake of the whole, this restoration restores the order of the universe itself. How does Christ gather all earthly realities to himself? For Lonergan, he does so by gathering and reconciling the historical order to himself.

Finally, Lonergan's understanding of the historical causality of Christ is not understanding of a new truth. It is a more comprehensive understanding of an existing truth, the doctrine of redemption. What he has presented amounts to what in *Divinarum personarum* he calls a "new step" in comprehension: a theology that is more concrete and more comprehensive that both deals with and seeks to understand the economy of salvation as it evolves historically.¹⁸⁰ His understanding of the historical causality of Christ represents an answer to a question of intelligence that seeks more fully to understand the mystery of redemption given the advent of historical consciousness. We will explain this in our conclusion.

¹⁸⁰ Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 753.

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS

In our introduction, we noted Bernard Lonergan's comment to Frederick Crowe, in August 1972, that the *Supplement* was to be an addition to his book *De Verbo Incarnato (DVI)*. In our conclusion, I will begin with a brief hypothesis explaining what I believe to be the relationship between the *Supplement* and *DVI*.

8.1 The *Supplement's* Relation to *De Verbo Incarnato*: A Hypothesis

In a Q&A session at the 1974 Lonergan Workshop, Bernard Lonergan was asked what he was currently doing in Christology:

Question: Would you say something about what you are now doing in Christology as distinct from what you did in *De Verbo Incarnato*?

Lonergan: Well, what I am now doing in Christology is nothing!...When you write a textbook in theology, you do what you can, for the rest you hand out the *commune doctorum*. One of the things that I wanted to treat and worked toward treating but never got around to actually putting it in a thesis form, is the historical causality of Christ. It is the sort of thing that you need the theory of history and Christ as historical cause; even to communicate the notions connected with it in Latin would be a matter of some difficulty, which I did not altogether surmount, didn't get around to doing when I was teaching. But it is a fundamental question, a fundamental issue, and it's perhaps the expression in our time of Christ the King, Christ the historical cause fit in more with the way people have been thinking. Categories that have meaning, a category more than a symbol.¹

In this statement Lonergan refers to the historical causality of Christ that he wanted to treat *and worked toward treating*. It is inconceivable that this unnamed work is not the *Supplement*. Lonergan did not forget this text.² In his response quoted above, there is concrete evidence that he intended to put the *Supplement*, or part thereof, into thesis form.

¹ Lonergan Workshop Q&A, June 19, 1974. Transcription available at 812A0DTE070 / TC 812 A&B at www.bernardlonergan.com.

² I state this position in response to Frederick Crowe's comment that "the work that he [Lonergan] forgot he had written had actually treated the historical causality in 1958, and indeed had done so at some length." Crowe, *Christ and History*, 19. Crowe does however grant the possibility that Lonergan may have not counted as a "work" a manuscript he never published. I believe this to be the case.

The question is then raised about how this thesis form would be published. If it was to be an additional thesis to one of his own texts, it would have been intended as an additional thesis to *DVI*. This is supported by a statement he made in 1962:

Finally, there is the theological mediation of history, the point I have already made when I spoke about the human good as corrupted by sin and restored by the redemption. This is the notion that I developed in *Insight* in chapter 20 – well, the corruption by sin in chapters 7 and 18 and the conception, the introduction, in chapter 20 of the supernatural as the one way in which the surd of sin can be eliminated from the human good. And I have developed that in the seventeenth thesis of my notes *De Verbo incarnato* on the meaning of redemption. The meaning of the death of Christ is that death is at once the penalty of sin and the source of our salvation. There is a reversal of roles. What had been the penalty of sin becomes the source of our salvation. And that reversal of roles is the key Christian, Catholic point in history. The doctrine of loving your enemies and being good to those that hate you, that doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount, is what meets the problem of evil in human life, what breaks the venom of the virus of sin, stops it, as it were, in its tracks, transforms it into something entirely different. And that is the fundamental aspect, to my mind, of the intelligibility of history. I hope some time to add a further thesis to my *De Verbo Incarnato* that will bring that out somewhat more: the historical action of Christ.³

Given the dating of the *Supplement*, and given the statement above, the first element of my hypothesis is that the *Supplement*, considered *as a whole*, is not a supplement to *DVI*. In fact, I do not believe it was ever originally intended as a supplement to anything Lonergan wrote. I do believe, however, that after publication of *DVI* Lonergan had the subsequent intent to pull material from the *Supplement*, explicitly on the historical causality of Christ, and transpose it to thesis format with the intent of adding it to *DVI*.

This element of the hypothesis, however, does not answer the question of why Lonergan started on this project in the first place. I will reply to this question in the next section. *How* Lonergan would follow this through in a practical manner is a different question. He could have intended this to be a standalone text; a work unrelated to any

³ A lecture at Regis College where the topic was “Method in Catholic Theology:” Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method I*, 259.

course at the Gregorian. On the other hand, perhaps he intended it as a supplement to one of his courses. If this was the case, it would have been intended as a supplement to his Christology course, specifically during the cycles when he was using Boyer's manual.⁴

During his Roman period, Lonergan taught Christology seven times.⁵ For the first three courses he used Boyer's manual. As Crowe notes, Lonergan was not yet ready to provide his own manual. Using Boyer's manual meant that he was not entirely free to plot his own course and soon felt the need to write supplements on certain questions.⁶ In 1954 he produced the notes *De ratione convenientiae*. Then, in 1956, *De constitutione Christi ontologica et psychologica*. It is not an unreasonable possibility that Lonergan originally intended the text as a supplement to Boyer's manual.

⁴ Writing supplements was not uncommon. Furthermore, Lonergan had already written *De ratione convenientiae* (1954) and *De constitutione Christi ontologica et psychologica* (1956) to supplement his course while he was using Boyer's manual. As to why Lonergan would feel the need for a supplement on redemption, I can only speculate. In the next section I will indicate that Lonergan explicitly refutes any view that reduces redemption essentially to the notion of satisfaction. Boyer certainly notes that Christ's satisfaction was not necessary, but *convenientiae*. There is no disagreement with Lonergan here. Most any theologian at the time would agree to this. Nevertheless, Boyer does tend to reduce the means of redemption to the means of satisfaction, and Lonergan most certainly would have taken issue with this. In the third of Boyer's four articles on redemption, he asks: "Utrum Christus moriendo pro nobis satisfecerit?" The *status quaestionis* begins with the following statement: "Sensus tituli: Tota vis praesentis quaestionis in determinato conceptu satisfactionis reponitur. Satisfactio pluribus sensibus accipi potest. Ibi enim satisfactionis nomen rite iam usurpari potest, ubi mors unius quocumque modo alios a poena vel malo quocumque liberat: quo sensu latiori iam nobis certum est Christum pro nobis satisfecisse, cum in thesi XXV ostenderimus Christum per passionem suam a peccato et daemone nos liberasse. At satisfactio magis determinatur includendo modum quo liberatio obtineatur; ita ut determinare modum quo passio Christi pro nobis satisfecerit idem sit ac theologicam et ultimam rationem rederre ipsius redemptionis." [Meaning of the Question: The entire force of the present question is based on a determinate concept of satisfaction. Satisfaction can be taken in many senses. For instance at the present time the term satisfaction can rightly apply when the death of one in any way liberates others from punishment or evil: now in the broader sense it is certain to us that Christ has made satisfaction for us, since in thesis 25 we had shown that Christ through his passion liberated us from sin and evil spirits. But satisfaction is more accurately defined by limiting it to the means in which liberation is obtained; in such a way that to determine the means that the passion of Christ has made satisfaction for us is the same as to express the theological and ultimate meaning of redemption itself.] Boyer, *De Verbo incarnato*, 340, translation mine.

⁵ 1953-1954, 1955-1956, 1957-1958, 1959-1960, 1961-1962, 1963-1964, and finally 1964-1965. Crowe, *Christ and History*, 65.

⁶ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 65.

Evidently the Gregorian ran out of stock of Boyer's manual and Lonergan was faced with options of finding another manual or writing his own. He chose the latter, and in the course cycle 1959-1960 issued the first edition of *De Verbo incarnato*. The second edition was issued in 1961, and a third in 1964. Again, it is not unreasonable that the subsequent writing and publication of *DVI* preempted completion of the *Supplement*.

When Lonergan published *DVI*, the *Supplement* would have been in a file with an unknown future, but there is evidence suggesting Lonergan may have continued to edit the final chapter.⁷ In any event, a comparison of the structure and content of the *Supplement* to *DVI* reveals that Lonergan most likely used the *Supplement* as a primary source for Theses 15-17 of *DVI*.⁸ If this was the case, then the future of the *Supplement* would hinge on the future of chapter 6. It is quite possible, even likely, that Lonergan subsequently intended to use chapter 6 as source for the new thesis. I believe that having completed a draft of the *Supplement* in May of 1958, and having then published *DVI* in 1960 with a second revision in 1961, Lonergan had in mind the notion of transposing chapter 6 of the *Supplement* into thesis format with the intention of adding this as an additional thesis to *DVI*. For some reason, when *DVI* was published he either did not judge the material from chapter 6 as ready for publication or, as he stated in the 1974 workshop, there were difficulties he did not surmount in communicating notions of a theory of history and Christ as historical cause into Latin.

In brief, then, it is my hypothesis that Lonergan's original intent was to write a systematic treatise on redemption which included treatment of the historical causality of Christ. This was likely intended as a standalone text. However, we cannot rule out that it

⁷ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 101.

⁸ Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of the *Supplement* correspond to Thesis 15, 17, and 16 of *De Verbo Incarnato*, respectively. Also, some passages are basically verbatim between the two texts.

may have been intended as a supplement to his Christology course while he was using Boyer's manual. Regardless, once it was evident that Boyer's manual would go out of print, Lonergan wrote his own Christology manual. The *Supplement* went into a file. But he did not forget this text, and he had in mind the notion to transpose chapter 6 into thesis format with the intent of adding that thesis to *DVI*, to meet the need he called for in that very text.⁹

Next we will turn to Lonergan's question of the historical causality of Christ, and to the essential elements in his answer to this question.

8.2 The Question of the Historical Causality of Christ

8.2.1 The Origin of Lonergan's Question

Speculative theology, as with any inquiry, begins with a question. Lonergan's speculation on the historical causality of Christ is a response to a question arising from historical consciousness. Historical consciousness is the advent of a more comprehensive understanding of the human person. It is grounded in the realization that what makes a human person who she or he is cannot simply be reduced to a constant human nature. This is true to a degree. However, there is also a variable human historicity, what we make of ourselves through the historical process. Human beings are products of history and shapers of history. Our histories depend very greatly on the past, but we are free to shape the future. For the most part, we shape the future through cooperation with others.

For Lonergan, following in the footsteps of Dawson, the concept of a variable human history is bound up with the notion of culture. Very early in his career, Lonergan

⁹ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 416.

held what he termed a “classicist” notion of culture. This was a notion of culture which held a normative, idealistic, universalistic view of culture. It was a view of what culture “ought” to be. It was a stable idea, grounded on the idea of a stable human essence, informing a stable way of human life, thought to be normative for all peoples.¹⁰ Such a notion of culture may have been thought to be normative, but it was certainly not empirical. Empirical studies of concrete human living dismantled the older view.

Christopher Dawson was a pioneer in this effort,¹¹ and Lonergan’s reading of Dawson changed his notion of culture.¹² He adopted Dawson’s anthropological notion of culture, a notion of culture not as static but dynamic, not as universal but local, not as abstract but concrete, not as constant but variable. It is not a perspective denying the truth of universal human nature. It is, however, a perspective recognizing the particular and concrete aspect of human living. That concrete aspect is one of development:

While classicist culture conceived itself normatively and abstractly, modern culture conceives itself empirically and concretely. It is the culture that recognizes cultural variation, difference, development, breakdown, that investigates each of the many cultures of mankind, that studies their histories, that seeks to understand what the classicist would tend to write off as strange or uncultivated or barbaric. Instead of thinking of man in terms of a nature common to all men, whether awake or asleep, geniuses or morons, saints or sinners, it attends to men in their concrete living.¹³

¹⁰ Lonergan, “Transition from a Classicist World-View,” 5-6; “Belief: Today’s Issue,” *Second Collection*, 92.

¹¹ In Dawson’s *The Dynamics of World History*, he states: “... modern history is no longer satisfied with rhetorical narrative or moral criticism. It seeks to understand the past rather as an organic process than as a mosaic of isolated facts. It tends to pay less attention than in the past to the superficial activity of politicians and diplomatists and more to the action of the permanent social and economic forces that determine the life of peoples. Above all, it is coming to accept the new concept of Culture which has been brought into currency by the anthropologists. It recognizes that the state is not, as the nineteenth-century historians believed, the ultimate social unit and the final end of historical study. The cultural unity is both wider and deeper than that of the state. It is not an intellectual abstraction or a by-product of the political process. It is itself the fundamental social reality on which all the other social phenomena are dependent.” See *The Dynamics of World History*, 19-20.

¹² Lonergan read Dawson’s *The Age of the Gods* and credits that text for shifting his notion of culture away from a classicist understanding: “In the summer of 1930 I was assigned to teach at Loyola College, Montreal, and despite the variety of my duties was able to do some reading. Christopher Dawson’s *The Age of the Gods* introduced me to the anthropological notion of culture and so began the correction of my hitherto normative or classicist notion.” See Lonergan, “*Insight Revisited*,” *Second Collection*, 264.

¹³ Lonergan, “The Future of Christianity,” *Second Collection*, 161.

Since concrete human living is characterized by variation and development, there is in fact the notion of a person's variable human historicity. Therefore, a modern, anthropological notion of culture recognizes that culture does not automatically spring from human nature as some normative, universal reality, as if human intentionality played no role. The modern notion of culture grasped by historical consciousness recognizes that cultures are products of intentional human activity, products of the concrete meanings and values governing a particular way of life. This is why Lonergan so often referred to the historical process as "man's making of man."

In brief, then, historical consciousness raised Lonergan's awareness of the role of culture in the human situation. His understanding of cultural development is at the heart of his understanding of human development. This is a crucial point in understanding the genesis of his interest in the historical causality of Christ. His interest in history is really grounded in his insight into the influence of culture on human development, where that influence can be for better or worse, for good or evil. This is why the cultural level is most critical in his structure of the human good of order. This is why, in his thought, cultural good is the best expression of human nature, and cultural evil is the worst. This is why he judges that it is cultural evil that calls for a heaven-sent redeemer.

The juxtaposition between Lonergan's awareness of the role of culture in human development with what was already an interest in soteriology is the origin of Lonergan's question on the historical causality of Christ. The link is manifested in his early essays on history. One also finds the link in his personal notes at the time he made his breakthrough to functional specializations in theological method. In his breakthrough, he identified two phases in theology. The first phase, mediating theology, mediates the past

into the present. The second phase, mediated theology, is direct theological discourse which takes its ground from the present with an eye toward the future. The functional specialties of doctrines and systematics are part of the second phase. His handwritten notes on his breakthrough to functional specializations reveal that (1) he conceived the functional specialty of doctrines as a doctrine on history emphasizing redemption, and (2) he conceived the functional specialty of systematics (designated “explanation” in his notes) as a theological theory of history.¹⁴

Lonergan’s notes reflect his earlier insight, revealed in his student essays, on the intimate link between history and redemption. Historical process, and therefore human historicity, is not outside of the divine plan. History itself is constitutive of the actual order of reality conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness. Since there are no divine afterthoughts, there must be an intelligible link between history and redemption. The link between history and redemption grounds the heuristic notion guiding Lonergan’s effort to explain the historical causality of Christ. He understands history through the lens of redemption, and redemption through the lens of history.

8.2.2 The Nature of Lonergan’s Question

In Lonergan’s cognitional theory, he adopts from Aristotle the judgment that there are two basic types of questions. The first is on the level of understanding. They are questions for intelligence: What? Why? How? The second is on the level of judgment.

¹⁴ Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 152. On this handwritten page the four specialties of the first phase of theological method are titled research, interpretation, history, and conversion. There is a second phase also with four functional specialties, titled foundations, doctrine, explanation, and communication. In *Method in Theology*, the specialty “conversion” will be named “dialectic,” and the specialty “explanation” will be named “systematics.” This handwritten page is numbered A472 in file 7 of Batch V in the Lonergan Archives, Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto. The page can be accessed at www.bernardlonergan.com, file 47200D0E060 / A471 titled “Functional specialties: Breakthrough page.”

They are questions for reflection: Is it so? Is it true? Transposed into theology, questions for intelligence are related to systematics and questions for reflection related to doctrines.

Lonergan's question is a question for intelligence, and theologically a question for systematic theology. However, his basic question is not "what" redemption is. He does explain this in the *Supplement* because he needs to explain this as a presupposition for a separate question. His question is not primarily a question of what redemption is, but how redemption is brought about, specifically through the historical causality of Christ. Both the question of "what?" and the question of "how?" are questions for intelligence. Where the former seeks the intelligibility of a thing in itself, the latter seeks the intelligibility in another, meaning the intelligibility of how that thing is produced.

The question of "what?" was the basic question governing Lonergan's final thesis in *DVI*. There he speculated that the intrinsic intelligibility, or essence of redemption, is the law of the cross.¹⁵ In his fourth and sixth chapters of the *Supplement*, he affirms the law of the cross as the governing principle of the economy of salvation. In this respect, his thought foreshadows *DVI*.

In the *Supplement*, however, his primary question is how redemption is realized in history. So the question is more a focus on the extrinsic intelligibility of redemption rather than its intrinsic intelligibility. Since a thing is understood through its causes, extrinsic intelligibility is understood through extrinsic causes. Although redemption is a supernatural reality, it is still a created reality. As with any created reality, it must have an extrinsic cause. Only God is uncaused. Metaphysically, this means that the formal cause or essence of any created reality cannot explain itself, in other words, cannot explain why it is in act.

¹⁵ Lonergan, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 576-577.

8.2.3 Lonergan's Approach to the Answer

Lonergan's approach to an answer is by way of analysis. There are two basic elements. The first element resolves the work of Christ into specific categories applicable to both objective and subjective redemption: satisfaction, meritorious obedience, sacrifice, and intercession. Through these categories, Lonergan integrates objective and subjective redemption while allowing for distinctions. Though Christ's work is mediated through his members, it is still the work of Christ. There is distinction without separation.

The categories were established in his third chapter. In that chapter he also discussed the category of the "price paid." The reason Lonergan leaves this category behind when he comes to his final chapter is because he is now integrating subjective redemption into an understanding of the "whole work of Christ." The giving of one's life, with respect to Christ's members, is not a generalized condition applicable to each and every member as a secondary cause, as a ministerial agent of Christ. On the other hand, for Christ the giving of his life *was* a condition.

Consider Lonergan's statement from article 17 ("The Payment of the Price"):

Redemption as means [*ut medium*] refers to that process by which this state [redemption as end] arises or is brought about, not only by causality [*causalitate*] but also and especially under that condition [*conditione*] most burdensome to Christ, namely, death on the cross. The Word of God could have saved us without coming down from heaven; the incarnate Word could have saved us without going through his passion and death; but in actual fact it was through his passion and death that he did save us.¹⁶

In this passage, *redemptio* has a broader meaning than "ransom" or "payment of the price." Furthermore, the terms *causalitate* and *conditione* are found in the same sentence and contrasted. Lonergan is using these terms in the technical sense to explain

¹⁶ Lonergan, *DBM*, 127 [*Supplement*, 52]. For the Latin text, see chapter 4, section 4.2.2.

the dependence of Christ's historical causality, understood as redemption as means, on a particular condition. That condition was the giving of his life. Hypothetically, God could have saved us in any number of ways, or not at all. However, scripture is clear that God directly willed a condition for Christ to be the cause of our salvation. That condition was the burdensome condition of giving his life. God directly willed this condition not in the sense that God directly willed the evil perpetuated by those who crucified Christ. God never directly wills evil. God willed this condition in the sense that God directly willed Christ's obedience and love in accepting his suffering and death. For Lonergan, this payment of the price or ransom is a condition applicable to Christ's causality, but not applicable as a condition for the instrumental (secondary) causality exercised by Christ's members who mediate Christ's ongoing work in history. Christ died once and for all for the salvation of all. This is why, in his final chapter, the category of "payment of the price" is not included with satisfaction, merit, sacrifice, and intercession.

The second element resolves the work of Christ into its causes, its forms of agency, to understand how Christ propagates and perfects the Body of Christ in history through the categories of satisfaction, merit, sacrifice, and intercession. Propagation refers to the work of Christ in history to apply to his members the fruit of his objective work such that what has been done in Christ is now done in and for the whole body. Perfection refers to the work of Christ in history to produce similar operations in the members, that is, operations of satisfaction, merit, sacrifice, and intercession modeled on Christ. By producing similar operations in the members, Christ mediates his ongoing work in history through his members, with the intent to prepare them for the future life in heaven and to produce in them good works to improve the human situation.

Lonergan's approach also reveals an intentional concern to counter a theological reductionism which would reduce our *theoretical* understanding of the work of Christ to a specific category, say satisfaction, based on a theological method which deduces the entire work of Christ from necessary reasons. In his fifth chapter on Christ's satisfaction, at the end of article 26 ("Division of the Question"), he noted that every theory gives rise to further questions. He stated that Anselm's theory is no exception. He raised a number of questions in that chapter, the last being the following: "...must the whole work of Christ be deduced from Anselm's necessary reason, or is there some other way to come to a theological understanding of this matter?"¹⁷ In that chapter, he never answered the question.

He does answer the question, but it is found in his final chapter. There he states that he does not follow those theologians preoccupied with deducing necessary conclusions from a hypothesis of condign satisfaction or any other hypothesis, but rather he subscribes to the method of Aquinas who looked to the concrete work of Christ and put down as many reasons for it as he could, whether reasons of necessity or of appropriateness, exemplified in a series of articles and in one outstanding article.¹⁸

This comment raises two points relevant to our interpretation of his theological approach. First, Lonergan is interested in understanding the concrete work of Christ. He is not interested in abstract theories of the work of the Lord deduced from hypothetical necessities. Just as in *Insight* he used an empirical approach to developing his cognitional theory, in the *Supplement* he uses an empirical approach to derive an imperfect and analogical understanding of Christ's historical causality. Relevant

¹⁷ Lonergan, *DBM*, *184 [*Supplement*, 76]. For the Latin text, see chapter 6, section B.1.

¹⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, *263 [*Supplement*, 112]. Lonergan's reference to the series of articles is *ST*, III, qq. 46-56, and to what he consider a single outstanding article, *ST*, III, q. 1, a. 2.

doctrines are presumed based on the authoritative teaching of the Church. However, to understand the meaning of those doctrines, he attends to the data of history, to human development, to concrete human living. As he noted at the beginning of the *Supplement*, only by attending to what is actual and concrete can one arrive at knowledge of created good.¹⁹ Created good is an effect, whether in the order of creation or in the order of redemption. You cannot understand a cause without understanding the effect. Any historical effect produced by Christ is a created good. But all good is being, and being is concrete. Therefore, if one intends to know the historical causality of Christ, albeit imperfectly and analogically, one needs to attend to what is actual and concrete.

Second, Lonergan's reference to a hypothesis of condign satisfaction is not a reference to the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction, but to the presupposition that the *only* solution to sin *must* necessarily be condign satisfaction. Based on necessary deductions from this necessary presupposition, one could deduce that the whole work of Christ is a work of satisfaction, and not much, if anything, else. When referring to the work of the Christ, Lonergan *always* includes Christ's satisfaction in the wider context which also includes Christ's merit, sacrifice, and intercession.²⁰ This applies both to objective and subjective redemption. This is fitting simply from a doctrinal perspective. Christ's work on our behalf is not to be understood as excluding work on our part. Christ made

¹⁹ Lonergan, *DBM*, 5 [*Supplement*, 3].

²⁰ In Lonergan's final chapter he refers to Christ's satisfaction on eleven different occasions, and in all but one instance he always includes Christ's merit, sacrifice, and intercession: *DBM*, *259 (2x), *260, *261, *262, *266, *267 (3x), *272, *294 [*Supplement*, 110 (3x), 111 (2x), 113 (4x), 116, 125]. The one exception is the very last sentence of the *Supplement*, where Lonergan states that it is appropriate that an intermediary friend (the God-man) should make superabundant satisfaction for sin. There may be one of two reasons he does not include merit, sacrifice, or intercession. First, since the *Supplement* is an unfinished work, this last sentence may not have been intended to say all there is on the matter. More likely, the reason is that the context of the statement involves an argument on why grace is superabundant. All of Christ's works are superabundant. I believe Lonergan's point, as I stated in my interpretation of that chapter, is that Christ's superabundant satisfaction for sin is superabundant not because it was a supererogatory deed, but because it was performed by a divine person.

satisfaction for the body, but penitents ought to make satisfaction for themselves (DB 904, 905, 922, 924; DS 1689, 1692, 1712, 1714; ND 1630, 1633, 1652, 1654). Christ merited for us, but we also should merit (DB 809, 843; DS 1545, 1583; ND 1946, 1983). Christ offered sacrifice once and for all, but Christ's members are to participate in the sacrifice of the Mass, a sacrifice which is truly expiatory (DB 940, 950; DS 1743, 1753; ND 1548, 1557). Christ lives forever interceding on our behalf, but we also ought to pray.²¹

However, from a systematic perspective, Lonergan's method to understand what "the whole work of Christ" really means is to proceed from concrete knowledge of the human situation. For Lonergan, redemption is God's solution to the problem of evil. The problem of evil is not with God. The problem of evil is with human beings. So the solution must address the human situation. This is why Christ works not for himself, but for us. The only exception is the work of Christ understood under the aspect of merit. However, even here Christ merits not primarily for himself, but for us.²² The point is that Lonergan does not try to understand the doctrine of redemption, and therefore the historical causality of Christ, by deducing necessary reasons from a necessary hypothesis, whether a hypothesis of condign satisfaction or any other hypothesis. He attends to the concrete world of human affairs because this is where the *effect* is located. You cannot understand a cause if you do not understand the effect. So although Lonergan certainly affirms that Christ offered satisfaction to God the Father on our behalf, the effect is not had in God. The effect is in history.

²¹ Lonergan, *DBM*, *260 [*Supplement*, 110].

²² Lonergan, *DBM*, *265 [*Supplement*, 112].

As such, there is indeed some other way to come to a theological understanding of what “the whole work of Christ” could possibly mean. For Lonergan, that other way is to establish the historical effects produced by Christ and then proceed to understand how the work of Christ is causally related to the production of these effects. This is why he stated that the work of Christ explained in his third chapter is better described as a principle, rather than a means. That objective work of Christ is indeed a means. However, it is not the whole means. There is more to the notion of redemption as means. A principle is what is first in some order. Thus to understand “the whole work of Christ” one must also understand Christ’s ongoing work in history proceeding from the principle. I believe this is why the first article in Lonergan’s final chapter is titled *De Opere Christi*. I find it hard to believe the title is not revealing of an intent to answer the question raised in the previous chapter.

8.2.4 Essential Elements in Lonergan’s Answer

My purpose here is to summarize what I interpret to be five essential elements in Lonergan’s understanding of the historical causality of Christ.

First, Lonergan understands *every* aspect of the historical causality of Christ as unfolding from the divine plan conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness. This divine plan is divine providence. This plan unfolds according to divine governance. Therefore, the historical causality of Christ can be understood as divine governance to redeem the historical order according to the plan of divine providence.

As such, although the historical causality of Christ is a dynamic process playing out in the dynamism of history, it is nevertheless grounded in something eternal and

immutable: divine wisdom and goodness. Lonergan's appeal to divine wisdom and goodness, and his faith in the divine plan, is a thread weaved throughout the *Supplement*. This thread ties each chapter to the other, each part to the whole.²³

Second, Lonergan's consistent appeal to, and faith in, divine wisdom is a rejection of divine voluntarism. The divine will always chooses from that which divine wisdom infallibly knows. The implication in Lonergan's speculative theology is significant. Since the divine will always chooses from what divine wisdom infallibly knows, then the actual world order, down to the smallest detail, is intelligible.²⁴ And since it is intelligible, then redemption in history will be in harmonious continuation with the basic principles of the actual order of reality. This judgment is based on the principle that there are no divine afterthoughts. This was the fundamental theological principle guiding Lonergan's heuristic structure of the solution to the problem of evil, presented in chapter 20 of *Insight*. In the *Supplement*, the principle now functions not for the purpose of anticipating what the solution to the problem of evil might look like, but how that solution can actually be understood in its historical dimension. The principle is operative throughout the text. In fact, it is *the* fundamental theological principle in the entire text. It is the ground of the two other major theological principles operative in the *Supplement*:

²³ There are some forty-three references to divine wisdom and goodness where the latter is sometimes described as divine will, divine choice, divine decree, or divine love. Chapter 1 (5x): *DBM* 5, 6, 24, 42, 64 [*Supplement*, 3 (2x), 11, 18, 26]; Chapter 2 (19x): *DBM* 68 (2x), 69 (2x), 70, 76, 83, 93 (2x), 94, 104, 108, 110 (2x), 111, 112 (2x), 113, 116 [*Supplement*, 28 (2x), 29 (3x), 31, 34, 38 (2x), 44, 45 (3x), 46 (3x), 47]; Chapter 4 (9x): *DBM* 159, 165, 166, 167, 168 (3x), 169, 178 [*Supplement*, 66, 68, 69 (3x), 70 (3x), 74]; Chapter 5 (1x): *DBM*, *228 [*Supplement*, 97]; Chapter 6 (9x): *DBM*, *244, *246, *249, *251, *252, *262 (2x), *263, *281, *286, *287 [*Supplement*, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111(3x), 119, 121 (2x),].

²⁴ The only exception to this rule of intelligibility is the fact of sin and the evil consequences of sin. Neither has any intrinsic intelligibility. But where intelligence can only order intelligibles, wisdom orders both the intelligibles and the non-intelligibles. So divine wisdom orders good and evil such that God always wills the good, in no way wills the evil of sin, and only indirectly wills the evil consequences of sin. And divine wisdom has ordered good and evil in such a way that good can be brought out of evil. That process by which good is brought out of evil is the law of the cross, and since that law has been chosen by the divine will in accordance with divine wisdom, it is a just law.

the principle of cause and the principle of continuity. It is the principle of principles. The principle provides Lonergan with a critical guidepost to pursue an imperfect and analogical understanding of the historical causality of Christ.

Third, although Lonergan takes an analytical approach that resolves the work of Christ into its causes, each cause, in one way or another, is constitutive of God's entry into "man's making of man" as mediated by Christ. This phrase acknowledges God as the salvific agent. The phrase also acknowledges the role of human freedom and the social nature of human causality. There is such a thing as a constant human nature. But there is a variable human historicity in which human beings make of themselves who they are. As Lonergan explained in his second chapter, who we make of ourselves is played out in the historical order. This historical order is fundamentally a social reality. Each of us will ultimately be judged on what we make of ourselves *qua* individuals. But the process itself is a social dynamic because history is a social dynamic. Therefore, if God is to enter into this process to help us make of ourselves what God intends, then it is fitting for God to enter into this social dynamic, into "man's making of man."

God's entry into "man's making of man" is entry of a redemptive vector into human history. This redemptive vector establishes, propagates and perfects human cooperation with God to transform evil into good.²⁵ Recall from Lonergan's first chapter

²⁵ There is an implication here for developing Lonergan's thought in the area of pneumatology. The end of the two divine missions is the same. Therefore the secondary end is the same. A theology seeking to understand the intelligibility of the mission of the Spirit would not be restricted to understanding the formality of that mission, where for Lonergan that formality is (1) what *constitutes* a divine mission; and (2) a contingent external term, so that there is a correspondence of truth to the judgment that a divine person is truly *sent*. What constitutes a divine mission is a divine relation of origin. So what constitutes the mission of the Spirit is the sending of the Spirit by the Father and the Son. The contingent external term of the mission of the Spirit is habitual (sanctifying) grace. But in *The Triune God: Systematics*, Lonergan acknowledges that to understand a mission one should also seek to understand the consequences, the created effects if you will, consequent on that term. The two missions are for the sake of initiating and strengthening new personal relationships between God and human beings. The Son initiates these

that the general structure of history is a threefold approximation of progress, decline, and restoration. Redemption is restoration through supernatural assistance. The redemptive vector reverses historical decline and restores the line of progress, the line of human development such that over time there is improvement in the total human good of order.

At the heart of this redemptive vector is Christ's mediation of God's meanings and values into human history, specifically into human culture. It is cultural evil that calls for a heaven-sent redeemer. Cultural evil is the most hideous, and human power in and of itself is impotent to heal it. So it is principally cultural evil that needs to be transformed into good. For Lonergan, the historical causality of Christ transforms cultural evil by mediating God's meanings and values into history. Through this transformation, evils at the social and particular levels of the human good are also transformed.

Furthermore, though Christ is the mediator of God's meanings and values into history, Christ himself uses ministerial historical agents to carry out his work. The Body of Christ is the medium by which Christ continues to act in history. As Lonergan stated years earlier, the ascent of the soul towards God is not a private affair. There is human solidarity in sin which deforms knowledge and perverts the will, but there is also a divine

relationships (which Lonergan understands as reconciliation), and through the Spirit's self-donation the new personal relationships are (1) strengthened and (2) provided a foundation for cooperation with God. I suggest here that the notion of cooperation with Christ (with God if you will) for the purpose of returning good to evil done is a basis to develop Lonergan's thought in the direction of pneumatology. In my opinion, this would suggest that the first effect of the gift of the Spirit would be the healing of dramatic and/or individual bias that judges good to be evil, and judges evil to be good. As Lonergan stated in *Insight*, "...how is a mind to become conscious of its own bias when that bias originates from a communal flight from understanding and is supported by the whole texture of a civilization?" This effect is foremost a healing effect, a revelation to a person of his or her own bias such that evil can be seen for what it is. Alternately I would describe this effect as a healing of the pure desire to know, a rehabilitation of the natural orientation to ask questions, a healing from the flight from understanding such that one can allow the entry of otherwise unwanted insights. See *The Triune God: Systematics*, 491; *Insight*, 8.

solidarity in grace which is the mystical body of Christ.²⁶ Lonergan understands this body through the analogy of a human good of order, but a supernatural one. His emphasis on the social dimension of grace is very prominent in his understanding of the historical causality of Christ. As a Catholic theologian, he identifies sanctifying grace as the contingent, external term corresponding to the truth of the judgment that the Spirit is truly sent. At the same time, he does not think of the Body of Christ as simply an aggregate of individuals who have sanctifying grace. A new reality is present. A “higher synthesis” if you will emerging from the fertility of a concrete plurality of many persons linked together, under Christ, such that it can truly be said that the members are members of one another, joined to each other through a union.²⁷ Lonergan understands this union through the analogy of friendship, a friendship initiated by the communication of divine friendship itself.

It is still Christ who is working in history, but now he is working through others, through the social and historical agency of the members cooperating with Christ. Human cooperation with Christ, as with any form of human causality, is fundamentally a social dynamic. Human cooperation depends on common meanings and common values, on common understandings and common agreements. An actual cause is not typically found in the isolated individual, but in several working together with mutual understanding and agreement on where they are going. The effectiveness by which the Body of Christ mediates Christ’s work in history ultimately hinges on the degree to which the members recognize and embrace the common meanings and values of the Head.

²⁶ Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 27.

²⁷ Years earlier Lonergan described the mystical body as a “concrete plurality” of many persons linked together. He was using the notion of vertical finality to explain the nature of the mystical body, since vertical finality operates through the “fertility of a concrete plurality.” See “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 21.

Fourth, there is one meaning and value of singular importance. It is the law of the cross. Since human cooperation is done in and through others, the law of the cross is meant to become a shared meaning and value of those who follow Christ, with the further intention of spreading to the wider culture. It is through returning good to evil that the members of Christ's body transform cultural evil into good, thus improving the total human good of order. The law of the cross is a meaning because it is intelligible and *judged* as such by members of the Body of Christ. This insight and judgment is only possible through the assistance of the Spirit. Through this judgment, evil is seen for what it is: the absurd, the unintelligible, that which is *meaningless*. The law of the cross is a value because God has created a world in which God has judged it good to return good to evil, and thus worthy to be chosen as a response to evil. When those who follow Christ perform operations according to this law they performatively treat evil for what it is. They refuse to treat evil as good, refuse to treat the false as true, refuse to treat the unintelligible as intelligible, refuse to treat the meaningless as meaningful.

To live the law of the cross requires that the members of Christ's body not shrink from legitimate suffering. Legitimate suffering is redemptive suffering. For Lonergan, we incline toward sin because we either knowingly shrink from suffering, or we unknowingly shrink from suffering. We unknowingly shrink from suffering when, finding no intelligibility in an unintelligible (evil) situation, our intellect substitutes one unintelligible situation for another.²⁸ Either way, in shrinking from redemptive suffering, we performatively deny that the absurd is absurd and therefore to be endured.

Christ's communication of grace makes it possible that we can operate according to this law. Lonergan attends to this communication of grace, understood according to

²⁸ Lonergan, *DBM*, 60 [*Supplement*, 25].

extrinsic efficient causality. Christ, as historical cause, is the efficient cause, that by which his members *can* return good to evil. But Christ, as historical cause, is also the exemplar cause. He is the model according to which his members ought to return good to evil done in accordance with the divine plan conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness. It is the model according to which Christ's members are to love others, even their enemies. As such, the law of the cross is the very model according to which those who authentically desire to follow Christ are to love God.

According to the divine plan, it is fitting that this law be communicated to human beings. Even though the communication of grace is required for us to be capable of choosing and living the law of the cross, it is fitting that we know this law in the first place. Absolutely speaking, "thematic" knowledge of the law is not necessary. There are certainly those who, enabled by grace, act according to this law even though they could not articulate this law in any systematic sense as we are doing here. However, since redemption as means is in harmonious continuation with the actual order of reality, it is fitting that Christ's ministerial agents understand this law and recognize it as a value.

Theologically, this means is that in addition to the grace of God's self-communication, there is fittingly the grace of God's revelation. This revelation is communication of what Lonergan later called the cognitive, constitutive, and effective meaning of Christ's message. "It is cognitive inasmuch as the message tells what is to be believed. It is constitutive inasmuch as the revelation crystallizes the hidden inner gift of love into overt Christian fellowship. It is effective inasmuch as it directs Christian service to human society to bring about the kingdom of God."²⁹

²⁹ Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 362.

Fifth, since in scholastic metaphysics the exemplar cause is the extrinsic formal cause,³⁰ Lonergan implicitly associates the law of the cross as the extrinsic formal cause of the redemptive vector in history. If we generalize this notion with the assumption that the redemptive vector is operative in all places, then the law of the cross is the extrinsic formal cause of history itself. In fact, in 1962 Lonergan explicitly stated that in his mind the fundamental aspect of the intelligibility of history was the transformation of evil into good according to this law.³¹

Lonergan is explicit that Christ is the exemplar cause when we imitate him. However, Christ also operates according to an exemplar, a *formam intentionalem*. That exemplar has been conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness from all eternity as the form of God's solution to the problem of evil. That form, or exemplar, is the law of the cross. It is the intrinsic principle of the economy of salvation. However, since the economy of salvation is a created reality, albeit supernatural, it must have an extrinsic formal cause. Since Lonergan's focus on the historical causality of Christ is a focus on extrinsic causality, it is appropriate that we identify what this extrinsic formal cause really is. Lonergan does so, but he does so implicitly and he uses the language of exemplar causality, not extrinsic formal causality. The law of the cross is the extrinsic formal cause conceived by divine wisdom and chosen by divine goodness. Christ, as man, mediates this law into history according to the divine plan. He does so by inaugurating, propagating, and perfecting the Body of Christ. In fact, the Body of Christ itself is produced by Christ according to this same law.

³⁰ John F. McCormick, S.J., *Scholastic Metaphysics* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1940), 165.

³¹ Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method I*, 259.

For Lonergan, the law of the cross is the fundamental aspect, the fundamental form or exemplar of the redemptive vector in history. In another text he identifies the law of the cross as the “strictly theological complement” of his dynamic structure of history.³² To the degree that this law is operative in history, it is then the fundamental aspect of the intelligibility of history itself, the law by which God overcomes evil in human history to redeem human history. Implicit then in Lonergan’s understanding of the historical causality of Christ is Christ’s knowledge of, choosing of, revelation of, and introduction of this law into human history. With a view towards the secondary end in which all earthly things will be gathered and reconciled in Christ, the law of the cross is the extrinsic formal cause of history itself, the model according to which Christ gathers earthly realities to himself.

As we just noted, Lonergan had at one time explicitly equated the law of the cross to the “strictly theological complement” of his dynamic structure of history. He made this statement in the context of providing a response to a request. The request was to provide a theological perspective on how a community of love adapts itself and directs itself to effective mission and witness.³³ I will end on this theme, because I believe that Lonergan’s other motive for writing the *Supplement*, aside from the juxtaposition of his interest in redemption with his own historical consciousness, was a desire to understand the historical causality of Christ with the hope that a community of love could adapt and direct itself more effectively in mission and witness.

³² “I have been asked for a ‘theological perspective on how a community of love adapts and directs itself for effective mission and witness.’ Presumably the reason for the request lies in points I have made elsewhere. There is in my book *Insight* a general analysis of the dynamic structure of human history, and in my mimeographed text *De Verbo Incarnato* a thesis on the *lex crucis* that provides its strictly theological complement.” Lonergan, “Transition from a Classicist World-View,” 7.

³³ Lonergan, “Transition from a Classicist World-View,” 7.

8.3 The Practical Orientation of the *Supplement*

It remains a fact that within and outside of the Lonergan community, Bernard Lonergan is best known for his cognitional theory and his theological method, due to the publications of *Insight* and *Method*, respectively. However, the posthumous discovery of his student writings of the 1930s³⁴ led the editors of the *CWL* to “revise considerably” their view of the course of his life and career.³⁵ The contents of these student writings revealed his interests in the economic, political, sociological, cultural, historical, and religious fields rather than the gnoseological and metaphysical.³⁶ The editors of the *CWL* sum up his interests at this time as follows:

The restoration of all things in Christ (Ephesians 1:10) was closer to a motto for him than ‘thoroughly understand what it is to understand.’ The human good proved to be more of a magnet than was cognitional theory. It was in the social order that the restoration would take place and the human good realized, so there was a crying need for a *summa sociologica*.³⁷

As the editors note, the examination of Lonergan’s student writings provide, in hindsight, the discovery that these interests run like a thread through the period from the 1930s to the 1980s.³⁸ These interests reveal a desire to work on the field of theory for the ultimate benefit of guiding praxis. Frederick Crowe suggested that Lonergan had experienced a strong influence directing him to the world and its needs, and so to the influence Christ had for the world’s healing.³⁹

³⁴ The contents of his unpublished student writings were contained in a manila folder, which Lonergan numbered 713 in the organization of his papers, and simply labeled “History.”

³⁵ Bernard Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 2 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), vii.

³⁶ Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, vii.

³⁷ Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, vii – viii. Lonergan’s reference to the need for a *summa sociologica* is found in *Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis*, 156.

³⁸ Lonergan, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, viii.

³⁹ Crowe, *Christ and History*, 18.

In fact, according to Robert Doran, perhaps the one thing that characterized Lonergan's mode of thinking and the cognitive authenticity that he encouraged in others was his approach to practicality.⁴⁰ For Doran, the main source of data for this facet of Lonergan's thinking is chapter 7 of *Insight*. In the year before he passed away, Lonergan mentioned in conversation that the chapters on common sense (6-7) and on judgment (9-10) were the first chapters of *Insight* that he wrote, that they contained what he most wanted to say, and that it was in order to substantiate his point that he wrote the first five chapters of *Insight*.⁴¹ Chapter 7 treats progress and decline in history. There Lonergan states that the principle of progress is liberty, and the principle of decline is individual, group, and general bias. Collectively these biases set up the reign of sin, the social surd.

The practical upshot of chapter 7 was already indicated in the Preface to *Insight*. There Lonergan asks the following question: "What practical good can come of this book?"⁴² His answer boils down to this: insight into insight brings to light the cumulative process of progress, and insight into oversight reveals the cumulative process of decline.⁴³ For Lonergan, "to be practical is to do the intelligent thing, and to be unpractical is to keep blundering about. It follows that insight into both insight and oversight is the very key to practicality."⁴⁴

For Lonergan, oversight is rooted in the fundamental problem which he calls the "flight from understanding."⁴⁵ He stated that no problem is at once more delicate and more profound, more practical and perhaps more pressing than the flight from

⁴⁰ See Robert M. Doran, "Lonergan, An Appreciation," *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Vernon Gregson (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 7.

⁴¹ Doran, "Lonergan, An Appreciation," 8.

⁴² Lonergan, *Insight*, 7.

⁴³ Lonergan, *Insight*, 8.

⁴⁴ Lonergan, *Insight*, 8.

⁴⁵ Lonergan, *Insight*, 8.

understanding. The reason has to do with the nature of the problem. “How is a mind to become conscious of its own bias when that bias originates from a communal flight from understanding and is supported by the whole texture of a civilization?”⁴⁶ The reason the problem is more profound than any other is because the root of the problem is a failure of human intelligence itself. As such, human intelligence is incapable of contributing to the healing of its own perversion, and does not even recognize the perversion for what it is. The absurd is thought to be intelligible, the false thought to be true, and evil thought to be good.

Thus what Lonergan most wanted to say “included preeminently a position on the role of human intelligence in history and society, and on the relation of intelligence to social and cultural progress and decline, especially in the view of the distinct dangers confronting human society today.”⁴⁷ In *Insight* he states that there is needed an intelligent critique of the role of human intelligence in history before there can be any intelligent direction of history.⁴⁸ This approach to practicality in *Insight* is a long-range approach. It is an approach which Lonergan described as “a withdrawal from practicality to save practicality.”⁴⁹ As with *Insight*, the practical upshot of the *Supplement* is the intelligent direction of history. The *Supplement* is a systematic work through and through. But it also has a practical purpose, and that practicality is a long-range approach to praxis. Like *Insight*, it is a long-range approach because it tries to get at the root of the problem. It is a practical approach because it assumes a broader understanding of what praxis is in the first place. Situations are constituted by meaning, and a change in

⁴⁶ Lonergan, *Insight*, 8. In the context of this statement, Lonergan says that no problem is at once more profound, more practical, and perhaps more pressing.

⁴⁷ Doran, “Lonergan, An Appreciation,” 8.

⁴⁸ Lonergan, *Insight*, 265.

⁴⁹ Lonergan, *Insight*, 266.

constitutive meaning is in the long run the most effective form of praxis.⁵⁰ Situations also reflect the values of a culture. Systematic theology is praxis to the degree it promotes the changing of the meanings and values of a culture such that the human situation more closely approximates the reign of God.⁵¹ I hold these viewpoints as my own, but more importantly I interpret that Lonergan held them as constitutive of his long-range approach to praxis.

I believe this long-range approach to practicality was Lonergan's other motive for writing the *Supplement*. He intended to promote understanding of the historical causality of Christ for the purpose of informing a practical theology of cooperation with Christ. Evidence for the motive is clear from his own words. In the opening paragraphs he explicitly states that the aim is a *fruitful* understanding to address our contemporary problems. He states that it is hardly surprising that we here on earth have little inkling about how heavenly things might be gathered in Christ. Then he adds that it would be a more serious matter if we were to neglect the question of how earthly realities are to be brought together since it is our duty to work with Christ who gathers these earthly realities. As Frederick Crowe has noted, these opening paragraphs of the *Supplement* establish the practical orientation of the whole work.⁵² The practical implication is that the better we understand how Christ works in history for the world's healing, the better we can cooperate with Christ in the world's healing. The better we understand Christ's means of directing history, the better we can cooperate with Christ to direct history.

⁵⁰ Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 3-4.

⁵¹ Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 4.

⁵² Crowe, *Christ and History*, 103. On Lonergan's pastoral strategy, see Frederick E. Crowe, "Lonergan as Pastoral Theologian," *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, ed. Michael Vertin (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 127-144; "Interpreting Lonergan," *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*, 151-152.

I end with what I argue is for Lonergan at the very heart of our cooperation with Christ. Christ's acceptance of the cross shows us how to love God, how to do God's will. Such love for God is possible because God has first loved us through the love of God poured in our hearts through the Holy Spirit given us (Rom 5:5). Lonergan was very fond of quoting Romans 5:5 in the latter part of his career, and he interpreted the passage as referring to God's love for us, not our love for God.⁵³ Christians, in response to this gift, are called to imitate Christ, to return good to evil done. Human development is had by returning good to evil done such that evil is transformed into good according to the wisdom, will, and power of God. Therefore, God's entry into human history, through the historical causality of Christ, is the objective entry of God's meaning and value into human history that is the law of the cross. For Lonergan, the implication is that there is a very practical aspect to loving God. The litmus test for authentically loving God is to return good to evil according to God's will. For Lonergan, Romans 5:5 is perhaps the singular passage best reflecting the judgment that God's initiating love has entered human history to redeem history. I suggest that Romans 8:28 is perhaps the singular passage best reflecting his judgment on the practical meaning of the drama which unfolds from God's initiating love, mediated through the historical causality of Christ: all things work for good for those who love God.

⁵³ Doran, *What is Systematic Theology*, 44.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Works of Bernard Lonergan:

- Lonergan, Bernard J.F., S.J. "Analysis of Faith." Trans. Michael Shields, S.J., from "Analysis Fidei" (1951-1952). *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 20 (2002): 125-154.
- _____. "Analytic Concept of History." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 11 (1993): 5-35.
- _____. "Appendix: Three Drafts on the Idea of Sacrifice. *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19 (2001): 29-34.
- _____. *Collection*, vol. 4 of Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- _____. *De Verbo incarnato*. Third edition. Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University *ad usum auditorum*, 1964.
- _____. *Early Works on Theological Method I*, vol. 22 of Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Eds. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- _____. *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, vol. 1 of Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- _____. *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, vol. 3 of Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- _____. *Method in Theology*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972. Latest Printing: Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- _____. "The Notion of Sacrifice." Trans. Michael Shields. *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19 (2001): 3-28.
- _____. *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, vol. 7 of Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Trans. Michael Shields. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- _____. "*Pantōn Anakephalaiōsis: A Theory of Human Solidarity / A Metaphysic for the Interpretation of St. Paul / A Theology of the Social Order, Catholic Action*,

and the Kingship of Christ, *In incipient outline.*" *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 9 (1991): 139-172.

_____. *Phenomenology and Logic: The Boston College Lectures on Mathematical Logic and Existentialism*, vol. 18 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Philip J. McShane. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

_____. *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1958-1964*, vol. 6 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

_____. *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965-1980*, vol. 17 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

_____. *A Second Collection: Papers by Bernard J.F. Lonergan, S.J.* Eds. William Ryan and Bernard Tyrrell. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

_____. *Shorter Papers*, vol. 20 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Robert C. Croken, Robert M. Doran, and H. Daniel Monsour. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

_____. *A Third Collection*. Ed. Frederick E. Crowe. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.

_____. *Topics in Education*, vol. 10 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

_____. *The Triune God: Doctrines*, vol. 11 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour. Trans. Michael Shields. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

_____. *The Triune God: Systematics*, vol. 12 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour. Trans. Michael Shields. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

_____. *Understanding and Being*. Eds. E.A. Morelli and M.D. Morelli, vol. 5 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Robert M. Doran and Frederick E. Crowe. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

_____. *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, vol. 2 of *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Unpublished Works of Bernard Lonergan:

Lonergan, Bernard J.F., S.J. *De bono et malo*. Title borrowed from title of first chapter. Autograph MS (probably dated 1958).

_____. *De ente supernaturali: Supplementum schematicum*. Mimeographed notes for the course *De gratia*. Montreal: College of the Immaculate Conception, 1946.

_____. *De notione sacrificii*. Autograph notes for course. Toronto: Regis College, 1959-1960

_____. *De sacramentis in genere*. Mimeographed notes for the course *De sacramentis in genere*. Montreal: College of the Immaculate Conception, 1940-1941.

_____. "Essay on Fundamental Sociology," (1934).

_____. *The Notion of Fittingness: The Application of Theological Method to the Question of the Purpose of the Incarnation*. Trans. Michael Shields from *De ratione convenientiae*. Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute.

_____. *De ratione convenientiae eiusque radice, de excellentia ordinis, de signis rationis systematice et universaliter ordinatis, denique de convenientia, contingentia, et fine incarnationis. Supplementum schematicum*. Mimeographed notes for the course *De Verbo incarnato*, Gregorian University, 1954.

_____. *The Supernatural Order*. Trans. Michael Shields from *De ente supernaturali*. Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute, 1992.

_____. *The Incarnate Word*. Trans. Charles Hefling from *De Verbo Incarnato*, 3rd edition. Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute, 2006.

_____. *The Redemption: A Supplement to De Verbo Incarnato*. Trans. Michael Shields from *De bono et malo*. Toronto: Lonergan Research Institute, 2000.

Other Published Works:

Anselm, St. "Cur Deus Homo?" In *Basic Writings*. Trans. S.N. Deane with an introduction by Charles Hartshorne. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1962.

Aquinas, St. Thomas. *Truth*. Translation from the definitive Leonine text *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate* by R. W. Mulligan (vol. 1), J.V. McGlynn (vol. 2), and R.W. Schmidt (vol. 3). Chicago: H. Regenery Co., 1952-1954.

- _____. *Summa Contra Gentiles*. Translated by A.C. Pegis (Book 1), J.F. Anderson (Book 2), V.J. Bourke (Book 3), C.J. O'Neil (Book 4). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975.
- _____. *Summa theologiae*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1981.
- Aristotle. *De Anima (On the Soul)*. Translation with an introduction by Hugh Lawson-Tancred. New York: Penguin Books, 1996.
- _____. *Metaphysics*. Translated by Richard Hope. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1960.
- _____. *Nicomachean ethics. With an English Translation by H. Rackham*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Arputhasamy, Bernard Hyacinth, S.J., "Redemption: Understanding Lonergan's Fundamental Meaning of the Law of the Cross as the Transformation of Evil into Good," Th.M., Regis College, Toronto, 2005.
- Augustine, St. *The Confessions of St. Augustine*. Translated by F.J. Sheed. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1943.
- _____. *Faith, Hope, and Charity*. Translated from *Enchiridion de fide spe et caritate* by Louis A. Arand. Westminster, MD: Newman Bookshop, 1947.
- _____. *The Trinity*. Translated from *De trinitate* by Stephen McKenna. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.
- Benestad, Brian J. "The Catholic Concept of Social Justice: A Historical Perspective," *Communio* 11 (1984), 364-381.
- Boyer, Carolus, S.J., *De Verbo Incarnato, ad usum auditorum*, 2nd edition. Rome: Gregorian University, 1952.
- Copeland, M. Shawn. "A Genetic Study of the Idea of the Human Good in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan." Ph.D. dissertation, Boston College, 1991.
- Crowe, Frederick E., S.J. "All My Work has been Introducing History into Catholic Theology." *Lonergan Workshop* 10. Ed. Frederick Lawrence. Boston: Boston College (1992): 49-82.
- _____. "Bernard Lonergan as Pastoral Theologian." *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*. Ed. Michael Vertin. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989: 127-144.

- _____. *Christ and History: The Christology of Bernard Lonergan from 1935- 1982*. Ottawa: Novalis, 2005.
- _____. "Lonergan's Universalist View of Religion." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 12 (1994): 147-179.
- _____. "Son of God, Holy Spirit, and World Religions." *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*. Ed. Michael Vertin. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989: 324-343.
- _____. "Son and Spirit: Tension in the Divine Missions?" *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*. Ed. Michael Vertin. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989: 297-314.
- _____. "The Task of Interpreting Lonergan." *Appropriating the Lonergan Idea*. Ed. Michael Vertin. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989: 145-160.
- Dawson, Christopher. *The Age of the Gods, A Study of the Origins of Culture in Prehistoric Europe and the Ancient East*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1933.
- _____. *The Dynamics of World History*. Ed. John J. Mulloy. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- Doran, Robert M., S.J. "The First Chapter of De Deo Trino, Pars Systematica: The Issues." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 18 (2000): 27-48.
- _____. "Intelligentia Fidei in De Deo Trino, Pars Systematica: A Commentary on the First Three Sections of Chapter One." *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 19 (2001): 35-83.
- _____. "Lonergan: An Appreciation." *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- _____. "The Nonviolent Cross: Lonergan and Girard on Redemption." *Theological Studies* 71 (2010), 46-61.
- _____. *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- _____. *What is Systematic Theology?* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Gracia, Jorge J. E. "Evil and Transcendentality of Goodness: Suárez's Solution to the Problem of Positive Evils." *Being and Goodness: The Concept of the Good in*

Metaphysics and Philosophical Theology. Ed. Scott MacDonald. Cornell University: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Hefling, Charles. "Another Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement: Lonergan on Christ's (Self-) Knowledge." *Lonergan Workshop 20*. Ed. Frederick Lawrence. Boston: Boston College (2008): 127-164.

_____. "Lonergan's *Cur Deus Homo*: Revisiting the 'Law of the Cross.'" *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology: Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran, S.J.* Ed. John D. Dadosky. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2009.

_____. "A Perhaps Permanently Valid Achievement: Lonergan on Christ's Satisfaction," *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 10 (1992): 51-76.

_____. "Philosophy, Theology, and God." *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press, 1988: 120-143.

_____. "Revelation and/as Insight." *The Importance of Insight: Essays in Honor of Michael Vertin*. Eds. John J. Liptay Jr. and David S. Liptay. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007: 97-115.

Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Trans. John Bowden from the German "*Mors turpissima crucis: Die Kreuzigung in der antiken Welt und die 'Torheit' des 'Wortes vom Kreuz.'*" Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Komonchak, Joseph. "The Church." *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.

_____. "Lonergan's Early Essays on the Redemption of History." *Lonergan Workshop 10*. Ed. Frederick Lawrence. Boston: Boston College (1992): 159-178.

_____. "The Violence of the Cross: A Mystery, not Punishment." *Commonweal* 132 (2005), 19-22.

Lyonnet, Stanislaus. *De peccato et redemptione. II: De vocabulario redemptionis*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1960.

Melchin, Kenneth. *History, Ethics, and Emergent Probability: Ethics, Society and History in the Work of Bernard Lonergan*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.

Miller, Mark T. "Why the Passion? Bernard Lonergan on the Cross as Communication." Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 2008.

O'Connor, R. Eric. *Curiosity at the Center of One's Life: Statements and Questions of R. Eric O'Connor*. Ed. J. Martin O'Hara. Montreal: Thomas More Institute, 1984.

O'Keefe, Mark, O.S.B. *What Are They Saying about Social Sin?* New York: Paulist Press, 1990.

Paulhus, Normand J. "Uses and Misuses of the Term 'Social Justice' in the Roman Catholic Tradition." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 15 (1987), 261-282.

Rivière, Jean. *Le dogme de la Rédemption: Essai d'étude historique*. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1905.

_____. *Le dogme de la Rédemption: Etude théologique*. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1914.

_____. *Le dogme de la redemption dans la theologie conteporaine*. Albi: Lombard, 1948.

Shute, Michael. *The Origins of Lonergan's Notion of the Dialectic of History*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993.

Stebbins, Michael. *The Divine Initiative: Grace, World-Order, and Human Freedom in the Early Writings of Bernard Lonergan*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History, Vol. 1: Abridgement of Volumes I-VI*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

_____. *A Study of History, Vol. 2: Abridgement of Volumes VII-X*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Wright, John H., S.J. "Divine Knowledge and Human Freedom: The God Who Dialogues." *Theological Studies* 38 (1977), 450-477.

Wright, N.T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Other Unpublished Works:

Doran, Robert M., S.J. "Lonergan, Girard, and Soteriology." Unpublished Course Notes, Marquette University, Milwaukee, 2007.

Monsour, H. Daniel. "Harmonious Continuation of the Actual Order of This Universe in God's Self-Communication." Unpublished paper delivered at the Lonergan Research Institute Seminar, Toronto, November 13, 2003.

Reference Works:

Denzinger, Heinrich. *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*. Fitzwilliam, NH: Loreto Publications, 2001.

Dupuis, Jacques, S.J. and Josef Neuner, S.J., editors. *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*. 7th ed. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 2001.

Himes, Kenneth, editor. *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005.

Ott, Ludwig. *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. Rockford, IL: Tan Books, 1974.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. Washington D.C.: USCCB Publishing, 2007 (fourth printing).

Vacant, A. et al, eds. *Dictionnaire theologie catholique*. Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1909-50.