

CURRENT THEOLOGY

SANCTIFYING GRACE AND THE DIVINE INDWELLING

During these last few years,¹ speculative theology on sanctifying grace has mostly centered upon the mystery of the divine inhabitation in the souls of the just, and upon the connected questions—created and uncreated grace, appropriation, divinization, and divine sonship. By reviewing, therefore, current theology on the divine indwelling we necessarily touch on most of what has been written recently on sanctifying grace.

BACKGROUND OF OPINIONS

The proper setting in which to envisage and understand contemporary theology on the divine indwelling is outlined in A. Michel's article on the inhabitation of the Persons of the Trinity in the just soul, in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*.² It was published in 1949, but its survey of theories and opinions stops before the years we are reviewing. Michel groups the solutions given to the question of what the indwelling adds to God's natural presence in creatures under three headings: (1) unsatisfactory answers, which leave out an element of the problem, are those which conceive the inhabitation either without a created grace (Peter Lombard), or—the other extreme—only with created grace (Ripalda, Viva, Vasquez); (2) solutions which hold a substantial presence of the divine Persons, as Scripture and tradition clearly demand, and which explain this presence either by way of knowledge and love (St. Thomas, Terrien, Froget), or as an objective indwelling by way of some sort of experimental knowledge (John of St. Thomas, Gardeil), or as a substantial presence on the ontological plane (St. Bonaventure, Lessius, Galtier); (3) explanations which establish a special presence of the Holy Spirit, not only by appropriation (as is commonly done) but as a property of the Third Person (Petau, Scheeben, de Rignon, Waffelaert).

Another more elaborate and systematic survey of recent theology on the inhabitation is presented in the first and second section of F. J. Trütsch's doctoral thesis, *SS. trinitatis inhabitatio apud theologos recentiores*.³ His classification of recent theories differs from Michel's. Contemporary theology on the inhabitation can be grouped in two main classes of opinions. The first

¹ This survey is limited, with but rare exceptions, to the post-war years 1945–51.

² A. Michel, "Trinité (Missions et habitation des personnes de la)," *DTC*, XV, 2 (Paris, 1950), 1830–55.

³ Trent, 1949; the work was actually written in 1946.

looks for an explanation in God's presence as principle of the supernatural life; the other considers His presence as term or object of it.

The first class comprises three sub-groups. (1) One group considers God as efficient cause of sanctifying grace, and this efficient causality explains His special presence in the inhabitation, either by itself alone (as Vasquez thought, but hardly anyone today), or as a partial principle of explanation together with God's presence of immensity (so, after John of St. Thomas and Gardeil, who presupposed it to objective presence, Garrigou-Lagrange, Elfes, Lange, Koenig, and others), or by the special way of efficient causality proper to the production of grace, namely, such as involves immediate presence of the divine Persons (Galtier, Retailleau, Dumont, *et al.*). (2) Another group explains the inhabitation by exemplary causality, that is, through assimilation or a divine operation that is formally assimilating the just soul to God (Galtier, Joret, Chambat, Martinez, Gomez, Rudloff), either under the aspect of nature (Gardeil), or of deity (Retailleau, Garrigou-Lagrange), or of Trinity (Galtier, Chambat). (3) A third group considers quasi-formal causality as the explanation of the divine indwelling (de la Taille, K. Rahner). The second class of explanations of the divine inhabitation, in the Suarezian line of thought, considers God's objective presence through knowledge and love as the reason of His indwelling in a special manner (Froget, Pesch, Gardeil, Garrigou-Lagrange, Lange, Delaye, Rudloff, Retailleau, Menendez-Reigada).

As is apparent from this tableau of opinions, many authors unite more than one opinion in an explanation of their own. Trütsch himself seeks to synthesize the two general tendencies and formulates his thesis as follows. God's indwelling is His union with the just soul by which one principle of life is constituted accidentally, that is, a new life is added by way of accident to an already established substance. In that union God joins Himself to the soul as actuating act: He actuates in a created and accidental manner the substance of the soul, ontologically and in view of knowledge and love (this should be understood after the analogy of the *species impressa*). For that reason the indwelling is also a union by way of habitual object. The aspect of object must be considered as a formal element in the indwelling, because it ultimately specifies even the ontological union, or the union by way of principle of the supernatural life. This ontological union cannot be determined accurately unless one refers to the aspect of object. Hence, if we speak formally, we may retain the classical formula: God inhabits the just man as object of habitual knowledge and love, "*sicut cognitum in cognoscente et amatum in amante*" (p. 137).

Against this background of opinions current theology reveals a desire to seize the speciality of God's presence in the soul through grace and manifests some sort of dissatisfaction with the appropriation theory.⁴ This desire and this dissatisfaction are apparently inspired by the thirst for realism and the aversion to nominalism which are characteristic of our time. Though a number of the studies we have to review are on the face of them historical and endeavor to detect and state the teaching either of the Fathers or of the Common Doctor, yet under this historical garb hides more often than not the hardly veiled doctrinal stand of their authors.

In the study of the divine indwelling, as pointed out elsewhere,⁵ two questions are to be distinguished. First, what is it that constitutes the speciality of the divine presence in the inhabitation? Second, is that presence proper to one or peculiar to each or common to all of the three Divine Persons? In other words, are there or are there not special relations of the just soul to each of the Divine Persons? Or can these relations be explained simply only by appropriation? Both of these questions are controverted in contemporary theology.⁶

DOM CHAMBAT'S THOMISTIC VIEW

A first elaborate study of the divine indwelling, mentioned by Michel and Trütsch, is that of Dom L. Chambat.⁷ It presents itself as a study of St. Thomas' teaching on the missions of the Divine Persons. Primarily it studies the first of the two above-mentioned questions, concerning the formal constituent of the special divine presence called inhabitation.⁸ Second-

⁴ The desire and the dissatisfaction do not date from today. Petau and de Régnon have always had their admirers, some hesitant, others more daring; cf. H. Schauf, *Die Einwohnung des hl. Geistes: Die Lehre von der nichtappropriierten Einwohnung des hl. Geistes als Beitrag zur Theologiegeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der beiden Theologen Carl Passaglia und Clemens Schrader* (Freiburg i. B., 1941), and the review by J. Bittremieux in *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, XIX (1942), 147-49.

⁵ THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, XIII (1952), 33.

⁶ It may be well to note that the question of these special relations to the Persons is freely discussed among Catholic theologians; the magisterium has not made any pronouncement in the matter; cf. *Pius Papa XII, De mystico Iesu Christi corpore deque nostra in eo cum Christo coniunctione: "Mystici corporis Christi,"* ed. S. Tromp, S.J. (Pont. Univ. Gregor., Textus et documenta, ser. theol., XXVI; Rome, 1946), p. 115.

⁷ Lucien Chambat, O.S.B., *Présence et union: Les missions des personnes de la sainte trinité selon saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris: Abbaye de saint Wandrille, 1945).

⁸ The same problem was studied by J. F. Sagüés, S.J., "El modo de inhabitación del Espíritu Santo según Santo Tomás de Aquino," *Miscelánea Comillas*, II (1944), 159-301. Sagüés distinguishes in the inhabitation a dynamic presence, distinct from that by way

arily it touches on the question of special relations to each of the Divine Persons. Its main conclusions are to some extent a trial-synthesis of the views of Gardeil and Galtier. The mission of the Divine Persons terminates in their inhabitation in the just souls (common teaching). This inhabitation is nothing else than the presence of the Divine Persons as efficient and exemplary cause of sanctifying grace (Galtier). That presence manifests in some way the Divine Persons, who become the object of knowledge and love (Gardeil, but with the modification that the manifestation does not constitute their presence, against Gardeil). The Divine Persons are present or represented in sanctifying grace before any act of knowledge or love on the part of the justified soul by the mere fact that they are apt to be known and loved. The indwelling is an ontological fact before being a psychological one; it is a presence before being a union.

Chambat traces this idea of St. Thomas concerning the indwelling to the sources, in Scripture, St. Augustine, St. Albert the Great. In all of these he finds a distinction between the presence of the Divine Persons and the manifestation of that presence. St. Thomas synthesized their data in a doctrine that is substantially the same from his first to his last works. In the *Commentary on the Sentences* (I, dist. 14–18) in a firmly structured treatise he shows that the missions “are characterized by the coming and the presence in creatures of the Persons, both as exemplary and efficient cause; exemplarity explains our assimilation to them, efficiency their real presence” (p. 113). The mission terminates in a quasi-experimental knowledge or enjoying love of them, which regards their presence and assimilating action (p. 107). In dist. 37, q. 1, a. 2, the teaching is not different: presence follows on causality, while union in knowledge and love only manifests their presence (cf. p. 127 f.). The *Summa contra gentiles* (IV, 21) teaches the same but specifies the exemplary causality proper to each Person: efficient causality common to the three determines their presence in the

of immensity, by which grace is produced, and the objective presence which properly constitutes the inhabitation and for which grace is the proximate disposition. The latter is a substantial presence. Why? Because grace is the beginning of glory. How is this? By charity, which establishes friendship between God and man, based on a sharing in beatitude, and thus renders God present as object of fruition; by faith and wisdom, a matrimonial bond between the soul and God. This can be expressed by saying that the Holy Spirit inhabits the soul *ad fructum imperfectum*, and more particularly *sicut cognitum in cognoscente et amatum in amante*, by habitual knowledge and love, or also by a quasi-experimental knowledge. Sagüés thus reconciles different ways of presenting St. Thomas' conception. He insists on showing that the objective presence entails a subjective presence, both in grace and in glory. But he leaves undecided the reason of this connection: whether of its nature or by a divine gift—“por su naturaleza o por concesión de Dios” (p. 189).

soul; exemplary causality particular to each Person is the principle of assimilation. Their presence as object of knowledge and love is determined as follows: the object is in the intellect as similitude and in the will by way of impulse or tendency (p. 146). This prepares the teaching of the *Summa theologiae* (I, q. 43), which insists more on the presence of the Persons as object of knowledge and love but does not neglect their presence as efficient and exemplary cause (p. 168). Assimilation to the Persons is by appropriation, that is, through the mediation of the essential attributes of wisdom and love (p. 174). Yet, because of this special exemplary causality of each of the Persons, we enter through grace into special relations with them (p. 201); we participate in the trinitarian life.

Dom Chambat's study is no doubt a reaction against Gardeil's explanation of the divine indwelling (which reduces it to the intentional order?), though he accepts from Gardeil's view what he deems "union" adds to "presence." It is also apparently inspired by the desire to go beyond the appropriation theory and to find room for special relations to the three Divine Persons; yet his stand does not seem to be very definite.

His work met with both criticism and approval. Criticism came especially from the Dominican side, which refuses his interpretation of St. Thomas, and generally defends Gardeil's position. Thus Guérard des Lauriers, J. M. Egan, and H. Dondaine,⁹ for different reasons: either because Chambat's exegesis of *I Sent.*, d. 37, q. 1, a. 2 ad 3m seems faulty (Guérard); or because he seems wrongly to understand exemplary causality, which is not an action, or the divine missions which terminate with the Persons, not at the gifts (Egan); or because he fails to grasp correctly the tension that exists between the two views: assimilation, and presence as object of knowledge and love; the latter, Gardeil rightly says, is properly the reason of the supernatural presence (Dondaine). This last critic proposes an illuminating remark. The presence by way of object is implied, though not expressly signified, in the assimilation to the characteristic qualities of the Persons: assimilation is dynamic conformation of subject to object (p. 436). Others have greeted Chambat's study as a welcome and needed corrective to Gardeil's views (Chevasse, Vandenbroucke, Glorieux, Galtier).¹⁰ The first of these

⁹ Cf. *Bulletin thomiste*, V (1943-46; published 1950), 196-214; *Thomist*, IV (1946), 461-65; *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXXI (1947), 433-37. The last review is perhaps the most balanced and penetrating. Chambat's interpretation of *I Sent.*, d. 37, q. 1, a. 2 ad 3m, is followed by Bundervoet (cf. note 41 below), who justifies it from a similar text of St. Albert the Great.

¹⁰ Cf. *Revue du moyen-âge latin*, II (1946), 87-91; *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, V (1946-49), 74 f.; *Mélanges de science religieuse*, IV (1947), 380; *Gregorianum*, XXVII (1946), 160.

objects, as others did after him, to Chambat's uniformizing tendency in interpreting St. Thomas; the difference between the *Commentary* and the *Summa* is greater than he says it is. He also points to an adjustment of Gardeil's "intentional" conception of the indwelling; when God is considered not as material but as the objective motive of theological activity, then it can be said that there is an immediate and substantial contact between the just soul and God. The hint is worth noting. Others still rest content with a general and noncommittal approval (Michel, Taymans, Loncke).¹¹ The upshot of the discussion is that a revision of Gardeil's position is desirable, and that the *proprium* or non-appropriation theory of the indwelling of the Three Persons is perhaps to be discarded a priori as incompatible with St. Thomas' principles.

THE GREEK FATHERS

Is that non-appropriation theory to be excluded from the teaching of the Greek Fathers? It is well known that it is generally under the aegis of the Eastern conception, as opposed to the Latin or Western one, that the *proprium* theory, especially a particular indwelling of the Holy Spirit, is presented in theology. A vigorous attack by Galtier on Petau's theory on the special role of the Holy Spirit in the work of our sanctification endeavors to prove this exclusion.¹² The intent of his study on the Holy Spirit in us according to the Greek Fathers is clearly stated in the Introduction. The author wishes to examine in detail the texts on which Petau based his interpretation; no one of Petau's followers ever did this. To answer the question, whether the Holy Spirit unites Himself to our souls in a special manner, it is not enough simply to show that He is in us according to His special way of existing. The problem is the following: in order to attribute to the Holy Spirit a really special role, a really proper and personal manner of uniting Himself to us and of intervening in the work of our sanctification, it is necessary to maintain that He unites Himself and intervenes by something which belongs to His Person and not only to His essence (p. 19). Some may, and did, question this way of formulating the *status quaestionis*: is this the problematic of the Greek Fathers? At any rate, the careful and impressive study Galtier makes of the texts of the Fathers, in the two parts of his book, both before the controversies about the Holy Spirit and at the time of these controversies, led him to a conclusion opposite to that of Petau. In conformity with the teaching of the New Testament, from Igna-

¹¹ Cf. *Ami du clergé*, LVIII (1948), 307; *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXIX (1947), 89; *Collationes Brugenses*, XLII (1946), 366.

¹² Paul Galtier, S.J., *Le Saint Esprit en nous d'après les Pères grecs* (Rome, 1946).

tius of Antioch, passing through Irenaeus, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, to Athanasius, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, the Greek Fathers do not teach what Petau read into them. Their teaching is not different from what theologians nowadays explain by appropriation; the Fathers did not know the term, but they taught the thing. They propose a teaching which Galtier formulates in his well-known thesis: the Three Persons intervene in the mystery of the divine union which sanctifies us for the same reason and in the same manner, because of the absolute unity of their one and same nature.

It is hard to escape the impression that Galtier reads the Greek Fathers with the desire of finding the proof for a thesis, rather than of detecting their teaching. Does he project on them a turn of mind, a way of asking the question, which is foreign to their outlook? If that were so, would this *ressourcement* be of the right type, apt to infuse new life into our Scholastic speculations? It may be that Petau, a pioneer, overstressed his intent and his findings. Those who came after him have not failed to correct and adjust his views. They agree with the principle that Galtier does not tire of repeating, that the Holy Spirit has no efficient role other than that of the divine essence, which is one therefore with that of the Father and the Son. But they claim that they do not overthrow that principle by allowing special relations with each of the Three Persons. At any rate, Galtier's scholarly work does not seem to have proved that this claim is not justified.

It is not surprising that this work met with reverent but firm criticism, which may be summed up perhaps by saying that he approaches the Fathers more as a theologian than as a historian. His reading of their texts is guided by a concept of inhabitation which is not theirs. Such is, for example, the criticism of Fr. M. J. Donnelly,¹³ who further objects, after Eröss,¹⁴ that between the theory of Petau and that of pure appropriation there is a possible middle stand which Galtier has not excluded. Moreover, in what exactly lies the difference between the natural and the supernatural presence of God? Galtier seems to leave this difference partly unexplained. Much the same and a more detailed criticism we find in G. Philips' review article.¹⁵ Galtier's study is polemical, not purely objective, with the result that he does not convince the followers of the so-called theory of the Greek Fathers to give up their allegiance. The notion of appropriation applies only to the production of created grace; besides this, can there not be a particular and distinct relation of union and assimilation to the *propria personarum*

¹³ Cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, VIII (1947), 501-3.

¹⁴ Cf. *Scholastik*, XI (1936), 393.

¹⁵ G. Philips, "Le Saint Esprit en nous, à propos d'un livre récent," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, XXIV (1948), 127-35.

(p. 129)? The critic's own position is the following: The production of grace is one, but the union of the soul is made with each of the Persons, and it ought to be expressed in a different manner for each, not only in order to remind us that they are Three, but because the life communicated to us in grace is essentially trinitarian (p. 130 f). He grants that there is to be found in the Greek Fathers a suggestion of the later theory of appropriation; but next to it there is another aspect of grace, that of a union of person to person. These remarks suffice to caution us against the judgments of some other critics, as Glorieux and Lebon,¹⁶ who subscribe to Galtier's thesis unreservedly. The least one can say, with de Ghellinck,¹⁷ is that his study compels those who disagree to re-examine the texts; or with Th. Camelot,¹⁸ that even after agreeing that there is no special role of the Holy Spirit, one has still to look for what distinguishes Him (*to gnōristikon*) from the Father and the Son in His outward action. History and theology have not said their last word about appropriation.

APPROPRIATION AND PROPRIUM THEORY

An illuminating and masterly doctrinal note on the trinitarian appropriations is given by H. F. Dondaine, O.P., in the technical information he adds to the second volume of the translation of the *Summa*.¹⁹ What concerns us here is not so much the interesting historical note on the origin of the theory, which is traced to the too daring way of Abelard, or the table of appropriations, however instructive this is for a Thomist; it is rather his avowal of some sort of dissatisfaction with the theory, whose justification and objective import is generally maintained but not fully explained (p. 419). Dondaine looks for a way out of the difficulty by pointing to a different stand one can take before the theory of appropriations. One may stress, as is generally done, the perfect equality and consubstantiality of the Persons and reduce all appropriation to their relations of origin, thus resting satisfied with clear ideas. One may also find in the appropriations an incentive to penetrate further into the austere concept of relation of origin which is the basis of appropriations. This second way sees in the appropriations more than a "*res solius nominis et tituli*." This suggestion deserves, no doubt, further investigation. Would it not perhaps, when ap-

¹⁶ Cf. *Mélanges de science religieuse*, IV (1947), 382; *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XLIII (1948), 761 f.

¹⁷ Cf. *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXX (1948), 864.

¹⁸ Cf. *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXXII (1948), 276 f.

¹⁹ H. Dondaine, O.P., *St. Thomas d'Aquin, Somme théologique: La trinité*, II: *Pars prima*, qq. 33-43 (Paris, 1946), Appendix II, 3: "Les appropriations trinitaires," pp. 409-23.

plied to the mystery of our sanctification, open a way for a rapprochement between the appropriation and *proprium* theories?

Yet, Dondaine himself, when explaining the divine inhabitation,²⁰ stops at the common way of saying: The presence of the divine indwelling, which can be appropriated to the Holy Spirit, is still an inhabitation and union common to the Three Persons. One may regret that he apparently did not exploit his own suggestion. Fr. M. J. Nicolas, O.P., in a critical review of Dondaine's doctrinal notes,²¹ expresses that regret. He hints that St. Thomas' teaching on the divine missions is the key to further penetration into the appropriation theory. According to him, in a synthesis of the whole of St. Thomas' trinitarian theology the manifestation *ad extra* of the Divine Persons could take as large a place as admirers of the Greek Fathers desire (p. 140). It would be easy, he says, and to the benefit of a complete theology, to integrate all the riches of the Greek theology in a Thomist treatise on the Trinity (p. 141). When shall we see the Thomist who realizes this hope?²²

As to the speciality of the supernatural divine presence, on which Dondaine also remarks, he discards the opinions and explanations other than those of John of St. Thomas and Gardeil. He shows in his personal way that the objective presence of the Trinity by way of knowledge and love is also a real and substantial presence. Habitual knowledge of the Trinity is a virtual state of tension between subject and immanent object.²³

The *proprium* theory of the divine indwelling continues to find followers. F. Taymans d'Eypernon, S.J., for example, in an inspiring book on the mystery of the Holy Trinity,²⁴ rallies to de Régnon's position that each of the Divine Persons plays a special role in sanctifying the just soul and that the just soul has a special and distinct relation to each of the Divine Persons. So does Fr. G. M. Dupont, S.J., in a spiritual book on devotion to the Holy Trinity.²⁵ He even goes further. Even in the order of creation he detects some sort of special relations to each of the Three Persons, a view which not all theologians or students of St. Thomas will share. More will

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Appendix II, 4: "Les missions divines," C: "Le mode de la présence d'habitation," pp. 438-49.

²¹ Cf. *Revue thomiste*, XXXV (1947), 139 ff.

²² Much less open-minded an approach to St. Thomas, or even to other theologians, is reflected in the article of T. Urdanoz, O.P., "La inhabitación del Espíritu Santo en el alma del justo," *Revista española de teología*, VI (1946), 465-533. His position is further developed in another long article in the same review for 1948; cf. *infra*, note 48.

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 447.

²⁴ F. Taymans d'Eypernon, S.J., *Le mystère primordial: La trinité dans sa vivante image* (Paris, 1941), pp. 109-28.

²⁵ G. M. Dupont, S.J., *Foundations for a Devotion to the Blessed Trinity* (Calcutta, 1947).

follow him in his exposition of our supernatural relations and assimilations to the Divine Persons, a life of communion with the Trinity made possible for us by transforming sanctifying grace. They may appreciate or wonder at his daring in proposing the highest of mysteries to the devotion of the faithful.

The desire to present the *proprium* theory of the inhabitation in an acceptable manner inspires two articles of Fr. M. J. Donnelly, S.J., in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES.²⁶ When, in the first, he achieves his aim of presenting accurately Scheeben's doctrine on the role of uncreated grace in our sanctification, he tacitly approves of the idea of a proper union with each of the Divine Persons. He only raises objection to Scheeben's concept of the metaphysical separability of created and uncreated grace and to his allowing that the union is a moral one. When, in the other article, he proposes a tentative solution for the non-exclusive *proprium* theory of the inhabitation of the Blessed Trinity, he draws his principle of solution from de la Taille's concept of grace as created actuation by uncreated Act. From the analogy of the application of this concept to the mystery of the hypostatic union, Donnelly leads gradually to its application to the indwelling of the Holy Trinity in the just. His endeavor goes, no doubt, and successfully, in the right direction. We must note, however, that Thomists have objected, and continue to do so, to the de la Taille concept of grace; it does not square with Thomist principles.²⁷ This invites a closer study of it, more than a cursory answer, such as that of Fr. Bourassa, S.J., to which we shall refer presently.²⁸

DIVINE INDWELLING IN THE JUST BEFORE CHRIST

A side problem of the divine indwelling through grace is that of the just before Christ. Students of the theology of grace are aware of the opinion of some theologians, the best known names being Petau and Waffelaert, who held that, according to the teaching of Scripture and the Greek Fathers, before the coming of Christ the Holy Spirit did not inhabit the just substantially but only virtually or in the effects of His action: not *ousiôdôs*, but only *energeia*. The theory has been re-examined again in a remarkable study by G. Philips on the grace of the just in the Old Testament.²⁹ After

²⁶ M. J. Donnelly, S.J., "The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit according to M. J. Scheeben," THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, VII (1946), 244-80; "The Inhabitation of the Holy Spirit: A Solution according to de la Taille," *ibid.*, VIII (1947), 445-70.

²⁷ Cf. Chambat, *op. cit.*, p. 88, n. 35; Dondaine, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXXIV (1950), 631; also his *La trinité*, II, 441.

²⁸ Cf. *infra*, notes 43 and 44; see also the position of Trütsch, *supra*, p. 242 ff.

²⁹ G. Philips, "La grâce des justes dans l'Ancien Testament," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, XXIII (1947), 521-56; XXIV (1948), 23-58.

stating the problem and reviewing theological opinions about it, he examines its patristic foundations and concludes that, except for St. Augustine who inclines to assimilate fully the grace of the just before Christ and after Christ, the Fathers, especially the Eastern ones, conceive the state of grace in the Old Testament as essentially imperfect, only inceptive, not complete, because only the Incarnation was to give men the full divine filiation. Accordingly, the Spirit of adoption was not given to the just before Christ except in a preparatory way. Petau's idea is not without foundation in the Fathers.

St. Thomas, it is true, who follows St. Augustine on the point, also conceives the state of grace and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit as identical in both Testaments, though it was less complete in the Old. After him, common theological doctrine did the same.

What are the scriptural foundations, if any, of the idea of the minority? G. Philips examines successively the idea of the Old Testament and the different writings of the New. He concludes that, according to Scripture, the sanctification of the just before Christ is incomplete compared to that of the just who are incorporated in Christ. Theirs was a preparatory interior justification. Particularly, the grace of the Old Testament did not entail the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, the result of His mission. "Formerly, the true filial status and the inhabitation of the *Pneuma* were not given: these follow on the Incarnation of the Son" (p. 30).

How conceive this "incomplete sanctification"? Created and uncreated grace are inseparable; they measure each other. The created actuation by the uncreated Act, ("the least imperfect expression of the reality of grace"), "is progressive. . . . It entails different preparations, inceptive and imperfect realizations, which yet belong to the order of a real and habitual sanctification. The grace of the Old Testament must be called justification but not donation and possession of the Persons" (p. 45). "The Old Testament, which did not manifest the divine processions, whether intrinsic or extrinsic, does not possess the trinitarian grace in the full sense of the phrase, implying the indwelling of the Three. Its supernatural life will have to develop, deepen, be more actualized by a new perfection. Only a last consummation will, through communion with the Spirit, insert the perfect resemblance with the Son in the children of the Father" (p. 56).

This suggestive idea of a development in the perfection of the state of grace, a development that touches on the indwelling of the Persons, lends new interest to a theory most commonly considered to be rather singular. For our present purpose it is noteworthy in another respect, as drawing attention to the connection of the inhabitation of the Three Persons with

Christ's Incarnation and our incorporation in Christ. Philips' study, with its firm scriptural and patristic foundations, no less than solid theology, makes one hope that some day he may give us a complete doctrine of the divine indwelling through grace, conceived as entailing special relations to each of the Divine Persons. Many a hint in his essay presents this as both positively and speculatively founded.³⁰

GRACE AND DIVINE SONSHIP

The problem of the divine inhabitation in both its aspects of special presence of the Trinity and of distinct relations with the Persons, is treated in the profound book of S. I. Dockx, O.P.³¹ Its argument may be summed up as follows. Our adoptive filiation, which is attested in Scripture and tradition, involves deification, already on this earth and not only in heaven. No one can deify except God. A real substantial presence of God in the soul is therefore entailed in our deification. What is that special presence? Not one by efficient causality, but by way of objective presence, that is, as object of operation, or by way of knowledge and love. But here on earth God cannot be the intelligible form by which we know Him immediately; this is only for the vision. He can and actually is in us as immanent goal or terminus of our charity, *terminus amoris*. This terminus, in the case of divine charity, is not a created reality but God Himself. Why? Because in the act of charity the will is drawn immediately by God Himself, without an intermediary terminus of a love of the created order, towards the possession of God in the beatific vision (p. 67). On this objective presence of God follows, in the gift of wisdom, the loving knowledge of Him, a loving intuition (p. 100). Such is St. Thomas' teaching on God's supernatural presence in us by way of knowledge and love. Does this presence originate special and distinct relations of the just soul to each of the Three Persons? In a way yes, in a way no. No, if you consider the created effect of their presence (p. 110). Yes, if you consider the Persons, not as principle, but as terminators of a relation of the creature to God; in that regard they can be and are per-

³⁰ In a note on Philips' study ("Les conditions du salut avant la venue du Sauveur chez s. Cyrille d'Alexandrie," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXXII [1948], 359-62), A. M. Dubarle, O.P., does not add anything on the point of the divine indwelling. A. M. Hoffman, O.P., "Die Gnade der Gerechten des Alten Bundes nach Thomas von Aquin," *Divus Thomas* (Freiburg), XXIX (1951), 167-87, states that the just of the Old Testament have the same grace as those of the New; progress from one to the other regards only explicit faith in the Redemption, the sacramental and charismatic economy, and the immediate granting of the vision.

³¹ S. I. Dockx, O.P., *Fils de Dieu par grâce* (Paris, 1948); this is a study according to St. Thomas.

sonally present in us (p. 113 f.). Such is the case in their invisible missions. Grace, charity, union of love—that is what makes us sons of God.

Therefore, in the explanation of the special divine presence, Dockx refuses Galtier's position. The need to invoke efficient causality to explain the substantial presence of God arises, he says, from hesitation in adhering fully to the Thomist realism of knowledge (p. 16). He follows substantially Gardeil's theory of the objective presence but corrects it on several points of detail. The originality of Dockx lies in the central role he gives to the love of charity. Charity draws God's substantial presence in the soul. As to distinct relations with the Three Persons, he proposes a middle way between pure appropriation and an exclusive *proprium* theory.

This essay raises a number of questions. We may set aside the question of his fidelity in interpreting St. Thomas; some of his critics have questioned it.³² It will be sufficient to raise two points. Does his exposition account sufficiently for the habitual presence of the Trinity independently of acts on our part? Is the reason why charity entails the substantial immanence of God, whereas another love does not require the interior presence of its object, perfectly clear?

Fr. Dockx's critics have not failed to remark on the newness of his interpretation of St. Thomas, some to praise it,³³ others to question it.³⁴ They have also pointed out the central role he gives to charity and to its immanent *terminus amoris*.³⁵ Some have noticed his dissatisfaction with the appropriation theory, yet his hesitation in opting for distinct special relations to the Persons.³⁶ Of detailed criticism we should retain his depreciation of faith, of which he considers only the conceptual aspect and neglects that of cognition by connaturality.³⁷ More clarification of his position was demanded.

Fr. Dockx gave it in an article on the specific foundation of God's real

³² Cf. *Angelicum*, XXVIII (1951), 290; F. Bourassa, in *Sciences ecclésiastiques*, III (1950), 228. K. Rahner says that the synthesis of Dockx is not that of St. Thomas, who is closer to the Greek Fathers than is commonly believed.

³³ Cf. Philips, in *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, XXV (1949), 416–18.

³⁴ Cf. Le Guillou, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXXIV (1950), 418 f.

³⁵ Cf. Le Guillou, *loc. cit.*; Bourassa, *op. cit.*, pp. 227–29; A. J. Bruneau, in *Revue thomiste*, LII (1952), 225–33.

³⁶ Cf. Sträter, in *Bijdragen der Nederlandsche Jezuiten*, X (1949), 198; Malevez, in *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXXII (1950), 216.

³⁷ Cf. Philips, *op. cit.*, p. 417; also, Fr. de Lanversin, S.J., "L'Acte de foi et nos relations avec la sainte trinité," *Recherches de science religieuse*, L (1952), 298–306; cf. especially p. 304.

presence in the just soul.³⁸ After surveying the opinions he discards as unsatisfactory (his criticism of the weak spot in Gardeil's position seems pertinent), he restates in a revised form his explanation of God's substantial presence in the soul as "reality of love" or *terminus amoris*. His exposition has gained in clarity and firmness. His commentary on II-II, q. 27, a. 4 ("Utrum [Deus] possit in hac vita immediate amari") is original and significant. It brings out his thesis: Just as in the vision God, immanent in the beatified intellect, is the principle *quo* of the vision (*id quo Deus videtur*), so also in the charity of our earthly pilgrimage God, immanent in the will as *terminus amoris*, is the principle by which we love God (*id quo Deus amatur*) (p. 686). Of special distinct relations to the Persons no mention is made here.

STUDIES IN APPROPRIATION

The discussions and differences of opinion about the appropriation and *proprium* theories of the indwelling of the Divine Persons naturally invited *ex professo* research into the idea of appropriation itself.³⁹ One such study is that of Fr. C. Sträter, S.J.⁴⁰ In a close examination of St. Thomas' texts he looks for a way of reconciling the two extreme opinions and of synthesizing St. Thomas and the Greek Fathers. His conclusions are the following. The first concerns appropriation in general. The idea of appropriation as "manifestatio personarum per essentialia attributa" (I, q. 39, a. 7) is, in St. Thomas' mind, an analogical concept. It is used on different levels of thought in different meanings. On a purely philosophical level, the essential attributes, power, wisdom, goodness, are appropriated to the Persons, Father, Son, Holy Spirit. In the theological field, there are two different levels of thought. On one level appropriation is made in the same sense as in philosophy, that is, considering only the divine essence and not seeing in it the three Persons; this is pure appropriation, which does not include special relations to the Persons. On another higher level of thought the mind, penetrated with the grace of faith, sees the divine nature only *in* the Persons; this appropriation includes special relations to the Persons, in the sense that the whole Trinity acts in us because of the Father, or acts because of the Son, or because of the Holy Spirit. We may note that appropriation on the

³⁸ S. I. Dockx, "Du fondement propre de la présence réelle de Dieu dans l'âme," *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXXII (1950), 673-89.

³⁹ Cf. Dondaine, *supra*, note 19; Nicolas, *supra*, note 21.

⁴⁰ C. Sträter, S.J., "Het Begrip 'Appropriatie' bij S. Thomas," *Bijdragen der Nederlandsche Jezuitelen*, IX (1948), 1-41, 144-86; a summary is given in French, pp. 40 f., 184 ff.

philosophical level does not suppose that philosophy detects the Trinity: it only means that, to the idea of the Trinity known from revelation, the notions philosophy proves about God are related and compared. This general idea of appropriation when applied to what we know about God leads to the following conclusions. Appropriation in the strict sense of pure appropriation (philosophical or theological, first meaning) applies to the order of creation. Appropriation in the second meaning of the word, which includes special relations, covers the order of grace. Fr. Sträter proposes to speak of appropriation only in the first sense of the word and to reserve the phrase, "special relations," to our supernatural elevation. In that manner the Greek theory of our union with the Divine Persons could be synthesized with the speculative system of St. Thomas.

This close study, not always easy reading, inspired, its author says, by a desire of reconciling the appropriation theory with St. Thomas' well-known realism (p. 2 f.), is undoubtedly a move in the proper direction. Its main idea, namely, the distinction between different levels of thought on which the analogical concept of appropriation is used in partly different meanings, stands a fair chance of being accepted in further studies on the question of the divine indwelling. At all events, Sträter's conclusions will have to be reckoned with.

Another way of uniting appropriation and special relations is proposed by A. Bundervoet, M.S.C., in a study on St. Thomas, *In I Sent.*, d. 14-18 and d. 37.⁴¹ His synthesis follows from the way he conceives the special presence of the Trinity in the just. In fact, he synthesizes Galtier and Gardeil. Both God's sanctifying action, which is at once efficient and assimilating, and His objective presence by way of (habitual) knowledge and love belong to the essence of the divine indwelling. Because the sanctifying causality has two aspects, there is room for both appropriation and distinct relations. In its efficient aspect, sanctification is attributed to the Persons by appropriation; in its assimilating aspect, it gives rise to distinct special relations to each of the Persons. This explanation looks both simple and complete. Perhaps too much so? If it comes to the notice of theologians, it deserves further consideration.⁴²

⁴¹ A. Bundervoet, "Wat behoort tot het Wezen van Gods heiligende Genade-Inwoning volgens St. Thomas I Sent., dist. XIV-XVIII en XXXVII?", *ibid.*, pp. 42-58.

⁴² Another study on the appropriation theory (which we have not been in a position to consult) is that of J. Solano, S.J., "Algunas tendencias modernas de la doctrina de las apropiaciones y propiedades en la Santísima Trinidad," *Estudios eclesiásticos*, XXI (1947), 5-34.

THE SPECIAL DIVINE PRESENCE

The study of Fr. Bourassa, S.J., on the divine missions and the supernatural in St. Thomas,⁴³ is another essay which attempts to explain the speciality of God's supernatural presence through grace. He hardly touches on the missions of the Persons as such. His entire effort is centered on explaining St. Thomas' formula for God's supernatural presence, "secundum operationem" or "sicut cognitum in cognoscente et amatum in amante." He shows how created grace is essentially relative to Uncreated Grace, in such a way that Scheeben's opposition between the Greek and the Latin way of conceiving our sanctification appears to be overstressed; it must be toned down considerably. Further, objective presence means of necessity a real presence of God, even in the habitual knowledge or love of the habitus of faith or charity; *intelligere* is a habitual knowledge as opposed to *cogitare*. But only faith formed by charity involves that presence, because charity alone unites God to the soul. All through Fr. Bourassa's explanations we surmise the idea of created actuation by Uncreated Act, yet it never shows up. But does the realism of faith and charity suffice to make this point unless the de la Taille formula be implied?

In a later note,⁴⁴ Fr. Bourassa answered a stricture of Dom Chambat on that idea of actuation by Uncreated Act. After proving that the idea of presence *per modum objecti* is found, if not in so many words, at least as to the teaching itself, in *I Sent.*, d. 14-16, he shows how the text of d. 17 invites us to call the union with the Divine Object an actuation (by Uncreated Act); but he restricts the use of the term to actuation of the soul in its operation, because an immediate actuation of the essence of the soul is impossible (p. 198). This Thomist objection again raises the question: why is this impossible on Thomist principles?

We find another hint for the explanation of God's special presence in the just in a brief article of A. Van Hove.⁴⁵ After reviewing and discarding other opinions he formulates his own, that God's indwelling consists in the fact that through grace the just soul is really and intrinsically directed towards the beatific vision and its attendant love. In the vision there is an immediate union with God; we must, therefore, find the same in grace, which is the

⁴³ F. Bourassa, S.J., "Les missions divines et le surnaturel chez saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Sciences ecclésiastiques*, I (1948), 41-94.

⁴⁴ F. Bourassa, "Dom Chambat et l'habitation des personnes divines," *ibid.*, III (1950), 194-98.

⁴⁵ A. Van Hove, "De modo quo Deus inhabitat in animabus iustis," *Collectanea Mechliniensia*, XXXIII (1948), 304-18.

beginning of glory. The idea, which had been further developed already by J. Sagües,⁴⁶ is worth noting, though it affirms rather than explains the special presence.

FOR AND AGAINST APPROPRIATION

Historical monographs on particular authors seem to be of a nature to throw light on the discussion of appropriation and *proprium* theories. An instance is an article by M. Caliaro on St. Bernard's teaching on the question, whether our sanctification is attributed to the Holy Spirit properly or by appropriation.⁴⁷ For the history of the question St. Bernard holds a key position, between the patristic and the Scholastic age. His teaching, the author says, cannot be explained satisfactorily by appropriation only. Though efficiency and inhabitation are common to the Three Persons, yet the union by which there is *unitas spiritus* between God and the soul terminates in the Person of the Holy Spirit, *vinculum unitatis*. This hints at a synthesis between appropriation and *proprium* theory—a synthesis which could hardly have been as developed in St. Bernard's time as it is today.

An altogether negative attitude to any attempt at explaining the divine indwelling as a special presence in any other way than by efficient and exemplary causality, and as a presence of the Persons to be explained in any way other than by pure appropriation, is taken by T. Urdanoz, O.P., in a long article on the causal influence of the Divine Persons in the inhabitation in the just soul.⁴⁸ His polemical tone, which makes no allowance for right views on the part of his opponents, apparently blinds the author to nuances of thought and expressions and reveals a rigidity of concepts that inclines him to condemn wholesale any opinions different from his own. Too easily he sees "error" and "opposition to Trent" and "pantheism" in ideas that remain far from such things. His article makes painful reading. The occasion for his writing was offered by some recent endeavors in Spain to revive the "Greek theory" about our sanctification, conceiving it by way of quasi-formal causality and in a manner that assigned properly personal functions to each of the Persons.⁴⁹ His rather one-sided view of the theories

⁴⁶ Cf. *supra*, note 8.

⁴⁷ Marco Caliaro, "Lo Spirito Santo nella vita spirituale secondo S. Bernardo, *Divus Thomas* (Piacenza), LI (1948), 304-18.

⁴⁸ T. Urdanoz, O.P., "Influjo causal de las divinas personas en la inhabitación en las ánimas justas," *Revista española de teología*, VIII (1948), 141-202.

⁴⁹ X. Zubiri, *Naturaleza, historia, Dios* (Madrid, 1944); cf. the last essay, "El ser sobrenatural: Dios y la deificación en la teología paulina." Cf. also J. Alonso, "Naturaleza y fundamento de la gracia de la Virgen," *Estudios Marianos*, V (1942), 11-110.

of Lessius, Petau, and Thomassin, reveals little appreciation of positive theology. So does his critical summary of H. Schauf's book⁵⁰ on nineteenth-century theologians who inclined to the Greek theories. One wonders how much of an effort he has made to get some insight into the ideas of those important theologians, Scheeben, de R  gnon, and Waffelaert. At any rate, he resolutely rejects two positions: that the inhabitation is a personal function of the Holy Spirit, or at least that each of the Three Divine Persons has in it His own function and distinct manner of actuation; and that there is any causal influence or immediate quasi-information by the Divine Persons in the order of formal causality.

As to his positive stand, Urdanoz, "with the teaching of the Church and the entire tradition," affirms that the inhabitation is common to the whole Trinity and appropriated to the Holy Spirit, and that it is to be explained by efficient causality. To prove his stand he reviews Galtier's book on the inhabitation of the Persons of the Holy Trinity (Paris, 1928).⁵¹ He emphasizes, more than his guide, the negative stand he took from the start. The doctrine of the Church proves, he asserts, that the position he defends is theologically certain, as is apparent from Leo XIII and from Pius XII's *Mystici corporis*,⁵² a statement which few perhaps, even of his sympathizers, will accept without comment. His further theological proof looks somewhat like a Don Quixote fight against imaginary opponents. All theologians are in agreement with the substance of what he proves, namely, that every divine work *ad extra* is common to the Three Persons, and that God, whether as nature or as Person, cannot be the form of a creature. But this fact leaves untouched the endeavor of many a modern theologian to synthesize appropriation and *proprium* theories and to find an explanation of the special divine presence other than by way of efficient causality. Even in the name of St. Thomas a number of Thomists, and not the least of them, understand appropriation in a sense which allows a synthesis with the positive elements of the Greek theory.⁵³

A more sympathetic approach to the problem of the contrast between Greek and Latin theories, which nevertheless leads to substantially the same negative result as the study by Urdanoz, is taken in the monograph of Fr. B. de M. V. Monseg  , on unity and trinity, *proprium* and appropriation in the trinitarian manifestations according to the doctrine of St. Cyril

⁵⁰ Cf. *supra*, note 4.

⁵¹ Cf. *infra*, p. 265.

⁵² More than one reader may be surprised at the laconic statement that Fr. Tromp's comment (referred to *supra*, note 6) "destruye el texto."

⁵³ Cf. *supra*, note 39.

of Alexandria.⁵⁴ The author is visibly guided by the idea, which in the course of his study grows to a firm conviction, that the said contrast is overstressed by the followers of the Greeks. It is more nominal than real, more superficial than substantial, more in the manner of conceiving and expressing things than in the realities conceived and expressed. Accordingly, he finds in St. Cyril a teaching on the Trinity, both in its inner life and in its operations *ad extra*, which is the same as that of Latin Scholasticism. In the divine works *ad extra*, he concludes, particularly in that of our sanctification, nothing must be said to be proper or special with a view to, or by virtue of, a personal characteristic (of the Holy Spirit). But everything that is attributed to one Person is appropriated. It is the same thing in its principle and in its term; the same in what touches on the efficient causality which sanctifies us and in the other causality which is called quasi-formal. In other words, St. Cyril teaches exactly the same theology of the inhabitation as St. Thomas.

The conclusion seems rather unexpected after the long and favorable study of the Greek theory, as Monsegú finds it explained by some contemporary Spanish theologians.⁵⁵ Why is it that his study of St. Cyril leads him to a conclusion practically the exact opposite of theirs? For two reasons, apparently. First is the above-mentioned leading idea that the Greek theory, in spite of apparent differences, is in reality the same as the Latin one. Monsegú expected to find the same teaching in St. Cyril as in St. Thomas; and he found it. In this regard he undoubtedly overstates the identity of teaching between the two. Greek and Latin theories on our sanctification are complementary rather than identical. They express in two different theologies one same teaching of the faith. Secondly, the author approaches St. Cyril's texts not with the desire of letting them speak for themselves as they did for St. Cyril's contemporaries, but with a mind trained in and filled with the traditional Scholastic theology of the Trinity. Proof of this is the long speculations about trinitarian life, *ad intra* and *ad extra*, which introduce his reading of St. Cyril. This means that he studies St. Cyril as a theologian rather than as a historian. One may wonder whether his conclusion will convince any of his friendly opponents; it impresses one as being partly subjective and not sufficiently objective.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ B. Monsegú, "Unidad y trinidad, propiedad y apropiación en las manifestaciones trinitarias, según la doctrina de San Cirilo Alejandrino," *Revista española de teología*, VIII (1948), 1-57, 275-328.

⁵⁵ Monsegú refers to Alonso and Zubiri (cited *supra*, note 49), as well as to Amor Ruibal and Menendez-Reigada.

⁵⁶ We have not seen the study of J. Sagüés, S.J., "El Espíritu Santo en la santificación del hombre según la doctrina de San Cirilo de Alejandria," *Estudios eclesiásticos*, XXI (1947), 35-84.

Further light on the appropriation and *proprium* theories could apparently be derived from the study of mysticism. Only one such example can find place here. In an article on the causal influence of the Divine Persons in mystical experience,⁵⁷ Fr. B. Apperribay, O.F.M., examines the theological implications of the manifestly trinitarian pattern on which the spiritual life of many mystics (St. Bonaventure, St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, Sister Angeles Sorazu) is shaped. In doing so, he proposes a way of combining *proprium* and appropriation theory. Whatever in the work of our sanctification is divine action *ad extra* is common to the Three Persons and attributed to one or each of them only by appropriation.⁵⁸ But sanctifying grace refers us immediately to God as He is, one in essence and three in Persons. Hence our supernatural life terminates in the intentional order (knowledge and love) at each of the Divine Persons according to their personal qualities. These relations are special,⁵⁹ and not only a matter of appropriation. Such is the teaching, he concludes, of both dogmatic and mystical theology. We must note, however, that the special relations to the Persons are only of the intentional order, and so, Fr. Apperribay explains, nothing more is meant than what was held by Fr. Gardeil.⁶⁰

TWO TRINITARIAN CONCEPTS OF GRACE

A clear systematic exposition of the doctrine of the divine indwelling is offered by the study of Fr. J. M. González Ruiz on the divine image of grace, key to a formally trinitarian inhabitation.⁶¹ With sound matter-of-factness the author faces the state of the problem. Every divine action *ad extra* is common to the Three Persons; yet Scripture and tradition are too explicit about special relations of the just soul to each of them to permit us to rest content with mere appropriation. How synthesize these two facts? He answers that we must leave intact the principle that efficient divine action is one and common to the Three; nevertheless, we can admit also distinct relations or distinct manners of indwelling for each of the Divine Persons.

⁵⁷ B. Apperribay, O.F.M., "Influjo causal de las divinas personas en la experiencia mística," *Verdad y vida*, VII (1949), 74-97. It would require a special study to draw from mystical theology its teaching on the special relations to the Divine Persons.

⁵⁸ Fr. Apperribay makes reference to Efrén de la Madre de Dios, O.C.D., *San Juan de la Cruz y el misterio de la santísima trinidad en la vida espiritual* (Zaragossa, 1947).

⁵⁹ Cf., according to Apperribay, Juan José de la Immaculada, O.C.D., "Acción hipostática del Espíritu Santo en la santificación del alma," *Revista de espiritualidad*, IV (1945), 440-45.

⁶⁰ Cf. A. Gardeil, *La structure de l'âme et l'expérience mystique* (Paris, 1927), II, 138.

⁶¹ J. M. González Ruiz, "La semejanza divina de la gracia, explicación de una inhabitación formalmente trinitaria," *Revista española de teología*, VIII (1948), 565-600.

He proves this as follows. First, the speciality of God's presence through grace is due, as to the fact, to efficient causality; as to the manner, to exemplary causality. The latter he explains by an exegesis of the Thomist phrase, "sicut cognitum in cognoscente et amatum in amante." Intentional union of God with the mind presupposes ontological assimilation to the Object, wrought by the Object itself: in the glory of heaven, as to the formally intelligible object, by the light of glory; on earth, as to the virtually intelligible object, by sanctifying grace. This immediate union with God originates special relations to each of the Persons. How? Grace is an image of God, that is, a created participation of similitude with the Second Person as such, who is the Image of the Father. By this very fact we are sons of the Father, not of the Trinity, for our filiation is a sharing in the Son's; and we are temples of the Holy Spirit, who is the sanctity or "unction" of Father and Son. These special relations do not suppose any distinct efficient action on the part of each of the Persons. They flow from the very nature of sanctifying grace, a formally trinitarian image.

A twofold remark may be made. First, the ontological assimilation to the Divine Object which originates the special presence would seem, on further investigation, to lead to something like the idea of created actuation by Uncreated Act; otherwise the direct union seems to remain partly unexplained. Secondly, the author shows that the formally trinitarian inhabitation which is entailed in grace does not postulate a formal threefoldness in sanctifying grace itself: this is likeness to the Son, not to the Trinity. Grace as such is not a miniature of the Trinity.

Another very different trinitarian concept of the life of grace is sketched by Dr. J. Zimmermann, in an original and novel way, in a study on Trinity, creation, and supernature.⁶² His approach to the problem is rather critical, if not revolutionary. After an over-all criticism of the traditional Augustinian-Thomist psychological theory of the Trinity, he substitutes for the way of conceiving the twofold procession *secundum intellectum et secundum voluntatem*, which involve *actio* and *passio*, a twofold polarity of opposed activities, "schauen-leuchten" and "erstreben-schenken," that is, to see (Father) and to shine (Son: *Verbum*), to strive after (Father-Son: *eros*), and to give (Holy Spirit: *agape*). Whatever one may think of this challenging position, it is the application which the author makes of it to the life of grace that concerns us here. The first of these activities, he says, is at the root of creation itself (his criticism of the Thomist doctrine of creation, based on a Suarezian-inspired idea of act and potency, *esse* and essence, need not detain us). The life of grace, from which he eliminates a grace

⁶² J. Zimmermann, *Trinität, Schöpfung, Übernatur* (Regensburg, 1949).

that would be an entitative habitus, inherent in the essence of the soul and different from charity, unfolds itself in a threefold activity that participates in and mirrors the trinitarian life. Grace-that-makes-see (*schauenmachende Gnade*) arouses faith; grace-that-broadens-out (*weitmachende Gnade*) provokes hope; and sanctifying grace (*heiligmachende Gnade*) arouses the love of charity. Such is his trinitarian concept of grace.

This idea of grace, which upsets the traditional Scholastic, in particular the Thomist, concept, however thought-provoking it may seem to be, is not likely to meet with a general approval. In fact, where Zimmermann's study has been noted, it was generally with great reserve, if not downright disapproval.⁶³ It will do for our present purpose to take note of this endeavor at finding a trinitarian concept of grace as another sign of the mood of present-day theology—a wish to remedy the unsatisfactory aspect of the appropriation theory.

STUDIES ON ST. THOMAS' TEACHING

If we turn to the other aspect of the problem of the divine indwelling, namely, the nature of the special divine presence, we have two doctoral theses which study St. Thomas' teaching on the point. The dissertation of Fr. Thomas J. Fitzgerald, on St. Thomas' teaching on the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit,⁶⁴ states the two well-known interpretations given to St. Thomas: one reduces the indwelling to an intentional or objective presence, the other requires an ontological and substantial presence. The author then critically examines these two schools. By comparing and contrasting in detail the texts of the *Commentary on the Sentences* and those of the *Summa*, and finally those of the *Contra gentes*, the author comes to a conclusion substantially the same as that of Chambat.⁶⁵ There is no substantial change in St. Thomas' teaching on the matter from the *Sentences* to the *Summa*, only a difference of emphasis. The first work stresses the ontological presence through assimilating causality; the second, the intentional presence through knowledge and love. Both elements were always retained by the Angelic Doctor.

This conclusion, which may eventually rally many students of St. Thomas,

⁶³ Cf. de Vries, in *Scholastik*, XXVII (1952), 299 f.; Michel, in *Ami du clergé*, LXII (1952), 51 f.; Philips, in *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, XXVIII (1952), 297 f. The latter remarks especially on the absence of scriptural and patristic "ressourcement."

⁶⁴ T. J. Fitzgerald, *De inhabitatione Spiritus Sancti doctrina s. Thomae Aquinatis* (Mundelein, Ill., 1949); cf. *Angelicum*, XXVIII (1951), 408 (disagrees, and retains Gardeil's position); *Sciences ecclésiastiques*, IV (1951), 187; Philips, in *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, XXVI (1950), 449.

⁶⁵ Cf. *supra*, note 7.

invites further investigation on the mutual connexion of these two elements of explanation. Some essays in this sense have already been pointed out; for example, that of Dondaine,⁶⁶ according to whom objective presence on close consideration involves assimilating and substantial presence, and vice versa.

The other dissertation on the special divine presence through grace according to St. Thomas is Fr. R. Morency's on the union of grace.⁶⁷ To situate his study in the diversity of interpretations, Fr. Morency groups these around three basic opinions which consider the divine indwelling either as an operative, or an objective, or a quasi-formal presence. Each of them admits a variety of nuances. He himself studies the union of grace under a twofold aspect, viewing it from a twofold direction. The first is that of God's union with the soul, which he regards from four angles: union and habitation (in which God's special presence reveals a twofold scheme of assimilation and knowledge); union and mission (as exemplary cause God is present by similitude, and as terminator of the just soul's orientation He is present as object of knowledge and love); union and love (this manifests also the twofold scheme of assimilation and operation); finally, union and adoption (here three modes of God's union with the soul appear as union of efficiency, of similitude, and of finality or objective union).

Viewed from the other direction, as the union of the soul with God, the union of grace takes on four different modes: union of passion, corresponding to efficiency; union of assimilation, the answer to exemplarity; union of finalization and of operation, in which God is end and object of the just soul's knowledge and love. All of these four modes are essential to the union of grace, but the union of operation is specific of it.⁶⁸ This solution "synthesizes Dom Chambat [and Fr. Galtier], who admits only a presence of efficiency and exemplarity, with Fr. Gardeil, who stops at the sole objective presence" (p. 270).

As an objective and all-round evaluation and synthesis of St. Thomas' teaching on our union with God through sanctifying grace, Fr. Morency's study is a remarkable work. Shall we say that his approach to the question is perhaps a trifle too extrinsic, too dependent on the material reality of the texts, and too little guided by an interior principle of explanation? That a more unifying synthesis would be desirable? At any rate, his study will

⁶⁶ Cf. *supra*, notes 20 and 21.

⁶⁷ R. Morency, *L'Union de grâce selon saint Thomas* (Montreal, 1950).

⁶⁸ Cf. Morency's study, "L'Union du juste à Dieu par voie de connaissance et d'amour," *Sciences ecclésiastiques*, II (1949), 27-79.

henceforth have to be taken into account by all who tackle the problem of St. Thomas' teaching on the divine indwelling.⁶⁹

In a passing exposition (pp. 128-35) Fr. Morency analyses the texts where St. Thomas speaks of an assimilation through grace to the Divine Persons "quoad propria personarum." Do these texts mean a threefoldness in sanctifying grace, foundation for special relations to each of the Three Persons? The appearance, Fr. Morency notes, is misleading. From no uncertain indications, this assimilation to the Persons is, according to St. Thomas, only a matter of appropriation; it refers the just soul to the Persons indirectly, that is, through the medium of the essential properties. He is no doubt right in sharing Dom Chambat's view on the point. The idea of distinct special relations or a special assimilation to each of the Persons as such lies outside the horizon of St. Thomas' trinitarian theology.

Fidelity to the appropriation theory of St. Thomas, and to the author's own previous explanation of the special divine presence, marks the revised edition of P. Galtier's *L'Habitation en nous des trois personnes*.⁷⁰ His unaltered answer to the two main questions involved in the mystery is as follows: (1) The divine indwelling is not peculiar to the Holy Spirit, it is rather a presence common to the Three Persons and attributed to the Third Person by appropriation; (2) God's special presence through grace, distinct from, and additional to, His natural presence in us, is not sufficiently explained by way of knowledge and love. It consists in the particular manner in which God produces grace in the soul, namely, by a causality which is identically efficient and exemplary: God's (supernatural) image is produced by direct and immediate presence of the Model.

About this last statement we should ask, why is it so? The identity of the two kinds of causality seems to be postulated rather than proved. Would perhaps the special way in which grace is produced be explained by de la Taille's concept of the supernatural as created actuation by Uncreated Act?⁷¹ And if our sanctification by way of actuation and self-communication of God means not only operation but also and primarily union, would it perhaps not be possible to conceive special relations to each of the Three Persons without supposing on their part a special operation of each or on our part a threefold created foundation of these relations?⁷²

⁶⁹ Cf. Michel, in *Ami du clergé*, LXII (1952), 49-51; Philips, in *Ephemerides theologiae Lovanienses*, XXVII (1951), 542; *Angelicum*, XXVIII (1951), 196 f.; Bourassa, in *Sciences ecclésiastiques*, IV (1951), 173 ff.

⁷⁰ Rome, 1950.

⁷¹ Cf. M. J. Donnelly, *supra*, note 26.

⁷² Cf. P. de Letter, "Sanctifying Grace and Our Union with the Holy Trinity," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, XIII (1952), 33-58; also, the reply by M. J. Donnelly, *ibid.*, 190-204.

A NEW APPROACH: OUR INCORPORATION IN THE MYSTICAL BODY

A new approach to the problem of our union with the Three Divine Persons is taken in the remarkable dissertation of Fr. H. F. T. Borgert, C.S.S.R., on God's indwelling in the soul,⁷³ a doctoral thesis presented in the theological faculty of Nijmegen University, Holland. The author faces the contrast between the explicit statements of Scripture and tradition on the ontological indwelling of the Three Divine Persons, and the minimizing theory of appropriations. The latter does not seem to render all that is implied in the former. He accordingly begins by examining the doctrine of the New Testament and of the Fathers in order to detect there a possible new way of approaching the problem. His findings lead him to the conclusion that according to the revealed doctrine the Three Persons inhabit the just souls as three distinct Persons; the same doctrine hints clearly that the entrance to the inhabitation of the Divine Persons lies for men in the union of their souls with Christ, in their membership in the Mystical Body.

Scholastic theology in general failed to exploit these hints of the sources of revelation; it rather followed St. Augustine who, on this particular point, did not synthesize his teaching on the divine indwelling with that on the Mystical Body of Christ. A few theologians followed the Eastern patristic current (Lessius, Petau, Scheeben, de Regnon, Waffelaert); but their theories, as exposed by them, are open to criticism.

Fr. Borgert accordingly approaches his study of the mystery from the new angle indicated in Scripture, that is, the mystery of our incorporation in Christ. He proposes his own hypothesis, as a probable theory of the divine indwelling, in two steps. First, an introductory chapter studies the mystery of Christ; then follows the study of the mystery of the Body of Christ, in which he exposes in detail his conception of the indwelling of the Three Persons. This may be summed up as follows. The central starting point is Christ, God-Man. His humanity, because of the hypostatic union, is the *instrumentum coniunctum* of the divinity and the universal principle in the dispensation of grace. Through faith and baptism we are in real relation to Christ's humanity and so *ipso facto* to the Verbum, for it is through Christ's humanity as instrumental and quasi-principal cause that we receive faith and the sacramental character. By the very fact of this relation to the Verbum we are in a real relation to the Father and the Holy Spirit. In this precisely consists the indwelling of the Divine Persons. Faith and baptism unite us with Christ; then follows the uncreated Gift; then the

⁷³ H. F. T. Borgert, C.S.S.R., *In Geest en Waarheid: Over de Inwoning Gods in de Zielen* (Nijmegen, 1950).

created gift, grace, which completes our incorporation in Christ and the divine indwelling. And so the inhabitation properly consists in a relation to the Verbum, and in the Verbum to the Father and the Holy Spirit, with the grace and virtues. That relation with the Verbum does not coincide with our relation to the divine nature *ratione creationis*. To this link with the Verbum grace answers as a participated similitude of the natural filiation.

Leaving aside remarks of detail,⁷⁴ we cannot but express the hope that the general theme of Fr. Borgert's thesis may not pass unnoticed by theologians and remain confined to the restricted area of the Dutch language. His approach to the question of the divine indwelling deserves further attention and study. Some may ask: In what manner or according to what traditional categories of causality is the activity of Christ's humanity (and of the Verbum), which originates our special relation to the Verbum, to be understood—efficiency, assimilation, or objective presence? Or how conceive the foundation of that relation and consequently of our relations to the Father and to the Holy Spirit? Those who are ready to admit with him the fact of our special relations to the Three Persons and to see a way of showing their possibility in the accidental relation to the Verbum entailed in our incorporation in Christ, may look for further light and for a way of expressing these relations according to the generally accepted notions of relation and causality.

Fr. Borgert is not the first to attempt this new approach to the mystery of our union with the Divine Persons. In 1944, Fr. E. Mersch, S.J., incorporated in his *La théologie du corps mystique*,⁷⁵ now available in the English translation of Fr. Cyril Vollert,⁷⁶ an earlier study of his, "Filii in Filio,"⁷⁷ in which this approach was made. His idea in its main outline is as follows. Grace unites us to, or incorporates us in, Christ. "Christ is the Son of the First Person; He is the Second Person Himself; He is the co-principle of the Third Person. When we are united to Him, therefore, we are, in Him and through Him, adopted sons of the First Person; with regard to the Second Person, we are members of the Word and share in His intellectual sonship; and with regard to the Third Person, we are associated in the work of love that has its terminus and its summit in the Holy Spirit."⁷⁸ This is exactly

⁷⁴ Cf. Sträter, in *Bijdragen der Nederlandsche Jesuïeten*, XII (1951), 407 f.

⁷⁵ Brussels, 1944; 2nd ed., 1946.

⁷⁶ *The Theology of the Mystical Body* (St. Louis, 1951); cf. Book IV, pp. 325–452; also, on the supernatural, pp. 455–78; and, on sanctifying grace, pp. 594–621.

⁷⁷ *Nouvelle revue théologique*, LXV (1938), 551–82, 681–702, 809–30.

⁷⁸ *The Theology of the Mystical Body*, p. 330.

St. Paul's teaching, which Mersch sums up by quoting Prat: "From the supernatural being received at baptism, special relations with each of the three divine Persons are derived: a relation of sonship with the Father; a relation of consecration to the Holy Spirit; a relation of mystical identity with Jesus Christ."⁷⁹ It is grace, the grace of adoption, which unites us to Christ and to the Verbum. This grace, inasmuch as it is *ad extra*, is a common effect of the Trinity. But it is not only *ad extra*, because and insofar as it unites us to the Word it is in a way *ad intra*. It belongs to the order of that which is "interiorized" (p. 373). Grace, moreover, is essentially an "entity of union." It unites us to Christ, to the Person of Christ who is the Word and the Son of the Father, and so makes us also (adopted) sons of the Father, in the Spirit. And as we share in Christ's sonship, which is the natural sonship of the Word, so also we share in His spiratorship and have a special relation to the Holy Spirit. Grace, therefore, is a special relationship to the Trinity. This is Mersch's way of reconciling the common and certain doctrine, according to which all operations of the Trinity *ad extra* are common to the Three Persons (and so also grace insofar as its efficiency or production is concerned), with the possibility and reality of special relations to each of the Three Persons. Nor does he require for these three relations a threefold foundation in created grace; grace need not be a miniature of the Trinity. All that grace does is immediately to unite us to Christ, to the Word, and make us share in His sonship. The relations to the Father and to the Holy Spirit follow necessarily on our relation to the Word, just as Christ the Word is necessarily related to the Father and to the Holy Spirit.

Mersch's explanation of our union with the Trinity through our union with Christ and the Word or our incorporation in His Mystical Body by means of grace, "entity of union" which takes us into the "order of the interiorized," appeals to new concepts, other than those in which the common Scholastic explanation of created grace as the foundation of relations is conceived. Perhaps that is the only way. Some may desire, however, to see this new trinitarian concept of grace expressed in the traditional categories. Can it be shown, in Scholastic terms, how the grace of sonship places us in a special relation to the Father and to Him alone, not to the Trinity as one?

An attempt at establishing a basis for adoptive sonship to the Father was made by Fr. H. P. C. Lyons, S.J., in an essay on "The Grace of Sonship."⁸⁰ He examines St. Thomas' teaching on adoptive sonship and concludes that his view "throughout his writings . . . was that adoptive grace made the

⁷⁹ Fernand Prat, S.J., *The Theology of St. Paul*, II (London, 1934), 320.

⁸⁰ *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, XXVII (1951), 438-66.

Christian a son, not of the first person, but of the Trinity" (p. 448), a conclusion which implies that one who wishes to hold special relations to the Three Persons ought to go beyond St. Thomas' explicit statements. He then proposes his own hypothesis. The divine existence as personal to the Word actuates to existence the habitual grace of Christ and the habitual grace of the Christian, and in consequence gives that habitual grace in each case, though differently, a relation of the same character as the existence itself, namely, of union with the Son and sonship to the Father. Instead, therefore, of looking for a link with Christ and the Word in the order of essence—all that is produced there has for its efficient cause the whole Trinity—he sees the connecting link in a supernatural corporate existence to which the Christian is actuated by the existence of the Son. "The incorporative actuation by the existence of the Son would give the Christian an 'accidental' share in Christ's existence . . . and an 'accidental' share in the relation of Christ's existence and so in the relation of sonship properly to the eternal Father" (p. 451).

If we understand well, sanctifying grace, as an accidental supernatural perfection in the order of essence, is produced by the whole Trinity, or is an effect of the Three as one; there is no foundation here for special relations. But the existence that actuates this supernatural perfection is an accidental share in Christ's existence and so in Christ's sonship; this relates the soul only to the Father. Fr. Lyons refuses an appeal to de la Taille's concept of created actuation by Uncreated Act, which is in the order of essence, not of existence (p. 454). One would naturally ask, what exactly is this "super-added supernatural existential actuation" (or is it not a "what"?), which is a share in Christ's existence or in the divine existence as pertaining to the Word, and not a share in the divine existence as common to the Three Persons? Sanctifying grace as a supernatural perfection in the order of essence, though produced by the Three Persons as one, exists by an existential actuation which refers the soul only to the Word or Son; how can grace open out special relations to the Father and the Word (and the Holy Spirit) in the order of existence, when in the order of essence it does not? The question is not without an answer; Fr. Lyons' considerations on the consonance of his hypothesis with St. Thomas (p. 457 f.) may imply a hint. His tentative hypothesis is of a nature to provoke further reflection.

Not all theologians, however, who approach the mystery of the divine indwelling from the side of the Mystical Body of Christ, conclude to the fact of special relations to each of the Three Persons. C. Journet, for example, in his voluminous and masterly second volume on *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*,⁸¹ definitely excludes them. In two sections especially, one on "the

⁸¹ Paris, 1951.

sanctifying influx of Christ" (pp. 254–339; particularly pp. 358–78) and in an excursus on presences of the Trinity in Itself and in the created world (pp. 358–81), he treats the question. By distinguishing in grace an entitative aspect and an intentional one (p. 260), as St. Thomas himself does (p. 262), he concludes that, because the adoption which gives us a share in the divine nature regards the entitative aspect of grace, it is a common operation of the Three Divine Persons (p. 265). Even in the present order of the Incarnation of the Word this remains true (p. 270); nor would it be different in the hypothesis that either the Father or the Holy Spirit had become incarnate (p. 275). In any hypothesis it is only by appropriation that the adoption can be referred to each of the Divine Persons. The reason of this is that "the trinitarian relations do not overstep the boundaries of the created" (p. 358). Yet the creature is admitted to a share in the trinitarian relations by God's presence through grace and inhabitation; but this is only by an objective or intentional presence of the Trinity (p. 369 f.). Accordingly, "when considered entitatively, the imprint of grace and of glory appears as a sharing in the divine nature inasmuch as it is common to the Three Persons, *quantum ad communia*; when considered intentionally, it appears as a sharing in the divine nature inasmuch as it subsists in Three Persons opposed to each other by their own relations, *quantum ad propria*" (p. 370). Such is St. Thomas' teaching on the subject (*ibid.*).

Must we see in this explanation a *confirmatur* of Fr. Lyons' conclusion that for St. Thomas, and on his explicit principles, there can be no special real relations to the Three Divine Persons?⁸²

A SCRIPTURE STUDY

The question of special relations to the Divine Persons is naturally suggested, though it is not mentioned, by a study we have to note before concluding—E. Bardy's thesis on the Holy Spirit in us and in the Church according to the New Testament.⁸³ The theme of the dissertation is much broader than that of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit through sanctifying grace; it comprises also His action in the faithful—whether sacramental or charismatic, following on confirmation and holy orders or on charismatic gifts—and another presence and action of the Holy Spirit in the Church as a Body, both actions being directed to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. The inhabitation of the Holy Spirit given with baptism and justification is taught in the New Testament without the shadow of a

⁸² Cf., however, *supra*, note 21.

⁸³ E. Bardy, *Le Saint-Esprit en nous et dans l'Eglise d'après le Nouveau Testament* (Albi, 1950).

doubt. But this indwelling, which is not inactive, reaches its full effectiveness with a more abundant effusion of the Holy Spirit in confirmation, charisms, and holy orders.

The active indwelling of the Spirit is connected with the Christian's union with Christ and not independent of the Father. Does it mean a special role of the Spirit which He has not in common with the Father and the Son? Bardy neither asks nor answers the question. His insistence, however, on the role of the Holy Spirit inclines one to wonder whether this scriptural teaching would be sufficiently rendered by a theology of mere appropriation. It suffices to note the implicit hint.

CONCLUSION

We may stop here our survey of current theology on the divine indwelling through grace.⁸⁴ If we wish briefly to state the results of this review, we can say the following. Attempts are being made at grasping more closely and expressing more accurately the special presence of God in the just. The general endeavor is to go beyond, or at any rate to deepen, the concepts of efficient and exemplary causality, or to detect the implications of St. Thomas' idea of objective presence by way of knowledge and love. Some authors rest satisfied with one or other of these explanations; others try to unite them. Still others, dissatisfied with either of them, look for a solution in the direction of quasi-formal causality. However, when these latter appeal to de la Taille's idea of created actuation by Uncreated Act, Thomists object that, on Thomist principles, an actuation of the soul's essence which is not hypostatic union is not intelligible; St. Thomas knows only two ways of immediate union with God: *secundum esse* in the hypostatic union; *secundum operari* in the objective presence by way of knowledge and love. Their objection demands further study.

Another feature of present-day theology of the divine indwelling is its

⁸⁴ In THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, XIII (1952), 33, we objected to the idea of sanctifying grace as a miniature of the Trinity. Fr. M. J. Donnelly replied (*ibid.*, pp. 190-204) by a thorough criticism of the concept of one created foundation of distinct relations to the Three Persons. We do not wish to attempt an answer to his Reply. Many of his remarks are well founded when taking into account St. Thomas' explicit teaching on relation and on our assimilation to the Persons. We simply desire to note that St. Thomas' teaching, as it stands, excludes distinct real relations to the Three Persons, and that what he says about assimilation to the Persons may well not go beyond appropriation. Would it be possible to hold to his teaching as it stands, and yet find a way for special relations to the Persons? Perhaps, to show the possibility of a threefold relation based on one foundation, one should unite the approach to the mystery of the divine indwelling by way of our union with Christ in His Mystical Body, with de la Taille's idea of grace. This was done by Fr. Malmberg, S.J., "Onze Eenheid met den Godmensch," *Bijdragen der Nederlandsche Jesuïeten*, VI (1943-45), 48-63, 246-67.

widespread dissatisfaction with the appropriation theory as an explanation of our union with the Three Divine Persons. Theologians look for a frankly trinitarian concept of grace. Except for those who limit themselves to the explicit teaching of St. Thomas and discard a priori the possibility of special relations to each of the Three Persons on the plea that all *ad extra* works of God are common to them, theologians attempt to synthesize the common and certain teaching that all divine actions *ad extra* are common to the Three Persons with the possibility and reality of distinct real relations of the just soul to each of the Persons. The main reason that prompts these attempts lies in the explicit statements of Scripture and of the Fathers which seem to mean more than a way of speaking; to explain them by mere appropriation seems to water them down unduly. Accordingly, it is but natural that a deeper study of the appropriation theory itself is taken up with a view to detecting the reality it hides. And followers of St. Thomas hold out the hope that this may lead to a fidelity to the Common Doctor which yet allows one to take from the "Greek theory" whatever is most appealing in it.

It would seem, then, that a close union of positive, that is, biblical and patristic, theology on the indwelling, with the speculations of Scholastic theology on this august mystery, the one tempering and guiding the other, together with contact with other mysteries of the faith (for instance, that of our union with Christ in His Mystical Body), hold promises for further fruitful research.

St. Mary's College, Kurseong, India

P. DE LETTER, S.J.