

# Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence: Bernard Lonergan and Hans Urs von Balthasar in Dialogue

by

Francis Joseph Jankulak

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Regis College  
and the Graduate Centre for Theological Studies of the Toronto School of Theology.

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Theology  
awarded by the University of St. Michael's College

© Copyright by Francis Joseph Jankulak 2019

**Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence:  
Bernard Lonergan and Hans Urs von Balthasar in Dialogue**

Francis Joseph Jankulak

Master of Arts

University of St. Michael's College

2019

**Abstract**

This thesis compares and contrasts notions of love in the thought of Bernard Lonergan and Hans Urs von Balthasar. In the context of the human condition, this project looks at depictions of love in two principal works. The first is von Balthasar's *Love Alone is Credible*, and the second is Lonergan's *Method in Theology*. This comparative study examines Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic sense of love in existential human existence exemplified by Thérèse of Lisieux. It provides an interpretation of Balthasar's insight into the constitutive meaning of love in 'genuine' Christian human life. This study also examines Lonergan's technical-systematic representation of love where 'being-in-love with God' represents 'authentic being.' This thesis argues that Lonergan's constitutive function of meaning is applicable to the ontological meaning of individual human existence. Lonergan and Balthasar's co-equal understandings of the way in which love constitutes the meaning of 'authentic' or 'genuine' human existence is embodied in a human being's *response* in love to the *gift* of God's love in grace.

# Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i> .....	<i>ii</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i> .....	<i>iii</i>
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
1-1 Importance of this Study .....	1
1-2 Recent Lonergan-Balthasar Scholarship .....	2
1-3 Focus of this Study, Thesis Statement and Benefits .....	5
1-4 Secondary Works, Methodology, and Chapter Overviews .....	9
1-5 Implications .....	12
Chapter 2: Love, Meaning, and Existence in von Balthasar’s Thought .....	14
2-1 Modalities of Divine Love .....	14
2-2 Balthasar’s Aesthetic-Dramatic Methodology .....	16
2-3 Love as Divine Gift – Eros and Agape .....	21
2-4 Love as Human Response – Eros, Philia and Agape .....	24
2-5 Aesthetic Meaning of Love and Genuine Human Existence .....	30
2-6 Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence .....	33
Chapter 3: Love, Meaning, and Existence in Lonergan’s Thought .....	35
3-1 Modalities of Human Love .....	36
3-2 Lonergan’s Technical-Systematic Methodology .....	42
3-3 Love as Divine Gift – Eros, Philia, and Agape .....	47
3-4 Love as Human Response – Eros, Philia, and Agape .....	49
3-5 Technical-Systematic Meaning of Love and Authentic Human Existence .....	52
3-6 Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence .....	56
Chapter 4: Balthasar and Lonergan in Dialogue .....	57

4-1 Part 1: Methodology .....	58
4-2 Part 2: Love as Truth and Beauty .....	67
4-3 Part 3: Meaning and Existence .....	75
4-5 Summary: Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence .....	79
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	81
5-1 Summary .....	82
5-2 Co-equality of Love .....	83
5-3 Co-equality of Meaning and Authenticity.....	84
5-4 Implications.....	86
5-5 Areas for Further Study.....	86
Bibliography .....	88

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### 1-1 Importance of this Study

Bernard Lonergan (1904-1984) and Hans Urs von Balthasar (1905-1988) exemplify two eminent Catholic theologians of the twentieth century. Fergus Kerr deems Lonergan, at the time of Vatican II, to be “by far the most eminent and influential Catholic theologian in the English-speaking world,” even though, Kerr concedes, Lonergan himself, “played little part in the doings of Vatican II”.<sup>1</sup> About Balthasar, Kerr has this to say, “Hans Urs von Balthasar is widely regarded as the greatest Catholic theologian of the [20<sup>th</sup>] century.”<sup>2</sup>

Robert Doran posits several reasons why it is important to bring Bernard Lonergan and Hans Urs von Balthasar into contact with one another. In a 1997 article,<sup>3</sup> updated in 2009,<sup>4</sup> he states, “I believe there is a certain urgency to the task of integrating what they stand for and represent, and of allowing them to complement and, where necessary, even correct one another.”<sup>5</sup> Doran sees this urgency as the need to forestall Lonergan-Balthasar disputes that could lead to theological infighting which, in turn, could risk “disastrous consequences”<sup>6</sup> for the church. He draws an analogy to the Aristotelian-Augustinian disputes of the Middle Ages. Doran speaks of a reconciliation between Lonergan and Balthasar which strives to explore their “mutual

---

<sup>1</sup> Fergus Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing , 2007), 106.

<sup>2</sup> Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, 121.

<sup>3</sup> Robert M. Doran, S.J., “Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations,” *Theological Studies* 58 no. 1 (Mar 1997): 61-84.

<sup>4</sup> Robert M. Doran, “Essays in Systematic Theology 4: Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations,” (2009), <https://www.lonerganresource.com/pdf/books/1/4%20-%20Lonergan%20and%20Balthasar.pdf> (accessed June 24, 2018).

<sup>5</sup> Doran, “Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations” (1997), 61.

<sup>6</sup> Doran, “Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations” (1997), 62.

complementarity.”<sup>7</sup> More recently, in 2015 Doran envisions the integration of Lonergan and Balthasar’s theological approaches in a collaborative project to construct a systematic theology.

He writes:

[...] the principal Catholic strands that have to be integrated into a consistent theological perspective represent the principal fruits of post-Vatican II Catholic theology. My own proposal, accepted by at least most of the participants, is that these can be best summarized under three headings: first, the generalized empirical method of Bernard Lonergan, with all its implications for interdisciplinary collaboration; second, the emphasis on theological aesthetics and dramatics insisted on by Hans Urs von Balthasar; and third, the preferential option for the poor [...] My own view is that [Balthasar’s] major emphases on aesthetics and dramatics must be incorporated in any future work in systematics.<sup>8</sup>

## **1-2 Recent Lonergan-Balthasar Scholarship**

Peter Drilling, in reconciling Lonergan and Balthasar’s approaches to Trinitarian theology, extends Doran’s 1997 “Methodological Considerations” article’s insights by addressing questions of theological meaning.<sup>9</sup> In doing so, Drilling highlights Doran’s position that “Lonergan’s highly theoretical theology becomes more balanced if it is related to Balthasar’s aesthetic-dramatic approach to meaning.”<sup>10</sup> Drilling cites an article by Anne Hunt who earlier (1998) considers the question of integrating Lonergan and Balthasar’s approaches to Trinitarian theology.<sup>11</sup> Hunt’s insights will be important to this study in several ways.

First, in a clear and coherent manner, Hunt explicates Doran’s hypothesis:

---

<sup>7</sup> Doran, “Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations” (1997). However in his 2009 paper Doran notes: “I would now speak of the mutual self-mediation of their respective theologies, rather than their mutual complementarity.” Doran, “Essays in Systematic Theology 4,” n. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Robert M. Doran, S.J., “A New Project in Systematic Theology,” *Theological Studies* 76 no. 2 (Jun 2015): 246.

<sup>9</sup> Peter Drilling, “Relating the Theologies of Hans Urs von Balthasar and Bernard Lonergan on Divine Action in the World,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 81 no.3 (2016): 267-283.

<sup>10</sup> Drilling, “Relating the Theologies of Hans Urs von Balthasar and Bernard Lonergan on Divine Action in the World,” 268.

<sup>11</sup> Drilling, “Relating the Theologies of Hans Urs von Balthasar and Bernard Lonergan on Divine Action in the World,” 268, n. 2. Anne Hunt, “Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology,” *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 197–218.

[Doran] notes that Lonergan's analysis of intentionality leaves aside the affective-symbolic drama that accompanies the operations of each intentional level and that permeates all cognitional and existential praxis. Doran insists that, while the intentional aspect, in its integrity, consists in the disinterested orientation of consciousness to the transcendental objectives of intelligibility, truth, reality, goodness, and participation in the unrestricted love that is the very life of God, there also exists what he calls the psychic aspect of interiority that lies in the *esthetic* dimension of human subjectivity and that permeates all of our intentional operations.<sup>12</sup>

Second, Hunt clarifies Lonergan's notions of categories, a central tenet in Doran's "Methodological Considerations" article, and in doing so introduces categories of authenticity, love, and meaning that are central to this study:

Lonergan thus locates general categories in terms of transcendental method (the authentic or unauthentic person) and special theological categories in terms of religious conversion (the interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness, "the authentic or unauthentic Christian, genuinely in love with God or failing in that love, with a consequent Christian or unchristian outlook and style of living."<sup>13</sup>)<sup>14</sup>

Third, Hunt illustrates Doran's use of Lonergan's notions of general and special categories as a means of bringing Lonergan's transcendental theological anthropology and Balthasar's aesthetic-dramatic theological anthropology together, one complementing the other.<sup>15</sup>

[Doran] proposes that Lonergan's transcendental theological anthropology illuminates the ground and provides the key to the generation and derivation of systematic theology's *general* categories, while Balthasar illuminates the ground of *special* categories that are proper to theology. Those special categories are derived from the esthetic-dramatic elements of Christian experience and provide an esthetic and dramatic base for authenticity or inauthenticity<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Hunt, "Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology," 206. Italics in the original.

<sup>13</sup> Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 292.

<sup>14</sup> Hunt, "Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology," 207.

<sup>15</sup> For the purposes of this thesis, Balthasar's 'aesthetic-dramatic theological anthropology' when used in a descriptive sense will be termed 'aesthetic-dramatic.' Drawing on Lonergan's cognitional theory based on intentionality consciousness and his systematic general empirical method, the corresponding Lonergan descriptive adjective will be 'technical-systematic.'

<sup>16</sup> Hunt, "Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology," 207. Italics added.

Whereas Hunt uses Doran's hypothesis to reconcile Lonergan and Balthasar's Trinitarian theology, this study will invoke Doran's categorical methodology to authenticate Lonergan and Balthasar's complementary view of love in the constitutive function of meaning of human existence.

John Dadosky's approach to Lonergan-Balthasar complementarity spans a range of topics, including the nature of religious identity<sup>17</sup> as well as theologies of the church and ecclesiology.<sup>18</sup> He also engages Lonergan-Balthasar theological-philosophical positions in order to compare and contrast their transcendental notions of beauty with that of Danish thinker Søren Kierkegaard.<sup>19</sup> Central to this study are two of Dadosky's other works on the topic of beauty which will be examined in Chapter 4.<sup>20</sup> In a 2010 article, Randall Rosenberg explores the contribution of Balthasar and Lonergan to a contemporary understanding of Christ's human knowledge.<sup>21</sup> In a footnote, he identifies 14 articles that he says contribute to conversations between Lonergan and Balthasar. These, he maintains, address Doran's challenge to "relate 'the positive gains' of Balthasar's work 'to Lonergan's systematics while complementing each of them by the other.'<sup>22, 23</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> John D. Dadosky, "The Dialectic of Religious Identity: Lonergan and Balthasar," *Theological Studies* 60 no. 1 (1999): 31-52.

<sup>18</sup> John D. Dadosky, "Centering the Church: A Development in Ecclesiology Based on Balthasar and Lonergan," *Lonergan Workshop* 20 (2008): 93-103.

<sup>19</sup> John D. Dadosky, "Recovering Beauty in the subject: Balthasar and Lonergan Confront Kierkegaard," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 83 no.4 (2009): 509-532.

<sup>20</sup> John D. Dadosky, "The Proof of Beauty: From Aesthetic Experience to the Beauty of God," *Analecta Hermeneutica* vol. 2 (2010); <sup>20</sup> John D. Dadosky, *The Eclipse and Recovery of Beauty: A Lonergan Approach* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.)

<sup>21</sup> Randall S. Rosenberg, "Christ's Human Knowledge: A Conversation With Lonergan And Balthasar," *Theological Studies* 71 no. 4 (2010): 817 – 845.

<sup>22</sup> Robert Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005), 15.

<sup>23</sup> Rosenberg, "Christ's Human Knowledge," 820.



Antedating Doran’s 1997 “Methodological Considerations” article, Hilary Mooney, in her 1992 dissertation, chooses not to undertake a comprehensive comparison of Lonergan and Balthasar, but rather takes an approach which she states allows Balthasar to “play a ‘catalysing’ role in the justification and amplification of Lonerganian theological aesthetics.”<sup>24</sup> In her dissertation on theological comparisons between Lonergan and Balthasar, Mooney introduces notions of the constitutive function of meaning in the context of love and human existence which are relevant to this study.<sup>25</sup> In a recent article she addresses the role of love, religious conversion and the human authenticity, writing that, in Lonergan’s understanding, “religious conversion situates one in a love relationship with God.”<sup>26</sup> Kevin Tortorelli’s 2005 book, *Christology with Lonergan and Balthasar*, is not as Tortorelli says, “a study of the Christology either of Lonergan or of Balthasar,” but rather is a collection of fifteen essays “composed of meditations on the mystery of Christ in the spirit of these two theologians.”<sup>27</sup>

### ***1-3 Focus of this Study, Thesis Statement, and Benefits***

The central theme underpinning this study arose out of a Regis College graduate course where one lecture, *Love the core of the human condition*, highlighted the importance of bringing the thought of Lonergan and Balthasar into dialogue on the topic of love and its role in the

---

<sup>24</sup> Hilary A. Mooney, *The Liberation of Consciousness: Bernard Lonergan’s Theological Foundations in Dialogue with the Theological Aesthetics of Hans Urs von Balthasar* (Frankfurt am Main: J. Knecht, 1992), 5.

<sup>25</sup> Mooney, *The Liberation of Consciousness*, 58-63, 130-170, 248-260.

<sup>26</sup> Hilary Anne-Marie Mooney, “‘It’s Not Names that Save Us, But the Choices We Make’ (Basil of Caesarea) Lonergan and Early Christian Writers on the Anthropological, Spiritual and Theological Significance of Human Authenticity,” in *Ricerche Lonerganiane Offerte a Saturnino Muratore*, edited by Edoardo Cibelli and Cloe Taddei Ferretti, 321-331 (Naples, Italy: Istituto Italiano per Gli Studi Filosofici, 2017), 328, n. 33.

<sup>27</sup> Kevin Tortorelli, *Christology with Lonergan and Balthasar* (Ely, Cambridgeshire: Melrose Books, c2005. 1st ed.), 6.

constitutive meaning of human existence.<sup>28</sup> It is to this end that this study is directed. I suggest that love, by itself a broad topic, can be narrowly studied by engaging Lonergan and Balthasar in dialogue through three of their works. I claim creditable results can be achieved by focusing on their portrayal of human and divine love in a specific context, the context of human and divine love exemplified concretely by St. Thérèse of Lisieux, by her life and by her authentic human existence.<sup>29</sup> Based on these affirmations, I propose the following thesis statement: *Lonergan and Balthasar's respective understanding of love mutually support the assertion that love is constitutive to the meaning of human existence.*

This study provides a response to Robert Doran's call for Lonergan-Balthasar integrative complementary research. To achieve this goal, the study will compare and contrast Lonergan and Balthasar's understanding of the role of love in constituting the meaning of the human person. Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic portrayal of St. Thérèse of Lisieux will serve as a concrete example of what I term to be a 'genuine'<sup>30</sup> Christian person. In turn, I will argue, this portrayal complements Lonergan's technical-systematic account of human authenticity as being-in-love

---

<sup>28</sup> The course, RGT 5580 *Lonergan and Balthasar* was conducted by Gill Goulding and Jeremy Wilkins in the fall (September – December) of 2015. In the syllabus of this course Gill Goulding writes: "This course explores those areas of convergences as well as crucial differences in their [i.e., Lonergan and Balthasar's] work. [...] Here, the centrality of love both at the heart of the Trinity and as a core of the human condition is a possible substantial area of convergence. For both Lonergan and Balthasar becoming a human subject in love with God changes everything."

<sup>29</sup> This study will engage Lonergan-Balthasar in dialogue through three works: Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971). This work, the last of Lonergan's major publications, is particularly well suited to serve as a counterpoint to Balthasar as it explicates Lonergan's notions of love, authenticity, and meaning which are central to this study. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004). This small book serves as an aesthetic ethological explanation of divine love as gift. Hans Urs von Balthasar, "Thérèse of Lisieux," in *Two Sisters in The Spirit: Thérèse of Lisieux & Elizabeth of the Trinity*, trans. Donald Nichols and Anne Englund Nash (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992). This book provides an insightful theological account of saintly love as a genuine human response to God's gift of love.

<sup>30</sup> As Balthasar uses aesthetic-dramatic terms to convey the notion of a true, saintly or authentic Christian life, there is no direct equivalent to Lonergan's technical-systematic term 'authenticity.' However, I claim and will demonstrate that the term 'genuineness' is analogous to 'authenticity.'

with God. Although Hans Urs von Balthasar and Bernard Lonergan may seem disparate in their approach to divine and human love, this study will demonstrate how each, in a complementary way, can contribute deeper meaning to the thought of the other. From the perspective of Lonergan, nuances to Balthasar's account of divine and human love will be claimed: (1) human response to divine love is being-in-love with God, and (2) love is constitutive to the meaning of human existence. Similarly, from the perspective of Balthasar, I will further claim: (3) Balthasar provides nuances to Lonergan's notions of the constitutive function of meaning, and (4) he provides a concrete example of authentic human existence in his portrayal of Thérèse of Lisieux.

I submit that significant benefits that accrue from this study include the advancement of the following aspects of Lonergan-Balthasar studies. First, utilizing Lonergan's notions of love and his notion of the constitutive function of meaning, described in *Method in Theology*, I hope to provide further insight into Balthasar's notions of the meaning of divine and human love. Divine love as *gift*, articulated by Balthasar in *Love Alone is Credible*, will be contextually situated with his biographical account of human love as *response* embodied in the saintly life of contemplation and prayer he portrays in "Thérèse of Lisieux." The significance of *Love Alone is Credible*, out of Balthasar's extensive theological repertoire, is supported by other scholars<sup>31</sup> as well as by his own words in the preface to what he calls his "little book:"

Thus this sketch will be an elaboration of what I endeavored in my larger work *The Glory of the Lord*, that is, it will be a "theological aesthetic" in the two-fold sense of a subjective theory of perception and a theory of the objective self-interpretation of the divine glory;<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Anne Hunt notes "As Peter Henrici has commented, the statement 'love alone is credible' is probably the densest summary of Balthasar's thought ('The Philosophy of Hans Urs von Balthasar,' in *Hans Urs von Balthasar: His Life and Work*, ed. David L. Schindler [San Francisco: Ignatius, 1991] 153), n. 10," Anne Hunt, "Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology," *Theological Studies* 59 (1998):197-218, 200.

<sup>32</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 11.

A comparative study, explicated in the context of Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic understanding of 'genuine' Christian human existence exemplified by Thérèse of Lisieux, will, I suggest, provide an analysis of Balthasar's insight into the constitutive meaning of love in Christian human life.

Second, this study will contribute to Lonergan studies by proposing a way in which Lonergan's general technical ontological notion of the constitutive function of meaning can also be understood to apply to the specific constitutive meaning of individual human existence.<sup>33</sup> Lonergan's notion of 'being-in-love with God,' his understanding of what constitutes 'authentic being,' will be the primary focus. Third, a conclusion will be drawn which will establish a complementarity between Lonergan and Balthasar with respect to their respective understandings of the way in which love constitutes the meaning of 'authentic' or 'genuine' human existence. This meaning is embodied in a human being's *response* in love to the *gift* of God's love in grace.

The point of departure for researching the centrality of love in constituting the meaning of human existence will be Balthasar's *Love Alone is Credible* and Lonergan's *Method in Theology*.<sup>34</sup> However, as each of these books builds on prior works key to this study, such works will serve as sources of the authors' thoughts leading to the insights contained in the referenced books. As well, later works by each author, which help to clarify their respective understanding of the relationship between love, authenticity and meaning, will also be consulted. Examples of such later works, include Balthasar's *My Life in Retrospect*<sup>35</sup> and "The Perfectibility of Man."<sup>36</sup> Interviews with Lonergan published as, *Caring About Meaning: Patterns in the Life of Bernard*

---

<sup>33</sup> Lonergan's 'Meaning and Ontology' will be central to this study. Lonergan, *Method*, 356.

<sup>34</sup> The choice of why these two particular books have been chosen for this study has been discussed previously.

<sup>35</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar, *My work: In Retrospect* (San Francisco: Communio Books, c1993).

<sup>36</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar, "The Perfectibility of Man," in Hans Urs von Balthasar, ed. Martin Redfern. (London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1972), 73-116.

*Loneragan*<sup>37</sup> will provide additional insight into his later thoughts on meaning, love, and human life.

#### **1-4 Secondary Works, Methodology, and Chapter Overviews**

Aspects of what constitutes genuine or authentic existence in both Lonergan and Balthasar's philosophical-theological anthropology will require the insight of other scholars. Frederick G. Lawrence's "Lonergan's Search for a Hermeneutics of Authenticity: Re-originating Augustine's Hermeneutics of Love"<sup>38</sup> will be helpful in providing guidance on Lonergan's views of love and authenticity. Victoria S. Harrison's "Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology"<sup>39</sup> will be important in interpreting Balthasar's views of love and genuine human existence. Balthasar's thoughts on truth and love revealed by Gill Goulding in "Truth Unveiled"<sup>40</sup> will help establish the role of truth as an aspect of love.

Jeremy Blackwood's comprehensive dissertation, published as *And Hope Does Not Disappoint: Love, Grace and Subjectivity in the Work of Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J.*, will provide valuable insights into Lonergan's thought on the meaning of love as God's gift and on human response to that gift fulfilled in falling-in-love with God.<sup>41</sup> Blackwood notes that

---

<sup>37</sup> Bernard J. F. Lonergan, Pierrot Lambert, Charlotte Tansey, and Cathleen M. Going, *Caring About Meaning: Patterns in the Life of Bernard Lonergan* (Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Thomas More Institute, 1982).

<sup>38</sup> Frederick G. Lawrence, "Lonergan's Search for a Hermeneutics of Authenticity: Re-originating Augustine's Hermeneutics of Love," in Gerald Whelan, ed. *Lonergan's Anthropology: The Next Fifty Years of Vatican II*. (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press. 2015). 19-56

<sup>39</sup> Victoria S. Harrison, "Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology," *The Heythrop Journal* 40 no. 3 (1999): 280-300.

<sup>40</sup> Gill K. Goulding, "Truth Unveiled: Balthasar and the Contemplation of Christian Truth," in Lambert Zuidervart, Allyson Carr, Matthew Klaassen, Ronnie Shuker eds., *Truth Matters: Knowledge, Politics, Ethics, Religion*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press (2013), 245-262

<sup>41</sup> Jeremy W. Blackwood, "'What Was Going Forward' in Lonergan's Development on Love," in *And hope does not disappoint: love, grace, and subjectivity in the work of Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J.* (Milwaukee, Wisconsin : Marquette University Press, 2017), 145-170.

Lonergan’s characterization of love encompasses three distinct aspects or modalities.<sup>42</sup> Since we are seeking common ground for establishing a dialogue between Lonergan and Balthasar on the question of love and its role in constituting meaning for human existence, a prerequisite for such dialogue is establishing terminology that is applicable to both authors. To achieve this purpose we distinguish three modalities of love: intimate-familial love, community love, and self-sacrificing love.<sup>43</sup> These three modalities, central to the claims that will be put forward in this study, will be discussed under the rubrics of: eros, philia, and agape.<sup>44</sup>

This study will demonstrate that, for Lonergan, being authentically one’s self embodies the central notion of the primacy of love achieved through authentic self-transcendence and being-in-love with God. For Balthasar, on the other hand, this study will show that in order to manifest what it means to truly exist as a human being one has to reflect divine Trinitarian love, the highest expression of which is conveyed in saintly contemplative prayer. Thus I will contend that, for Balthasar, genuineness or truth concerns the notion of the primacy of love in prayer, while, for Lonergan, authenticity or truth can be understood as the primacy of love through self-transcendence and being-in-love. Establishing a dialogue between Lonergan and Balthasar on love in the constitutive meaning of human existence will not only confirm their respective portrayals of love as complementary, but also, through comparison and contrast, provide new

---

<sup>42</sup> I am indebted to Darren Dias for suggesting that modality can be understood as a way of experiencing or expressing aspects or categories of human and divine love.

<sup>43</sup> Blackwood, speaks of a “triad of love: “[...] domestic love in the family, love in the loyalty of civil community [...], and the love of God [...]” ; *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 38-39, fn. 60. It should be noted that the rubric ‘self-sacrificing love’ encompasses both God’s unrestricted gift of love to humanity as well as human beings’ response to that gift in self-transcending love of God.

<sup>44</sup> Though there may be concern regarding the choice of eros as a rubric for intimate/familial love – in light of its association with erotic, sexual love – it will be shown that both Balthasar and Lonergan use the word eros: Balthasar, to convey aesthetic-theological meaning to aspects of love; Lonergan to convey systematic-technical meaning to self-transcendence

ways of perceiving their individual methods<sup>45</sup> of explicating of the role of love in human existence.

Drawing on, and developing further, the methodological approach Hunt introduced in *Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology*, I propose the following context which I hope may clarify the role of love in the meaning constitutive of human existence. The context can be expressed in the technical-systematic category ‘human love’ and in the dramatic-aesthetic category ‘divine love.’ This approach coheres with Hunt’s assertion that Lonergan locates general categories in terms of transcendental method and special theological categories in terms of interiorly and religiously differentiated consciousness.<sup>46</sup> Thus, general categories will be based on Lonergan’s general empirical method<sup>47</sup> while special categories will be based on Balthasar’s special theological aesthetic method.<sup>48</sup> Doran and Hunt’s categorical methodology outlined previously will unfold in this study in the following way. Drawing on Blackwood’s depiction of Lonergan’s three aspects of human love,<sup>49</sup> I propose the following modalities for this study: 1) eros, representing intimate-familial love; 2) philia, signifying community love; and 3) agape, exemplifying self-sacrificing love which embodies both human and divine aspects. These modalities will serve as a framework for comparing and contrasting Lonergan and Balthasar’s notions of divine love as *gift* and human love as a *response* to that gift. In order to establish the role of love in the meaning of human existence it is necessary to

---

<sup>45</sup> Balthasar refers to his “theological aesthetic” as a “theological method.” Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 10.

<sup>46</sup> Hunt, *Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology*, 207.

<sup>47</sup> Lonergan makes use of both terms – ‘transcendental method’ and ‘general empirical method’ – in his writings.

<sup>48</sup> It should be noted that general and special categories do not unequivocally align Lonergan as solely general and Balthasar as solely special. I suggest Lonergan’s generalized empirical method, when invoked to address theological questions, leads to what he terms special *theological* categories. For example, love can be both a human-human relationship (husband-wife) and a theological divine-human relationship (God’s *gift* of love and human *response* to God’s gift).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. n. 43.

consider both Balthasar and Lonergan's understandings of meaning and existence. That inquiry will proceed under two rubrics: A) ontological meaning, and B) authenticity.<sup>50</sup>

In Chapter 2, Balthasar's depiction of divine love and saintly love in *Love Alone is Credible*, and "Thérèse of Lisieux" will be examined in headings outlined above. The way in which Balthasar depicts love as constitutive of both divine *gift* and human *response*, as well as the way in which he views love as constitutive to genuine human existence will be examined. There an aesthetic-dramatic interpretation of ontological meaning and authenticity as holiness and genuine human existence will be put forward.

In Chapter 3, a similar approach will be used to examine Lonergan's understanding of love in *Method in Theology*. The way in which Lonergan portrays love as constitutive of both divine *gift* and human *response*, as well as the way in which he understands love to be constitutive of authentic human existence itself will be examined. There a technical-systematic interpretation of ontological meaning and authenticity will be put forward.

The positions advanced in Chapters 2 and 3 will be examined in Chapter 4 so as to discover complementarities and contradictions. Dialectal tensions will be identified and addressed by drawing on Doran's nuanced terms of dialectical contraries and contradictories.<sup>51</sup> Finally, in Chapter 5 a summary will be presented, conclusions articulated, and implications as well as opportunities for further study put forward.

---

<sup>50</sup> Although these systematic-technical terms derive from Lonergan, it will be shown that parallels can be drawn to Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic terms of holiness (meaning) and genuineness (authenticity).

<sup>51</sup> Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 14.



## ***1-5 Implications***

By limiting a broad topic to a specific perspective, this study will achieve creditable results by focusing on love in the context of Christian/human existence. This project will also advance Doran's systematic theology project and support a methodology he suggested using Lonergan's notions of special and general categories. These categories will be applied in a new area: divine and human love. This project will also offer new insights into Lonergan's concept of the constitutive function of meaning. In summary, I claim this project will advance recent Lonergan-Balthasar scholarship by addressing the question of the meaning of love and human existence in the thought of these two theologians.

## Chapter 2: Love, Meaning, and Existence in von Balthasar's Thought

This chapter examines notions of love, meaning, and existence revealed, both explicitly and implicitly, in Balthasar's *Love Alone is Credible*<sup>1</sup> and "Thérèse of Lisieux." The relationship of love to meaning and existence will be explored in a context framed theologically in terms of love as *gift*, God's gift of love through grace, and love as *response*, human response to God's gift of love as expressed in a life of prayer and holiness. This response can be understood, and therefore given meaning, as being constitutive of human existence, in other words, human living that is both genuine and authentic. This chapter examines Balthasar's thoughts of love as gift and response in the context of meaning and existence. Love itself will be studied within the three methodological modalities of love previously put forward: 1) eros, representing intimate-familial love; 2) philia, signifying community love; and 3) agape, exemplifying self-sacrificing love embodying both human and divine aspects.<sup>2</sup> In this study the primary thrust of Balthasar's theological method is considered to be a movement proceeding 'from above',<sup>3</sup> (God's gift of love), 'to below,' (to human beings, and their perception and response to this love.)<sup>4</sup>

### 2-1 Modalities of Divine Love

Although we are positing three modalities of love in our study it must be made clear that in *Love Alone* Balthasar expresses but two modalities: eros and agape. We propose that eros, denoting

---

<sup>1</sup> Henceforth also referred to as *Love Alone*.

<sup>2</sup> The triad of love articulated by Blackwood, cf. Chapter 1, n. 43.

<sup>3</sup> According to Nicholas Healy, "A number of commentators have interpreted the idea of 'from above' or *katology*, as the key characteristic that distinguishes Balthasar's theology from other contemporary models." Nicholas J. Healy, *The eschatology of Hans Urs von Balthasar: being as communion* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2005), 96.

<sup>4</sup> This primary thrust 'from above' does not however exclude a thrust 'from below' which, as will be seen later, represents the human person's *response* to God's *gift* of love. It should also be noted for purposes of this study the distinction being made between perception and response. Perception of God's love is a prerequisite to response, but is not properly in itself considered to be a response.

intimate divine love, and agape, denoting self-giving, self-sacrificing love, provide a means for exploring Balthasar's thoughts of love as divine gift.<sup>5</sup> These two modalities, eros and agape, must be both 'revealed' in love by God and 'perceived' as love by human beings. Both the revelation and the perception of divine love proceed through the gift of God's grace. For Balthasar, images of intimacy and beauty reveal love as divine eros: God's Word – love itself. Images of self-giving love and glory reveal love as agape: God's self-sacrificing love.

At this point it is helpful to examine Balthasar's use (and non-use in the case of *philia*) of these terms and what they appear to signify in *Love Alone*. In *Love Alone* there are ten occurrences of eros, three of which have a qualifying adjective: true eros, ecstatic eros, and sexual eros.<sup>6</sup> Even in the context of sexual eros, Balthasar qualifies his use of the term by associating it with Christ's teaching on marriage: "In the state of marriage, the form of *agapē* is impressed upon that of sexual *eros*."<sup>7</sup> Agape, occurs five times, three of which are to be found in Balthasar's own use of the word, the other two being part of cited references. Within *Love Alone* Balthasar gives us two approaches to divine love, one of which we call a theological-philosophical approach (eros and agape), the other we call a theological-aesthetic approach (beauty and glory). In order to establish the common ground necessary to create a dialogue between Balthasar and Lonergan we have chosen the rubric eros to denote intimate love and the rubric agape to denote self-giving, self-sacrificing love.

---

<sup>5</sup> It will be recalled that in Blackwell's triad, love of God is the third aspect of love. In this study, this third aspect, love of God, is understood to mean both God's self-giving love and human beings' self-transcending love of God; cf. Chapter 1, n. 43.

<sup>6</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 18, 86, 136.

<sup>7</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 136.

In a theological-philosophical approach commenting on Greek philosophy we see Balthasar acknowledging therein an understanding of both eros and agape in terms of images of God's love, an understanding we suggest he also accepts. Balthasar writes:

The ancient worldview—whether it is understood more in the sense of Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, or Plotinus and Proclus—is permeated by the divine and contains within an image of God. The world, as the ancients saw it, was sacred and, in a formal sense, lacked nothing but the center. With the establishment of the center, God's agape appeared to fulfill the cosmic powers of love to overflowing. Indeed, according to the Areopagite, God's agape had a rightful claim to the title of the true eros, and all the power of eros governing creation found its center therein.<sup>8</sup>

## **2-2 Balthasar's Aesthetic-Dramatic Methodology**

It is beyond the scope of this study to explicate Balthasar's complex 'theological aesthetics,' a theological method encompassing beauty, goodness, and truth.<sup>9</sup> Balthasar devoted fully seven volumes in his work, *The Glory of the Lord*, to this endeavor. His theological method has been described by one scholar as "a mystical, contemplative meditation on the overall aesthetic 'wholeness' of God's revelation in Jesus."<sup>10</sup> In this study, we focus our attention more narrowly on the way in which Balthasar's 'aesthetic' or 'method' as explicated in *Love Alone*, can serve to clarify the constitutive role of love in human living, both as gift and response. For Balthasar both 'method' and 'aesthetic' are multi-faceted in meaning.<sup>11</sup> Balthasar refers to *Love Alone* as a

---

<sup>8</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 17-18.

<sup>9</sup> See Adian Nichols, *A Key to Balthasar: Hans Urs von Balthasar on Beauty, Goodness, and Truth* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 2011); Dominic Robinson SJ, in his review of Nichols' book writes: "The book is structured around the three volumes of Balthasar's trilogy: *The Glory of the Lord*, on beauty; *Theo-drama*, on goodness; and *Theo-logic*, on truth. Taking these together Nichols aims to provide a key to Balthasar, stressing it is 'a' key, not necessarily the only one. For each of the three works we are given a key word through which to understand the message: for beauty this is 'form'; for goodness, 'freedom'; and for truth, 'logic.'" [http://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/book\\_20111007\\_1.htm](http://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/book_20111007_1.htm) (accessed March 9, 2018).

<sup>10</sup> Larry Chapp, in the Abstract of his 1994 Dissertation; Larry Scott Chapp, "The theological method of Hans Urs von Balthasar" (1994), ETD Collection for Fordham University, AAI9425189. <https://fordham.bepress.com/dissertations/AAI9425189> (accessed December 18, 2017).

<sup>11</sup> Balthasar uses various terms to convey his understanding of what we choose to call in this study his 'method'; these terms include: 'approach', 'way', 'reduction.'

“sketch” which, being a “theological aesthetic”, is both a “twofold” theory and a “theological method”.<sup>12</sup> For purposes of this study, method is taken to mean a ‘way’ to achieve an end or goal.<sup>13</sup> Based on the premise that Balthasar’s theological approach can be taken as a theology ‘from above’, the *a priori* transcendentals of beauty, goodness, and truth provide a starting point for understanding the relationship of these transcendentals to love.<sup>14</sup> In this study the aesthetic quality of beauty occupies a preeminent position among the three. Our first task is to examine Balthasar’s notion of theological aesthetic as presented in *Love Alone*.

In the Preface to *Love Alone*, Balthasar states that the book itself, an elaboration of his earlier work, *The Glory of the Lord*, is in a twofold sense a theological aesthetic. Balthasar writes:

Thus this sketch will be an elaboration of what I endeavored in my larger work, *The Glory of the Lord*, that is it will be a “theological aesthetic” in the twofold sense of a subjective theory of perception and a theory of the objective self-interpretation of the divine glory; [...] <sup>15</sup>

In the above citation Balthasar states his theological aesthetic can be understood in more than one sense, as he says it is both an objective theory and a subjective theory. We suggest that from the perspective of divine glory, in a theological approach from above, his aesthetic is the “objective self-interpretation of the divine glory”<sup>16</sup> – the “self-glorification of divine love.”<sup>17</sup> In that sense his aesthetic can be theologically construed as an objective theory. It is what “God wishes to say to [humanity] in Christ; [...] a deed that interprets itself before [humanity ...] that

---

<sup>12</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 11.

<sup>13</sup> Balthasar, referring to Barth’s dialectics, states: “[...] we must admit that dialectics was not an end in itself but only a method: a means and pointer meant to arrive at the end in itself.”; Hans Urs von Balthasar, *A Theology of Karl Barth: Exposition and Interpretation* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press: 1992), 62. This choice of ‘way’ as constituting one meaning of method, as will be seen in our consideration of Lonergan in Chapter 3, serves as common ground for comparing and contrasting the two theologians.

<sup>14</sup> For the purposes of this study, a ‘transcendental’ will be taken in the sense of being a universal, whose existence is prior, i.e., *a priori*. Thus beauty, goodness, and truth are deemed to be transcendentals. Love is not here deemed to be a transcendental, rather love itself embodies beauty, goodness, and truth. Of the three transcendentals, beauty is the primary focus of this chapter.

<sup>15</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 11.

<sup>16</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 11.

<sup>17</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 10.

it is credible only as love – specifically, as God’s own love, the manifestation of which is the glory of God.”<sup>18</sup>

Further, Balthasar is suggesting that there is not only a theological reality, *faith* encompassing the glory of God, but also a philosophical reality, *reason* seeking to understand that glory which is credible only as love. Peter Henrici, in *The Philosophy of Hans Urs von Balthasar*, expresses Balthasar’s approach to the interdependent roles of philosophy and theology as “[...] one which offers an entry into theology from philosophy,”<sup>19</sup> noting further that, “[A]part from the continual references to the history of philosophy and thought that are characteristic of von Balthasar’s work, there are six places in the trilogy where philosophy occupies center stage.”<sup>20</sup> Henrici claims this centrality of philosophy, though less pronounced in *Love Alone*, remains as evidenced by two chapters in his book which deal with the philosophy of love and its human failure.<sup>21</sup> Thus, according to Balthasar, *reason* seeking to understand what “God wishes to say to [human beings] in Christ”<sup>22</sup> can properly also be understood as a subjective theory. Drawing on Henrici’s insight, we infer that reason seeking to understand God’s love can therefore be construed as a ‘philosophical-theological aesthetic.’ Balthasar is saying that the glory of God, God’s self-glorification of divine love, and its manifestation in the person of God’s own son, Jesus Christ, are only credible to human understanding and reason as love, thus having both a philosophical and theological aspect. Such a philosophical-theological aesthetic would, according to Balthasar, have nothing to do with a purely philosophical aesthetic

---

<sup>18</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 10.

<sup>19</sup> Peter Henrici, “The Philosophy of Hans Urs von Balthasar”, in David L Schindler, ed. *Hans Urs von Balthasar: His Life and Work* (San Francisco: Communio Book, Ignatius Press, 1991): 149-161, 153.

<sup>20</sup> Henrici, “The Philosophy of Hans Urs von Balthasar,” 152.

<sup>21</sup> Henrici, “The Philosophy of Hans Urs von Balthasar,” n. 34: Balthasar, *Love Alone*, “The Third Way of Love,” 51-60 and “The Failures of Love,” 61-74.

<sup>22</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 10.

which one finds in Christian thought in the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, or German Idealism.<sup>23</sup>

For Balthasar, the aesthetic quality of beauty becomes a means of conveying two theological aspects of love: *gift* and *response*. As *gift*, aesthetic is the self-interpreting glory of the sovereignly free love of God embodied in an objective theory – that is as the object of human perceiving. As *response*, aesthetic is the reception of that love “perceived with the eyes of faith,”<sup>24</sup> embodied in a subjective theory – that is as human perceiving.<sup>25</sup>

Balthasar refers to his theological aesthetic approach to understanding God’s revelation of divine love through the personhood of Jesus Christ as a ‘third way.’ He does not systematically explicate the other two ways which fail to provide, as he says, “the criterion for the genuineness of Christianity.”<sup>26</sup> Although Balthasar identifies ‘religious philosophy’ and ‘existence’ as two other insupportable ways that fail to meet this criterion, other interpretations seem to be equally plausible.<sup>27</sup> It is helpful to examine and position Balthasar’s third way in our study. We claim this third way to be a theological approach from above; it is an elaboration of God’s self-

---

<sup>23</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 11.

<sup>24</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 11.

<sup>25</sup> Balthasar’s twofold theological subjective and objective theory of perceiving will be later compared and contrasted (Chapter 4) to Lonergan’s cognitional theory of knowing examined in Chapter 3.

<sup>26</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 51.

<sup>27</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 51. We posit one such plausible interpretation of Balthasar’s ‘third way’, to be explored in Chapter 4 of this study. This interpretation envisions his ‘third way’ as an ‘approach’ or ‘method’ that provides a resolution to seemingly contradictory dialectic positions. In this view the other ‘two ways’ incorporate many and varied dialectical positions: e.g., cosmological reduction-anthropological reduction, pp. 15-50; *a priori-a posteriori*, easy-with difficulty, already evident-evolving through history, p. 50; religious philosophy-existence, thinking-living, knowledge-deed, extrinsicism-immanentism, blind faith-gnostic pretensions, p 51; I/me-Thou/other, thought-action, p.52; distinct phenomenon-veiled phenomenon, binds-frees, beauty-truth, p54; modernism-integralism, p 59; intellectual-spiritual, p. 60.

interpretation of God's own divine glory<sup>28</sup>. This "sovereignly free love of God"<sup>29</sup> is love as divine *gift*. This gift has two aspects: the gift of revelation of God's love and the gift of human perception of this love. Although Balthasar does not explicitly articulate what constitutes the other two ways, he does allude to approaches which he claims fail to grasp God's revelation of divine love in Christ. We infer from his statements that the other two ways include variations of extrinsicism (philosophy) and immanentism (existence)<sup>30</sup> for he states in the introduction to Chapter 3, The Third Way of Love:

Neither religious philosophy nor existence can provide the criterion for the genuineness of Christianity. In philosophy, man [*sic*]<sup>31</sup> discovers what is humanly knowable about the depths of being; in existence, man lives out what is humanly livable.<sup>32</sup>

Balthasar makes reference to an 'aesthetic sphere', which he states "represents a third, irreducible realm, next to that of thought and action."<sup>33</sup> We suggest that in this statement Balthasar is referring to his third way, in contrast to philosophy (thought) and existence (action). Balthasar claims the gift of God's love can only be perceived by the "eyes of faith,"<sup>34</sup> and therefore is not reducible to the laws of perception (philosophy). There is a requirement, however to understand this gift. We see here the evidence of the intimate link between an approach from above and an approach from below. In a footnote Balthasar states:

The moment I claim to have understood the love that another person has for me, i.e., either explaining it on the basis of the laws of human nature or considering myself entitled to it because of my inherent qualities, I have once and for all undermined and falsified that love and thereby cut off the possibility of reciprocity. Genuine love is always inconceivable, and only thus is it a gift.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Cf., Chapter 2, n. 4.

<sup>29</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 11.

<sup>30</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 51-53.

<sup>31</sup> In this study we quote directly, acknowledging that this does not reflect inclusive language.

<sup>32</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 51.

<sup>33</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 52.

<sup>34</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 11

<sup>35</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 52, n.1.



Balthasar's third way exists in an aesthetic realm or sphere, in counterpoint to the realms of nature and human living. It is only in this third aesthetic realm that, "in the experiences of extraordinary beauty – whether in nature or in art – we are able to grasp a phenomenon in its distinctiveness that otherwise remains veiled."<sup>36</sup> This beauty is as overwhelming as a miracle yet possesses intelligibility as a miracle. It is beyond the scope of this study to examine Balthasar's reasoning and to address philosophical questions of Balthasar's 'third way' beyond this brief analysis. Balthasar's suggestion that the two approaches, one in the realm of nature and intelligibility, and the other in the realm of aesthetics and beauty, converge to a unity are pivotal to this study. This convergence will also unfold when we consider the thought of Lonergan in Chapter 3.

In concluding this section on Balthasar's methodology, it is important to make clear that in *Love Alone* the two aspects of Balthasar's theological aesthetic – an objective theory from above and a subjective theory from below – are not separately depicted in an analytic or systematic fashion. Both senses are explicated in juxtaposition. In his aesthetic treatment of love both aspects are integrally connected, representing a unified whole, one inseparable from the other.

### ***2-3 Love as Divine Gift – Eros and Agape***

The association of eros to beauty and agape to glory is presented to us in the examples cited above. While preferring the theological-aesthetic approach of beauty and glory as terms to convey love as divine gift, Balthasar also finds ways to express love in theological-philosophical

---

<sup>36</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 52.

notions of eros and agape. In the realm of nature, love is experienced as beauty or eros. In the divine realm, love is perceived as glory and experienced as agape:

Already in the realm of nature, eros is the chosen place of beauty: whatever we love—no matter how profoundly or superficially we may love it—always appears radiant with glory; and whatever is objectively perceived as glorious —no matter how profoundly or superficially we experience it—does not penetrate into the onlooker except through the specificity of an eros. Both reciprocally related poles are transcended in the realm of revelation, wherein God's kenotically condescending Logos expresses himself as Love, *Agapē*, and thus as Glory.<sup>37</sup>

Although aesthetic beauty is Balthasar's means of conveying the immutable mystery of God's love, he acknowledges that “the charm of beauty” in the aesthetic realm, is challenged by “the ‘truth’ lying behind or above [beauty]” in the philosophical realm:

To dispel the charm of beauty by reducing its ‘appearance’ into some ‘truth’ lying behind or above it is to eliminate beauty altogether and to show that it was never really perceived in its distinctiveness.<sup>38</sup>

We now consider what Balthasar has to say concerning the nature of God's gift of love as revelation and the gift of perceiving this love. Balthasar uses aesthetic imagery to convey the way God reveals God's self to human beings. Balthasar emphasizes that this revelation needs to be appropriate to the capability of human beings' ability to recognize it, since it is wholly other. He states: “If God wishes to reveal the love he harbors for the world, this love has to be something that the world can recognize, in spite of the fact of, or in fact *in*, its being wholly other.”<sup>39</sup> The images Balthasar employs convey both the intimate nature of God's love – eros – and also the self-giving nature of this love – agape. Within the realm of intimacy Balthasar sees the love of a mother for her child as metaphor for God's love:

After a mother has smiled at her child for many days and weeks, she finally receives her child's smile in response. She has awakened love in the heart of her child, and as the child awakens to love, it also awakens to knowledge: the initially empty-sense impressions gather

---

<sup>37</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 54.

<sup>38</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 54.

<sup>39</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 75; italics in the original.

meaningfully around the core of the Thou. Knowledge [...] comes into play, because the play of love has already begun beforehand, initiated by the mother, the transcendent. God interprets himself to man as love in the same way: he radiates love, which kindles the light of love in the heart of man, and it is precisely this light that allows man to perceive this, the absolute Love [...]<sup>40</sup>.

Perceiving (and subsequently receiving and responding to) God's love is itself a gift from God.

Balthasar states:

But just as no child can be awakened to love without being loved, so too no human heart can come to an understanding of God without the free gift of his grace—in the image of his Son.<sup>41</sup>

This realm of intimacy also possesses the aesthetic quality of glory. Balthasar, quoting 2 Cor 4:6, referring to “the glory of God in the face of Christ,” states that, “[in] this face, the primal foundation of being smiles at us as a mother and as a father.”<sup>42</sup> Balthasar argues that the Word as revelation of God's love requires both self-knowledge<sup>43</sup> and love (as faith) as a response to this revelation.

If revelation were not love, then a receptive disposition of pure letting-be—which is intelligible only as the attitude of love that allows itself (as faith) to be led beyond all desire for self-knowledge—would be inhuman and unworthy of God, and God's revelation itself would not be able to instill such an attitude as an answer to his Word. Love can accord a priori (and therefore as faith) only with love, never with nonlove. [...] it is only because the Word has already been expressed and understood as love that the response of love can occur<sup>44</sup>

Having examined two modalities of the gift of divine love, eros and agape, from the perspective of the divine realm, an approach we labeled from above, we turn our attention to modalities of human love appropriate to the human realm.

---

<sup>40</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 76.

<sup>41</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 76.

<sup>42</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 76.

<sup>43</sup> Balthasar's view of self-knowledge will later be compared and contrasted with Lonergan's view.

<sup>44</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 83.

## 2-4 Love as Human Response –Eros, Philia, and Agape

While Balthasar’s aesthetic qualities of beauty (eros) and glory (agape) are suitable descriptors of God’s love in the divine realm, in the human realm modalities of love in human terms are required. These terms are: intimate or familial love (eros), love of community (philia), and universal or self-sacrificing love (agape). In *Love Alone* Balthasar does not directly explicate the nature of these human modalities of love; rather he refers to them only in highlighting human attempts to grasp aspects of the ineffable mystery of God’s love in myths and mythical religions:

The sheltering gaze that love casts upon being and essence, and its insight into the true nature of spousal love and the genuine love of children in the hearth of the triune fire of the family, its insight into genuine friendship, and genuine love of country, [...] and in its mysterious transfiguration beyond all conceivable success [...] preserves what we also find sheltered in the golden core of myths and mythical religions [...] <sup>45</sup>

In referring to ‘true’ spousal love, the ‘genuine’ love of children, family, ‘genuine’ friendship, and ‘genuine’ love of country, Balthasar sets up a contrast to inauthentic love. <sup>46</sup>

Balthasar depicts inauthentic human love as failures of love <sup>47</sup> or what he terms “the finitude of love” in “islands of love.”

The finitude of existence always seems immediately to justify the finitude of love, and since life in the world as a whole cannot be interpreted as love, it withdraws into islands of reciprocal sympathy: the island of eros, of friendship, of love of country, and ultimately the island of a certain universal love based on the single human nature that all people share, and even based on the single *physis*, pervaded by a common *logos*, that belongs to all of the beings in the universe. <sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 144, n.3.

<sup>46</sup> Authentic and inauthentic are not terms Balthasar uses, but rather are terms being put forward in order to lay the ground for establishing an argument to examine constitutive meaning and existence central to this study. Balthasar prefers ‘genuine’ or ‘true’ rather than ‘authentic.’ “When man encounters the love of God in Christ, not only does he experience what genuine love is, but he is also confronted with the undeniable fact that he, a selfish sinner, does not himself possess true love.” Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 61. Lonergan prefers the term ‘unauthentic.’

<sup>47</sup> Balthasar devotes a full Chapter in *Love Alone* to this subject: “4. The Failures of Love”, 61-73.

<sup>48</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 68; italics in the original.

Balthasar is stating that without perceiving and responding to God's gift of God's self-revelation in love, the constitutive meaning of genuine human life cannot be interpreted as love. This subject will be more fully examined below. In this citation, the three modalities of love (eros – intimacy, phila – friendship, and agape – universal love) are merely 'islands of reciprocal sympathy' that are 'based on the "single human nature that all people share.' To proceed beyond what might be deemed a philosophical-theological depiction of human love requires a movement to more specific existential human realities – in general the saints of tradition and in particular St. Thérèse of Lisieux.<sup>49</sup>

Balthasar, in his Preface to *Love Alone*, refers to "the great saints of the theological tradition" as lovers, the ones who "know most about God."<sup>50</sup> Using the image of glory, Balthasar states that saints alone genuinely respond to the gift of God's love in self-sacrificing love (agape): "But the genuine saints desired nothing but the greater glory of God's love; this alone is the condition of possibility of what they do."<sup>51</sup> This genuine divine love cannot be understood in terms of any possible human relationship, but only as a miracle: "Genuine love is always inconceivable, and only thus is it a gift."<sup>52</sup> Saints experience, in a most profound and intensive way, the desire to respond to God's gift of love with their own love:

The saints experienced something of the heat of this categorical imperative [to love]; we can see it in their lives and actions. It is in them that Christian love becomes credible; they are the poor sinners' guiding stars.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Anticipating Lonergan's systematic-technical approach, Balthasar's aesthetic-dramatic approach, here termed a human existential reality, will be termed a human ontological reality. Their respective notions of human reality and human existence will be explored in Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis.

<sup>50</sup> Balthasar includes Thérèse of Lisieux among those saints, *Love Alone*, 12.

<sup>51</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 121.

<sup>52</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 52, n. 1.

<sup>53</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 120.

Balthasar further adds, “the genuine saints desired nothing but the greater glory of God's love; this alone is the condition of possibility of what they do.”<sup>54</sup> And again, “The saints are lost in the depths of God; they are hidden in him.”<sup>55</sup> Moving from the general to the specific, St. Thérèse provides a concrete instance of genuine love as a response to divine love.

Thérèse’s life exemplifies love as an authentic human response to God’s gift of love. From Balthasar’s “Thérèse of Lisieux” we discern St. Thérèse’s ‘perception’ of God’s gift of love, and her ‘response’ to this gift. According to Balthasar’s account, Thérèse’s perception of the beauty and glory of divine love is associated with the image of the Holy Face: “Her whole life in Christ is concentrated into her *devotion to the Holy Face*.”<sup>56</sup> He writes: “The Holy Face [...] is for her the direct revelation and vision of the divine countenance.”<sup>57</sup> Drawing on an image of beauty, Balthasar quotes Thérèse:

But for me you have left behind your sweet picture; and you know that I have recognized you! Yes, I recognize you, even through tears, Face of the Eternal, I recognize your beauty.<sup>58</sup>

Thérèse’s response in love embodies the domain of family, community, and love of God. In the domain of intimacy (eros) Balthasar takes care to quash any sexual-eros aspect to Thérèse’s intimate loving relationships while highlighting the true-eros<sup>59</sup> aspect of her love towards her most intimate family members. He states:

The love that permeates the family is a completely pure love. Although it is an earthly and flesh-and-blood love, it is completely free from any trace of the disturbance, confusion and danger that concupiscence brings.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 121.

<sup>55</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 121.

<sup>56</sup> “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 221; italics in the original.

<sup>57</sup> “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 222.

<sup>58</sup> “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 223.

<sup>59</sup> Sexual eros and true eros are terms, Balthasar himself uses, *Love Alone*, 18, 136.

<sup>60</sup> “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 134.

This quote reveals the way that Balthasar, though acknowledging a strong sexual desire or concupiscent aspect of eros, takes great care to disavow such aspects to Thérèse herself. Whether such attributes are historically valid is beyond the scope of this study. Further, Balthasar quotes Thérèse herself:

[...] the difference between marriage and virginity never presented a problem to her. Married love within the framework of the Christian family was from the beginning the symbol and sacrament of the virgin love between Christ and the soul. "Is our family not a virginal family?"<sup>61</sup>

Even beyond the sphere of family Balthasar points out:

Just because the shadow of concupiscence never fell upon her, she can gaily use bodily terms for expressing her love, without any fear--and, indeed, with their full Christian meaning. When she first visits the Bishop of Bayeux, she accepts the affection heaped upon her with the same joy with which she slumbered in her father's lap. "He caressed me as no one (I was told) was ever caressed by him before."<sup>62</sup>

Images of intimacy reflected in St. Thérèse's family abound in Balthasar's portrait of Thérèse. Several familial illustrations serve to illustrate this. Of the love of her father, Balthasar has this to say:

Thérèse loved him, almost idolized him; at a glance she saw in him the unbreakable unity of love and authority [...] "it was as though he no longer belonged to this world, so much did his soul love to lose itself in the eternal truths." And it was Thérèse who knelt beside her father during evening prayers; "I only needed to look at him to learn how the saints pray."<sup>63</sup>

Of Thérèse's mother, who died when Thérèse was only five years old, images of child-like love prevail. Balthasar writes, "Mama is the atmosphere of love and, above all, the atmosphere in which one prays."<sup>64</sup> For Balthasar, the importance of prayer in genuine human existence is conveyed in images of Thérèse's love of her mother and father. He writes of her, "[P]rayer brings [Thérèse] into communion with her mother, her father and her sisters. For part of her

---

<sup>61</sup> Balthasar, "Thérèse of Lisieux," 134.

<sup>62</sup> Balthasar, "Thérèse of Lisieux," 134-35.

<sup>63</sup> Balthasar, "Thérèse of Lisieux," 120-21.

<sup>64</sup> Balthasar, "Thérèse of Lisieux," 124.

experience in prayer is conditioned by the presence of beloved persons: the presence of human love is a sort of token for the hidden presence of God.”<sup>65</sup>

Balthasar brings to light the love Thérèse displays to the nuns of her community (philia), describing it as a natural extension of the love of her parents and siblings:

The love between the sisters so movingly described by Thérèse reflects the same atmosphere as the love of the parents. When she later comes to love all her religious Sisters in Carmel with a tender and seemingly natural affection, this represents the unfolding of her love for Pauline, Marie, Céline and Léonie.<sup>66</sup>

Balthasar characterizes this unfolding love of her community of nuns as a “spiritual love” (philia) which is a transformation of the intimate “natural love” (eros) of her sisters:

From the first, she knows them no longer according to the flesh, and she treats them as she treats any other nun. [...] she transforms natural love into spiritual love and so treats all the nuns as her sisters in the Lord.<sup>67</sup>

Balthasar’s treatment of St. Thérèse’s Act of Oblation to Merciful Love is now examined in order to establish a basis for comparing Balthasar and Lonergan’s respective notions of the modality of love we call agape.<sup>68</sup> A thorough study of St. Thérèse’s Act of Oblation, an act we submit is a manifestation of her love of God as agape, is beyond the scope of this project. In the brief summary that follows we draw on Guy Gaucher’s commentary on the Oblation.<sup>69</sup> Gaucher agrees with Abbé André Combes assessment of the spiritual significance of Thérèse’s prayer of oblation.

The historical circumstances of the Act of Oblation related in these pages [...] confirm the opinion of those who, following Abbé André Combes, see in Thérèse’s new orientation of

---

<sup>65</sup> Balthasar, “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 124.

<sup>66</sup> Balthasar, “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 128.

<sup>67</sup> Balthasar, “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 153.

<sup>68</sup> I am indebted to Sr. Gill Goulding CJ for bringing this event to my attention.

<sup>69</sup> Thérèse, Guy Gaucher, and Aletheia Kane, *The Prayers of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux: The Act of Oblation* (Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 1997).



spirituality “one of the most moving and momentous revolutions the Holy Spirit has unleashed in the spiritual evolution of humanity.”<sup>70</sup>

On Trinity Sunday, June 9, 1895, Thérèse was suddenly moved to offer herself as a victim to God's merciful love as an oblation. She writes:

In order to live in one single act of perfect Love, I offer myself as a victim of holocaust to your merciful love, asking you to consume me incessantly, allowing the waves of infinite tenderness shut up within you to overflow into my soul, and that thus I may become a Martyr of your Love, O my God!<sup>71</sup>

Balthasar refers to acts of oblation in several passages in his works. In the context of holiness or sanctity, he writes of Thérèse:

[...] the word sanctity comes to include for her everything that is genuine and real to each one of us—because it is just so ordinary. In her most solemn pronouncement, that act of oblation that she was constantly performing and applying to herself she writes: “O my God, O most blessed Trinity, I desire to love you and make you loved, to work for the glorification of Holy Church by saving souls on earth and delivering souls suffering in Purgatory.”<sup>72</sup>

This act of self-surrender, of self-sacrificing love, he casts in terms of a personal readiness to serve God. It is, he states, an expression of “the true principle of Christian faithfulness: a burning readiness to be used and consumed for the salvation and redemption of the world. This is a readiness that will necessarily be expressed as personal oblation, as the prayer of surrender.”<sup>73</sup>

Balthasar goes on to attribute the act of self-surrender to Thérèse herself: “Thérèse of Lisieux knew that this prayer, if it is an authentic expression of unlimited readiness, happens in ‘the heart of the Church’, linked to the infinite fruitfulness and efficacy of Mary's Yes to God.”<sup>74</sup> In these quotes, it is noteworthy that Balthasar stresses that which he deems to be “authentic”, where

---

<sup>70</sup> Gaucher, *The Prayers of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux*, p 7; André Combes, *The Spirituality of St. Thérèse: An Introduction* (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1950), p. 52.

<sup>71</sup> Gaucher, *The Prayers of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux*, p 7

<sup>72</sup> Balthasar, “Thérèse of Lisieux,” 111; Thérèse, *Story of a Soul: The Autobiography of St. Therese Of Lisieux* (Washington: ICS Publications, 1975), 276.

<sup>73</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Explorations in Theology Volume 4, Spirit and Institution* (San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press 1995)306.

<sup>74</sup> Balthasar, *Explorations in Theology Volume 4*, 306.

elsewhere he may equally have used qualifying terms such as “true” or “genuine.” This leads us to now consider notions of the relationship of human existence to aesthetic and existential or ontological meaning, as elements for establishing a dialogue between Balthasar and Lonergan.<sup>75</sup>

## **2-5 Aesthetic Meaning of Love and Genuine Human Existence**

In this section we seek to clarify our use of the terms ‘aesthetic meaning’ and what we call ‘ontological or constitutive meaning.’ As well, we seek to bring these two meanings together in a dialogical form or as a conversation where we compare and contrast aesthetic meaning and constitutive meaning. In examining these two meanings our objective is to reconcile what we call a word’s common aesthetic meaning and its deeper ontological or constitutive meaning. The words ‘love’ and ‘existence’, central to this study, are two such words that need to be brought into harmony or convergence. To achieve this objective we proceed as follows. We argue that while Balthasar explicitly depicts a commonly understood aesthetic meaning of love, he also implicitly conveys a deeper ontological or constitutive meaning of love, a meaning that relates to existence and authenticity. We clarify these meanings through two expositions: 1) love as holiness (ontological meaning); 2) prayer as the essence of existence (authenticity).

In our first exposition, we contend that for Balthasar love as saintliness or holiness conveys an ontological meaning, manifested by the life of the saintly person to whom it is addressed. For Balthasar, as noted above, saints preeminently are lovers, “ones who know most about God.”<sup>76</sup> Holiness, which exists objectively in the Church, instills a subjective holiness in its members. Balthasar states, “The objective holiness that dwells in Scripture, sacrament and office has the

---

<sup>75</sup> The adjective ‘ontological’ occurs but once in *Love Alone is Credible*, whereas Balthasar uses the adjective ‘existential’ in ten instances. In what follows, to provide a basis for comparing Balthasar and Lonergan, we use ‘ontological’ in place of ‘existential.’

<sup>76</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 12.

purpose of fertilizing the subjective [ontological] loving holiness of the members of the Church.”<sup>77</sup> Thus love and holiness are inextricably connected to the ontological reality of saintly human beings. However, holiness is not to be attainable only by the exceptional saints of tradition, but rather is a goal for all human beings.

Above all, [the Church] must not build up Christian behavior from the lower limit of what can barely still be permitted and leave the striving for holiness to a few outsiders as exceptional and peculiar behavior. When the Church thus thinks from above downward in moral questions and gives corresponding instructions, she simply follows the movement of revelation and the style of the apostolic letters.<sup>78</sup>

In an interview with Angelo Scola, Balthasar references two documents from the Second Vatican Council to emphasize the strong ties between holiness and love:

The Council has expressed this lucidly in two documents: in *Lumen Gentium*, [and *Dei Verbum*] by the assertion that all Christians, not just a number of elect, are called to perfect love and holiness.<sup>79</sup>

Balthasar observes a strong relationship between love and mercy, for he says, “We must now exhibit mercy as an ontological modality of love in its own right. In his essence, the God of Jesus Christ is ‘merciful’ (Lk 6:36), ‘rich in mercy’ (Eph 2:4), ‘Father of mercies’ (2 Cor 1:3).”<sup>80</sup>

In our second exposition we claim that, for Balthasar, prayer constitutes the essence of authentic or genuine human existence. For this we draw on the insights of Victoria Harrison. Harrison asserts that an early work of Balthasar on contemplative prayer, one that emphasizes the need to pray, supports a claim that, in encountering God through prayer, one achieves authentic human identity. She writes, “According to von Balthasar, in praying, one encounters

---

<sup>77</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Short Primer for Unsettled Laymen* (San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press 1985), 32.

<sup>78</sup> Balthasar, *Short Primer for Unsettled Laymen*, 64.

<sup>79</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar and Angelo Scola, *Test Everything: Hold Fast to What Is Good* (San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press 1989)

<sup>80</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Logic Volume 2, Truth of God* (San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press 2004) 143.

God, and it is through this encounter that one can attain authentic personal identity and genuine fulfilment.”<sup>81</sup>

Harrison posits that Balthasar’s views of the human-divine situation, which she terms his theological anthropology, is a “philosophical anthropology that is fundamentally shaped by his Christology.” In other words, she argues that the human component of this human-divine relationship can be viewed as arising out of Balthasar’s Christocentric philosophical anthropology. She names this human aspect or “conception of humanity,” *homo orans*.<sup>82</sup> Having articulated a convincing case for this assertion, she brings forward evidence from Balthasar’s work that relate to prayer, love, and human existence that support the portrayal of a human being as a *homo orans*. This term identifies a human being as a person who prays, or a praying person. Human beings’ innate need to pray stems from God. Harrison, referencing Balthasar, writes:

Thus, deeply rooted in human nature is the ability to hear the Word. Most importantly, to claim that human beings, to be truly themselves, must listen to God's Word is, for von Balthasar, to claim that, to be truly themselves, human beings must pray. And the kind of prayer that he has in mind here is contemplative prayer.<sup>83</sup>

If authenticity is embodied in prayer and love, is inauthenticity then that which is opposite?

Harrison addresses this question also in terms of truth:

The claim that human beings, to be truly themselves, must pray implies the possibility of a state wherein human beings are not truly themselves. von Balthasar considers this state to be equivalent to a human being not realizing her own ' truth ' - a ' truth ' which is unique to each individual and given to her by God.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Victoria S. Harrison, “Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology,” , 280. In n.1, Harrison, referring to this early, work writes: “*Das Betrachtende Gebet* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1976) was first published in 1957. I also use both of the English translations entitled *Prayer*: the earlier, by A. V. Littledale (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1961); and the more recent, by Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press. 1986).”

<sup>82</sup> Harrison, “Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology,” 280; italics in the original.

<sup>83</sup> Harrison, “Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology,” 281.

<sup>84</sup> Harrison, “Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology,” 283.

In addition to truth, Harrison also casts prayer in terms of love, adoration, and obedience. For the purpose of this study we highlight her insights on prayer and love. She quotes Balthasar directly:

Love is the content and aim of contemplation, and so, from the outset, should be directly sought and realised. Love desires the presence of the beloved, and so the person praying places himself in God's presence<sup>85</sup>

She goes on to say, that “[Balthasar] claims, the more one prays contemplatively the more one comes to love Christ.” Thus a proper response to God’s gift of love is contemplative prayer.

Harrison, quotes Balthasar:

[...] each human life is unique, and each individual will see the life of the Lord in a different way. Furthermore, the special love of God for each individual makes use of Christ's life in contemplation as an instrument from which to draw an incomparable and original melody.<sup>86</sup>

Having examined the relationship of prayer, holiness and love in constituting what is genuine and true in human living, we offer a summary of our claim that, for Balthasar, the true meaning of human living is constituted by love.

## ***2-6 Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence***

Balthasar’s aesthetic theological understanding of divine love in *Love Alone is Credible* has been interpreted in the context of divine gift. This has been done so as to facilitate subsequent comparisons to Lonergan’s analogous depiction of divine love as gift. As gift, love can be seen to proceed from above downwards, that is, divine love directed to the human person.

Balthasar’s theological method and his portrayal of three modalities of love: eros, philia, and agape, were examined. His portrayal of human response to God’s gift of love in the oblation of Thérèse of Lisieux was put forward as a concrete example of love as agape, or being-in-love

---

<sup>85</sup> Harrison citing Balthasar, *Prayer* (H), pp. 104 ff. “Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology.” 292.

<sup>86</sup> Harrison citing Balthasar, *Prayer* (L), p. 162. “Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology.” 295.

with God, Thérèse's love of community exemplified love as *philia*, and her intimate love of her family as *eros*.

Since Balthasar does not explicitly address the notion of love as a constitutive meaning of human existence within the works cited, Victoria Harrison's notion of *homo orans* was used to ascertain Balthasar's implicit understanding of such an ontological meaning. To facilitate a subsequent correlation between a dramatic-aesthetic understanding and a technical-systematic understanding of love, Balthasar's understanding of love as truth was examined.

We now turn to examine Lonergan's technical-systematic understanding of love in the context of the ontological or constitutive meaning of human existence.

### Chapter 3: Love, Meaning, and Existence in Lonergan's Thought

Balthasar's theological-aesthetic approach in *Love Alone is Credible* is an approach from above. It begins with God's love as gift and leads to human love and human knowing as a response to that gift. On the other hand, Lonergan's technical-systematic approach in *Method* is an approach from below. It begins with human knowing leading to human love as a response to God's divine gift of love. However, as will be seen later, Lonergan's method though beginning from below upwards encompasses a movement from above downwards. This downward movement is more fully developed in later Lonergan writings. In this study we prescind from a full reflection of this downward movement but acknowledge its presence in *Method*.<sup>1</sup> Muhigirwa Rusembuka in critically examining Lonergan's notions of human development, writes: "Lonergan asserts that human development follows two fundamental and complementary ways, an ascending one, from below upwards, the way of achievement, and a descending one, the way downwards, the way of heritage."<sup>2</sup>

In this chapter Lonergan's notions of love, meaning and existence are explored in the context of human knowing.<sup>3</sup> In order to establish common ground for putting forward a dialogue between Balthasar and Lonergan, we have postulated three modalities of love: intimate-familial love, community love, and self-sacrificing love. These three modalities, central to this study, are discussed under the rubrics of: eros, philia, and agape.

---

<sup>1</sup> In Chapter 5 this downward movement is discussed as an area for further study,.

<sup>2</sup> Muhigirwa F. Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan: Anticipation in Insight* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 2001), 7.

<sup>3</sup> Lonergan uses the term 'notion' in different senses, one of which is the common sense meaning of an idea, concept, or image. However, when he qualifies it with the descriptor 'transcendental notion', as will be seen, it takes on a deeper meaning. The use of this term in this chapter, except where noted otherwise, is the first meaning.

As gift, Lonergan envisions divine love proceeding from above downwards, God's love flooding the human heart. As response, Lonergan envisages love as a culmination of God's gift of a desire to know, an *eros* of the spirit. This desire is effected through a human being's upward movement to self-transcendence which, at its apex, results in one's falling-in-love with God. While Lonergan's cognitional theory of human knowing provides the foundation for our present investigation of love, meaning and existence in his early thought, it is beyond the scope of this study to explicate his theory.<sup>4</sup> For insight into Lonergan's evolving notions of our proposed three modalities of love we turn to Blackwood's *And hope does not disappoint*.<sup>5</sup> To discern Lonergan's technical-systematic method, his thoughts on ontological meaning, and his stance on the role of love in authentic human existence we look to *Method in Theology*.<sup>6</sup>

### **3-1 Modalities of Human Love**

Being central to our study of love, meaning, and existence in the thought of Balthasar and Lonergan, it is important to warrant our choice of terms for modalities of love. Firstly, the choice of the three descriptors: 1) intimate-familial love, 2) community love, and 3) self-sacrificing love. Secondly, the choice of the corresponding rubrics: 1) *eros*, 2) *philia*, and 3) *agape*. Lonergan's thoughts on love provide the foundation for these choices. In this section we examine Lonergan's evolving and varied notions of love from his early writings in 1943 to his thoughts in *Method in Theology* in 1972 and in relevant later works. For his early thoughts we rely on Blackwood's *And hope does not disappoint*. We examine Lonergan's usage of the words *eros*

---

<sup>4</sup> For a comprehensive exposition of this theory, see Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, CWL 3 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1992), hereafter also referred to as *Insight*.

<sup>5</sup> Blackwood, *And hope does not disappoint: love, grace, and subjectivity in the work of Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J.*, hereafter also referred to as *And hope does not disappoint*.

<sup>6</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, hereafter also referred to as *Method*.



and agape to differentiate his use of these terms from our use of them in this study. In later sections, following a consideration of Lonergan's technical-systematic method, love as divine gift and love as human response is explored. Although both Balthasar and Lonergan express a triad of love using varied descriptive terms, each conveying different meanings, our task in this study is to focus more narrowly on their specific understandings of love in the context of the constitutive meaning of human existence, in other words, their respective understandings of love as the existential meaning of human living.

Blackwood maintains that Lonergan, in a 1943 paper, "Finality, Love, Marriage,"<sup>7</sup> expresses an early analysis of important aspects of love. In his Introduction to *And hope does not disappoint*, Blackwood, in reference to Chapter 1 of his book, states:

Chapter 1 begins with [Lonergan's] analysis of love in an early article, "Finality, Love, Marriage," and offers an account of the development of his understanding of love and interpersonal relation through significant Latin and English works through the first twenty years of his development.<sup>8</sup>

Blackwood provides an analysis of Lonergan's paper, focusing on a section "The Concept of Love." Blackwood posits that Lonergan presents a scholastic analysis of love where, in the context of vertical finality, love is framed as four aspects: desiring the good, willing the good, willing a common good, and achieving a common good. The first two aspects are oriented to the individual, the latter two oriented to the community. Thus we begin to see in Lonergan's early thoughts on aspects of love an aspect or modality of community love (*philia*). Aspects of 'desire' and 'willing' [for the good] may also be construed as precursors of the modality of intimate-familial love (*eros*). Marriage, for Lonergan, though beginning with the intimate love of husband

---

<sup>7</sup> Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage," in *Collection*, ed. Fredrick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* 4 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 17-52; originally published as "Finality, Love, Marriage," *Theological Studies* 4 (1943):477-510.

<sup>8</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 21-26.

and wife, is ultimately oriented and directed to a higher purpose.<sup>9</sup> Blackwood, referencing “Finality, Love, Marriage,” notes that love, and particularly marriage, are unions of individual subjects that form an upward tendency to supernatural perfection. This perfection is “an objective movement in the space-time solidarity of man, and married life a series of steps upward through love of one's neighbor to the love of God.”<sup>10</sup>

Drawing on a series of notes that Lonergan wrote for a 1951-52 course on Sanctifying Grace, Blackwood makes several statements relating to Lonergan’s thoughts on divine love (agape) and friendship (philia) that are relevant to our study.<sup>11</sup> Blackwood observes how Romans 5:5 (“And hope does not disappoint us, because God has poured out his love into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, whom he has given us”),<sup>12</sup> becomes “a recurring touchstone for Lonergan’s understanding of God’s gift of divine love to us.”<sup>13</sup> We construe this love to be agape, God’s self-giving love for humanity. Blackwood also highlights how, through the Holy Spirit, we become friends of God, adopted children of God, and heirs in eternal life. Blackwood interprets Lonergan as saying that friendship and love are part of God’s divine plan which shows that “God loves us and we love God with God’s own love, constituting our mutual friendship [philia]; and adoption either supposes or effects a common nature, with the consequence of inheritance.”<sup>14</sup> Blackwood sees in these notes a link between Lonergan’s early understanding of love expressed

---

<sup>9</sup> For another interpretation of Lonergan’s understanding of love as an “upward tendency from *eros* to friendship, and from friendship to a special order of charity” see Elizabeth J. Snedden, *The Eros of the Human Spirit: The Writings of Bernard Lonergan, SJ* (New York: Paulist Press, 2017), 26. We shall encounter the expression ‘eros of the human spirit’ recurring in Lonergan’s thought.

<sup>10</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 26; quote in n. 18 taken from Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage,” 45.

<sup>11</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 28-29; Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace,” in *Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 19 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011), 581-613

<sup>12</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 28-29, n. 25.

<sup>13</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 28-29, n. 2.

<sup>14</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 29; n. 25.

in “Finality, Love, Marriage” and his later understanding of love which he will express in an intentionality context.<sup>15</sup> According to Blackwood, Lonergan’s horizon was moving away from a metaphysical faculty psychology analysis in *Insight* to what we deem to be a technical-systematic intentionality analysis in *Method*,<sup>16</sup> a topic we address in a later section.

Blackwood posits that Lonergan’s notion of a triad of love<sup>17</sup> has its roots in Lonergan’s response to a question posed to him in 1958 during a series of lectures given in Halifax.<sup>18</sup> This triad, corresponding to the three levels of intellectual operations Lonergan posited, are, “[...] the domestic love in the family [eros], love in the loyalty of civil community [philia], [...] and the love of God [agape].”<sup>19</sup> This love of God, for Lonergan, has a sense of self-donation, or as we have chosen to call it, self-sacrificing love (agape). It is God’s “divine self-gift in the incarnation [...] the first expression of God’s love to us.”<sup>20</sup>

By 1971 Lonergan, in *Method in Theology*, describes these three modalities of love in the context of human beings’ capacity for self-transcendence:

[...] our questions for intelligence, for reflection, and for deliberation, constitute our capacity for self-transcendence. That capacity becomes an actuality when one falls in love. Then one’s being becomes being-in-love. Such being-in-love has its antecedents, its causes, its conditions, its occasions. [...] Being-in-love is of different kinds. There is the love of intimacy, of husband and wife, of parents and children. There is the love of one’s fellow men with its fruit in the achievement of human welfare. There is the love of God with one’s whole heart and whole

---

<sup>15</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 28; n. 25.

<sup>16</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 31. Blackwood does not use the descriptor ‘technical-systematic.’

<sup>17</sup> Blackwood notes that the first full-fledged appearance of this triad appeared somewhat later, in 1963, in editorial notes to “The Meditation of Christ in Prayer” (Bernard J.F. Lonergan, “The Mediation of Christ in Prayer,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6, Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996, 172, n. 14.)

<sup>18</sup> Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, ed. Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli, CWL 5 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990).

<sup>19</sup> The three levels of intellectual operations that Lonergan posits in *Insight* are: experiencing, understanding, and deciding. Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 38-39, n. 60.

<sup>20</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 39.

soul, with all one's mind and all one's strength (Mk. 12, 30). It is God's love flooding our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us (Rom. 5, 5)<sup>21</sup>

For Lonergan, there are different kinds or modalities of 'being-in-love.' The first modality, intimate-familial love (eros), Lonergan states is 'the love of husband and wife, of parents and children.' The second modality, community love (philia) is 'the love of one's fellow men with its fruit in the achievement of human welfare.' The third modality, self-sacrificing love (agape) is love of God having the twofold aspect of divine gift and human response. As gift it is God's love flooding our hearts. As response it is the love of God with one's whole heart and whole soul, with all one's mind and all one's strength.

Though the words eros and agape appear in Lonergan's work, the use of these two words in this study as rubrics for two modalities of love needs to be clearly distinguished from Lonergan's own use of the terms. Lonergan employs several qualifying descriptors, as will be seen later, to convey notions of intimacy or eros. Similarly for notions of self-sacrificing love, agape, he also makes use of various qualifying terms. As Lonergan does not explicitly use philia, in referring to community love, there is less ambiguity in our use of this term. However as Lonergan does use eros and agape, it is necessary to distinguish his use of these terms from our use in this study.

In *Method in Theology* eros appears twice and in both occurrences Lonergan uses eros in a qualifying sense which conveys an intrinsic ontological aspect that is characteristic of intimacy. Lonergan speaks of 'the eros of the human spirit', the innermost aspect of human being, when he elucidates the nature of two central aspects of his technical-systematic methodology. The first use of eros pertains to the driving force underpinning his notion of cognitional intentionality:

---

<sup>21</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105.

[...] we have distinguished many conscious and intentional operations and arranged them in a succession of different levels of consciousness. But [...] as the many operations are conjoined in a single compound knowing, so too the many levels of consciousness are just successive stages in the unfolding of a single thrust, the eros of the human spirit.<sup>22</sup>

The second instance of his use of eros pertains to an equally compelling potency: the desire and the capacity for self-transcendence culminating in religious conversion. This conversion, according to Lonergan, leads one to total, other-worldly love – one’s being-in-love with God:

[...] religious conversion goes beyond moral. Questions for intelligence, for reflection, for deliberation reveal the eros of the human spirit, its capacity and its desire for self-transcendence. But that capacity meets fulfilment, that desire turns to joy, when religious conversion transforms the existential subject into a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and so an other-worldly love.<sup>23</sup>

This transformation or conversion is the human manifestation of agape, though Lonergan does not explicitly use the term agape in *Method in Theology*. However, Blackwood, in *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, does cite an instance where Lonergan’s uses both agape and eros. This occurs during a July 20, 1977 Lonergan Workshop where Lonergan is responding to a question posed to him. Lonergan states: “God’s gift of his love is the *agape* that sublates<sup>24</sup> *eros*, the loving that sublates desiring.”<sup>25</sup> Thus according to Blackwood, a view to which we concur, Lonergan perceives agape as an aspect of love that transforms and elevates eros, the normal human power or force of desire and willing.

---

<sup>22</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 13.

<sup>23</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 242.

<sup>24</sup> For Lonergan, “what sublates goes beyond what is sublated, introduces something new and distinct, puts everything on a new basis, yet so far from interfering with the sublated or destroying it, on the contrary needs it, includes it, preserves all its proper features and properties, and carries them forward to a fuller realization within a richer context.” Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 241.

<sup>25</sup> Bernard Lonergan, Unpublished Document 1600DTE070, <https://www.bernardlonergan.com/pdf/91600DTE070.pdf> (accessed February 19, 2018).

### ***3-2 Lonergan's Technical-Systematic Methodology***

It is beyond the scope of this project to elaborate Lonergan's transcendental methodology beyond that required to provide a framework for comparing and contrasting his methodology with that of Balthasar.<sup>26</sup> Whereas Balthasar's aesthetic-dramatic methodology adopts a perspective of divine gift to human response drawing on aesthetic/dramatic descriptive language, Lonergan's technical-systematic approach begins with human conscious receptivity of divine love employing technical/systematic explanatory language.

Lonergan's technical-systematic approach, understood as a theology 'from below', is founded on the premise that knowing, the human desire for truth, value, and goodness, culminates in self-transcendence and falling-in-love with God. For Lonergan, love is constitutive of the meaning of authentic human existence. The a priori transcendentals: beauty, truth, value, and goodness, provide a point of departure for positing a relationship between these transcendentals and love. In *Method in Theology*, Lonergan explicitly identifies truth, reality, value, and goodness as transcendental concepts and as objects of cognitional intentionality. Concepts, for Lonergan are objects of the precepts to be intelligent, be reasonable, and be responsible. He states,

So if we objectify the content of intelligent intending, we form the transcendental concept of the intelligible. If we objectify the content of reasonable intending, we form the transcendental concepts of the true and the real. If we objectify the content of responsible intending, we get the transcendental concept of value, of the truly good.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Excellent sources include: Patrick Corcoran S.M., editor, *Looking at Lonergan's Method* (The Talbot Press: Dublin, 1975); Mark D. Morelli and Elizabeth A. Morelli, *The Lonergan Reader* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997); Frederick E Crowe, *Lonergan*. (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992); Joseph Flanagan, *Quest for Self-Knowledge: An Essay in Lonergan's Philosophy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997).

<sup>27</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 11-12.

However, prior to ‘concepts’ in human conscious intending, there are transcendental ‘notions’ that lead to correct, valid, or true transcendental concepts. In other words, Lonergan is saying that prior to one’s forming a concept or insight, one must be attentive to, or possess an intention or ‘notion’ to perceive or grasp a universal reality.<sup>28</sup>

But quite distinct from such transcendental concepts, which can be misconceived and often are, there are the prior transcendental notions that constitute the very dynamism of our conscious intending, promoting us from mere experiencing towards understanding, from mere understanding towards truth and reality, from factual knowledge to responsible action.<sup>29</sup>

Thus Lonergan is expressing an equivalence between human knowing and universal or transcendental aspects of reality. In *Method* Lonergan deepens and enriches the three levels of cognitional theory of consciousness in *Insight* to encompass four levels: the empirical, the intellectual, the rational, and the responsible.<sup>30</sup> These four levels embody, or are analogous to, four transcendentals: beauty, understanding (reality), truth, and goodness.<sup>31</sup> The role of love in relation to these transcendentals is one of being at the apex of these levels of consciousness.<sup>32</sup>

Lonergan states:

So the gift of God’s love occupies the ground and root of the fourth and highest level of man’s intentional consciousness. It takes over the peak of the soul, the *apex animae*.<sup>33</sup>

Like Balthasar, Lonergan refers to his theological approach or method as a third way which at its apex is falling-in-love with God. Similarities and differences in their respective

---

<sup>28</sup> As noted previously, Lonergan also refers to this innate desire or intention as “the eros of the human spirit.”

<sup>29</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 14.

<sup>30</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 9.

<sup>31</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 13. See also John D. Dadosky who identifies beauty as a transcendental, “The Proof of Beauty: From Aesthetic Experience to the Beauty of God,” *Analecta Hermeneutica* vol. 2 (2010) 1-13.

<sup>32</sup> At this time there is no consensus in Lonerganian studies whether love represents a fifth level of consciousness as Jeremy Blackwood argues, or an aspect of the fourth level as others maintain. See Jeremy Blackwood, “The Scholarly Discussion on Love and The Fifth Level of Consciousness in Lonergan,” *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*: 171-208. This question is not addressed in this study.

<sup>33</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 107, italics in the original.

methodological approaches are examined in the next chapter. Lonergan identifies the first way as method conceived as an art, to be learned not from books but in seminars – an emulation of a master, a “reflection on previous achievement.”<sup>34</sup> He identifies a second way wherein method is conceived as an empirical process drawing on the success of natural science. Lonergan’s third way, his method in theology, begins with a key insight drawn from empirical science: method is a “*normative pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results.*”<sup>35</sup> Within Lonergan’s third way we find two movements: a movement from below upwards and a movement from above downwards.<sup>36</sup> These two movements and their relationship to our study of love, meaning, and existence in the thought of Bernard Lonergan are now examined.

The conscious operations that constitute Lonergan’s movement from below upwards proceed through four levels of consciousness.<sup>37</sup> At the first level, the empirical level, one senses, perceives, and imagines, that is, one creates perceptions or images. At the second level, the intellectual level, one inquires, works out, and expresses concepts. At the third level, the rational level, one reflects and passes judgment on the truth or falsity of the concept. At the fourth level, the responsible level, one deliberates, decides, and takes action on one’s decisions. These intentional operations can be summarized as: experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding.<sup>38</sup> Corresponding to these operations are the transcendental precepts: be attentive, be

---

<sup>34</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 3.

<sup>35</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 5, italics in the original.

<sup>36</sup> In what follows we draw on Rusembuka’s insights “Human Development from Below Upwards” and “Human Development from Above Downwards.” Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan*, 13-102.

<sup>37</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 9.

<sup>38</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 14.



intelligent, be reasonable, and be responsible.<sup>39</sup> Lonergan states that regarding the four levels of experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding, “[T]he lower levels are presupposed and complemented by the higher. The higher sublimate the lower.”<sup>40</sup>

In the context of love, meaning, and existence, certain questions bear closer examination. The question of how Lonergan understands self-transcendence and authenticity, their interdependence, and their relationship to love and the four levels of conscious intentionality requires consideration. As one comes to appropriate one’s conscious intentionality at each level one ‘transcends’ one’s previous understanding of both the process of knowing and the knowledge appropriated. This step of self-transcending one’s original horizon of knowing to a new and deeper horizon is termed a ‘conversion.’<sup>41</sup> Lonergan posits levels of self-transcendence corresponding to levels of conscious intentionality: cognitional self-transcendence at the third level of judging and moral self-transcendence at the fourth level of deciding.<sup>42</sup> Since the fourth level encompasses an aspect of taking action, this action constitutes yet another level of self-transcendence: religious self-transcendence.<sup>43</sup> Blackwood also emphasizes the role of love as a culmination of the movement from below upwards.<sup>44</sup> He writes:

[Lonergan’s] lecture, “Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious,” given on October 10, [1974] once again made use of successive imagery culminating in love and situated love as

---

<sup>39</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 55.

<sup>40</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 120.

<sup>41</sup> See “Horizons” and “Conversions and Breakdowns” in Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 235-244.

<sup>42</sup> Lonergan also refers to cognitional self-transcendence as intellectual self-transcendence.

<sup>43</sup> Early in *Method*, Lonergan does not specifically give this highest level of self-transcendence a name, simply leaving it unqualified. Rusembuka labels it ‘affective transcendence’, Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan*, 64. There Rusembuka, quoting Lonergan in *Method in Theology*, 289, writes: “The human person is ‘self-transcendent affectively when he fell in love, when the isolation of the individual was broken and he spontaneously functions not just for himself but for others as well.’”

<sup>44</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 116-117, n. 44.

the ground of stable authenticity insofar as it is the fulfillment for which intentional consciousness strives.<sup>45</sup>

Complementing Lonergan's movement from below upwards is a movement from above downwards. This movement, though not fully formulated in *Method*, is expressed in his later writings.<sup>46</sup> It is beyond the scope of this study to fully explore Lonergan's later thoughts on the priority of love, focusing principally on the earlier thoughts expressed in *Method*. In Chapter 5 we suggest this as a possible area for further study. Rusembuka summarizes Lonergan's downward movement as follows:

If 'the way up' implies a movement from below upwards that includes the data, the intelligible, the true, the good, the way down implies a movement from above downwards that proceeds from the good to the data through the true and the intelligible.<sup>47</sup>

Rusembuka warrants his claim for a way down being present in *Method* by citing two occasions where Lonergan alludes to such a movement. The first occasion<sup>48</sup> is in Lonergan's statement that,

[...] as the many elementary objects are constructed into larger wholes, as the many operations are conjoined in a single compound knowing, so too the many levels of consciousness are just successive stages in the unfolding of a single thrust, the eros of the human spirit. To know the good, it must know the real; to know the real, it must know the true; to know the true, it must know the intelligible; to know the intelligible, it must attend to the data.<sup>49</sup>

The second occasion<sup>50</sup> occurs when Lonergan explicates Blaise Pascal:

First, then, there is a knowledge born of love. Of it Pascal spoke when he remarked that the heart has reasons which reason does not know. Here by reason I would understand the compound of the activities on the first three levels of cognitional activity, namely, of

---

<sup>45</sup> Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "Self-Transcendence: Intellectual, Moral, Religious," in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 316–325.

<sup>46</sup> Rusembuka presents a comprehensive analysis of eleven post-*Method* articles supporting a movement from above downwards; Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan*, 78-99.

<sup>47</sup> Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan*, 63.

<sup>48</sup> Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan*, 63.

<sup>49</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 13.

<sup>50</sup> Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan*, 63.

experiencing, of understanding, and of judging. By the heart's reasons I would understand feelings that are intentional responses to values; [...] Finally, by the heart I understand the subject on the fourth, existential level of intentional consciousness and in the dynamic state of being in love. The meaning, then, of Pascal's remark would be that, besides the factual knowledge reached by experiencing, understanding, and verifying, there is another kind of knowledge reached through the discernment of value and the judgments of value of a person in love.<sup>51</sup>

This statement also supports our claim that love, existing at the existential level of human conscious intentionality, constitutes the true meaning of human existence.

### ***3-3 Love as Divine Gift – Eros, Philia, and Agape***

We now consider what Lonergan has to say concerning the nature of God's gift of love both as a manifestation of this love as well as the gift of human beings' ability to perceive and experience this love. Lonergan uses technical-systematic language to convey both these aspects of God's self-revelation to human beings. In this section we proceed in the way downward and in the following section, human response to God's love, we proceed in the way upward. While the depiction of God's gift of love as agape or self-giving love predominates in *Method in Theology*, the notion of God's love as eros, or intimate love, is present as well. This is expressed in terms of the experience of God's intimate love. Lonergan draws on several images to portray this aspect of divine love. This experience is predominantly the experience of being-in-love with God:

Being in love with God, as experienced, is being in love in an unrestricted fashion. All love is self-surrender, but being in love with God is being in love without limits or qualifications or conditions or reservations.<sup>52</sup>

This experience of God's gift of intimate love, eros, is also one of mysterious holiness, being grasped by ultimate concern, and consolation without cause:

---

<sup>51</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 115.

<sup>52</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105-106.

[...] the gift of God's love is an experience of the holy, of Rudolf Otto's *mysterium fascinans et tremendum*. It is what Paul Tillich named a being grasped by ultimate concern. It corresponds to St. Ignatius Loyola's consolation that has no cause, as expounded by Karl Rahner.<sup>53</sup>

As an explicit depiction of divine love as friendship, *philia*, is absent from *Method in Theology*, we draw on other sources for insight into Lonergan's thoughts on this modality of love. Joseph Mudd states that, "Lonergan has argued that the primary reason for the incarnation is the mediation of divine friendship."<sup>54</sup> To support this assertion Mudd references Lonergan's thesis of the Law of the Cross, and "an unfinished draft of a book on the redemption within he places the Law of the Cross in the broader context of the mediation of divine friendship. The mediation of friendship is Lonergan's answer to 'Cur Deus Homo?'"<sup>55</sup> Mudd further states:

Divine friendship is one way of understanding what the Trinity is. Lonergan explains: 'Divine friendship is mutual benevolent love with respect to that which is good by its very essence. This friendship is proper to the divine persons alone in which the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit necessarily and eternally will divine good to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.'<sup>56</sup> Human participation in that friendship is understood according to a principle of extension by which a friend loves his friend's friends.<sup>57</sup>

For Lonergan the notion of love as divine gift first and foremost is love as agape, God's self-giving love flooding our hearts.<sup>58</sup> He writes: It used to be said, *Nihil amatum nisi praecognitum*, Knowledge precedes love. [...] But the major exception to the Latin tag is God's gift of his love flooding our hearts.<sup>59</sup> Again Lonergan writes, "It may be objected that *nihil amatum nisi praecognitum*. But while that is true of other human love, it need not be true of the

---

<sup>53</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 106, italics in the original.

<sup>54</sup> Joseph C. Mudd, *Eucharist as Meaning: Critical Metaphysics and Contemporary Sacramental Theology* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2014), 225.

<sup>55</sup> Mudd, *Eucharist as Meaning*, 225, n.1. In this footnote Mudd also references works by Charles C. Hefling Jr. and John Volk.

<sup>56</sup> Mudd here is referencing, Bernard Lonergan, *Cur Deus Homo?*, trans. Michael Shields, available from the Lonergan Center, Boston College, 237-38.

<sup>57</sup> Mudd, *Eucharist as Meaning*, 226

<sup>58</sup> See earlier exposition of this modality of agape,

<sup>59</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 120; I suggest that Lonergan's full explication of this Latin text also provides further evidence to support Rusembuka's claim of two movements in Lonergan's theological method. This Latin text occurs four times in *Method* (120, 278, 283, 340)

love with which God floods our hearts through the Holy Spirit he has given us (Rom. 5, 5).”<sup>60</sup>

Lonergan, equating God’s love with his notion of love at the highest level of conscious intentionality, writes: “the gift of God’s love occupies the ground and root of the fourth and highest level of man’s intentional consciousness. It takes over the peak of the soul, the *apex animae*.”<sup>61</sup>

### **3-4 Love as Human Response –Eros, Philia, and Agape**

It must be emphasized that love as a human response to God’s gift of love, in the context of what we have called the upward movement of cognitional intentionality is fully realized only at the fourth level – the level of judgments of value. The prior levels serve as precursors to this highest level where one comes to fully realize one is falling-in-love with God. Prior to the publication of *Method in Theology* in 1972, during the Halifax lectures in 1958, Lonergan was asked “is it possible to structure love on the [...] three levels of intellectual operations?”<sup>62</sup> Lonergan replied, “Yes, [but] it is not so easy to structure love that way. [Because] the three levels are relevant to ethics.”<sup>63</sup> His reply indicates that this correlation exists not as modalities of love but rather as modalities of ethics: the “*good as the object of desire*,” the “*good of order*,” the “*good in the intelligible sense*,” and the “*good in the sense of value*.”<sup>64</sup>

Rusembuka quotes Lonergan, in a 1976 Lonergan Workshop, highlighting the preeminent role of love in relation to levels of cognitional operations:

There is a development from below upwards, ever fuller attention to every broader experience, ever understanding and formulation of the understanding, ever fuller verification of these

---

<sup>60</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 278.

<sup>61</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 107.

<sup>62</sup> Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 377.

<sup>63</sup> Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 377.

<sup>64</sup> Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, 377, 378, 380, italics in the original.

formulations, ever truer authenticity in one's commitment to intelligence, reasonableness, responsibility, love.<sup>65</sup>

Blackwood notes that, for Lonergan, love is at "summit of successive imagery"

positioned "at the highest reaches of consciousness"<sup>66</sup> He quotes Lonergan:

The relation of judgments of value is also portrayed as a movement towards vertical finality in a scale of values. Judgments of value occur in different contexts. There can be the context of growth: one's knowledge of one's operating increases, and one's responses advance up the scale of values; openness to further achievement prevails. At the summit there is the power and vigor of being in love: the love of intimacy [eros], the love of mankind [philia], and the love of God [agape].<sup>67</sup>

Lonergan clearly distinguishes his method of intentionality-analysis from metaphysical-psychology, writing:

Now to effect the transition from theoretical to methodical theology one must start, not from a metaphysical psychology, but from intentionality analysis and, indeed, from transcendental method.<sup>68</sup>

He further states that this upward path proceeds through the levels of cognitional intentionality and associated levels of self-transcendence: knowing the real, the true, the good, and ultimately the loveable:

So in our chapter on religion we noted that the human subject was self-transcendent intellectually by the achievement of knowledge, that he was self-transcendent morally inasmuch as he sought what was worth while, what was truly good, and thereby became a principle of benevolence and beneficence, that he was self-transcendent affectively when he fell in love, when the isolation of the individual was broken and he spontaneously functioned not just for himself but for others as well<sup>69</sup>.

Lonergan proceeds to identify the three modalities of love which we have termed eros, philia, and agape:

---

<sup>65</sup> Rusembuka, *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan*, 49.

<sup>66</sup> Blackwood, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*, 97.

<sup>67</sup> Bernard J.F. Lonergan, "What Are Judgments of Value?" in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004), 145.

<sup>68</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 289.

<sup>69</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 289.

Further we distinguished different kinds of love: the love of intimacy, of husband and wife, of parents and children; the love of mankind devoted to the pursuit of human welfare locally or nationally or globally; and the love that was other-worldly because it admitted no conditions or qualifications or restrictions or reservations.<sup>70</sup>

Lonergan then identifies God's gift of sanctifying grace as the source of the human intrinsic desire to know and love God, and states that this desire is embodied in his cognitional theory of human knowing.

It is this other-worldly love, not as this or that act, not as a series of acts, but as a dynamic state whence proceed the acts, that constitutes in a methodical theology what in a theoretical theology is named sanctifying grace.<sup>71</sup>

In *Method in Theology* Lonergan does not begin with love but rather with human desire for knowing, and it is only at the highest level of knowing that love takes on its true meaning. Until its full realization through successive levels of self-transcendence: intellectual, moral, religious, love is portrayed by Lonergan as being in some way an underpinning component of the desire to know, what he terms an 'eros of the human spirit.' However, once the highest level of self-transcendence is achieved, the lower levels are transformed. Lonergan writes:

All love is self-surrender, but being in love with God is being in love without limits or qualifications or conditions or reservations. Just as unrestricted questioning is our capacity for self-transcendence, so being in love in an unrestricted fashion is the proper fulfilment of that capacity.

That fulfilment is not the product of our knowledge and choice. On the contrary, it dismantles and abolishes the horizon in which our knowing and choosing went on and it sets up a new horizon in which the love of God will transvalue our values and the eyes of that love will transform our knowing.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 289.

<sup>71</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 289.

<sup>72</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105.

### ***3-5 Technical-Systematic Meaning of Love and Authentic Human***

#### ***Existence***

In this section Lonergan's technical-systematic representation of love, authenticity, and existence is examined as follows. First, the interdependent roles of self-transcendence, love, and authenticity are examined. Second, unauthenticity is shown to be a failure to love. Third, authenticity, in the context of ontological/constitutive meaning, is considered.

For Lonergan, love is inextricably linked to self-transcendence and authentic human existence. As noted above, the fourth level of cognitional intentionality, judgments of value, is a movement towards vertical finality. Lonergan further casts these judgments in the context of the authenticity of a human being. He states:

Judgments of value are simple or comparative. [...] they compare distinct instances of the truly good to affirm or deny that one is better or more important, or more urgent than the other. Such judgments are objective or merely subjective inasmuch as they proceed or do not proceed from a self-transcending subject. Their truth or falsity, accordingly, has its criterion in the authenticity or the lack of authenticity of the subject's being.<sup>73</sup>

We conclude from this statement that Lonergan is establishing a criterion for both authentic and unauthentic being or existence. True judgments of value are those where one does not pursue a course of action for one's personal good or satisfaction but rather one pursues the good at the highest level of Lonergan's scale of values. He writes:

[...] in so far as one's decisions have their principal motives, not in the values at stake, but in a calculus of the pleasures and pains involved, one is failing in self-transcendence, in authentic human existence, in the origination of value in oneself and in one's society.<sup>74</sup>

This pursuit or movement towards higher value is a movement towards vertical finality. At its highest level this movement culminates in a state of being-in-love, thereby transforming one's

---

<sup>73</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 36-37.

<sup>74</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 50.



knowing and resulting in a new kind of knowledge. Lonergan says, “there is another kind of knowledge reached through the discernment of value and the judgments of value of a person in love.”<sup>75</sup> Thus authentic human existence is the self-transcendence manifested by a person in love.

Just as authentic human existence is rooted in one’s movement through the levels of self-transcendence, so too love is the root of authentic human existence; consequently the failure to love is a manifestation of unauthenticity. The failure to love is a failure to conform to the transcendental precepts: to be attentive, to be intelligent, to be responsible, to be loving – one fails to be: attentive, intelligent, responsible, and loving. Lonergan refers to these failures when he speaks of those who are authentic or unauthentic. He describes categories of people as being either “attentive or inattentive, intelligent or slow-witted, reasonable or silly, responsible or irresponsible.” Christians, at the highest level of self-transcendence and authenticity, are either authentically or unauthentically Christian insofar as they are either “genuinely in love with God, or failing in that love.”<sup>76</sup>

We now look at authenticity as an aspect of ontological/constitutive meaning. We suggest that Lonergan’s notion of the constitutive function of meaning can be understood to apply to the meaning of individual human existence. For Lonergan, meaning comprises a major theme in *Method in Theology*. In *Method* he devotes a full chapter to elucidating the elements and functions of meaning.<sup>77</sup> He states, “[Meaning] can be clarified by a reduction to its elements. It fulfils various functions in human living.”<sup>78</sup> Lonergan distinguishes four functions of meaning:

---

<sup>75</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 115.

<sup>76</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 292.

<sup>77</sup> Lonergan, “Meaning” in *Method in Theology*: 57-99.

<sup>78</sup> Lonergan, “Meaning” in *Method in Theology*: 57

cognitive, constitutive, communicative, and effective.<sup>79</sup> Of these four functions, the constitutive function of meaning is the focus of this section. Though Lonergan's primary use of constitutive meaning lies in the context of social institution and human cultures, it is his use of constitutive meaning in the context of an individual within a community that is of importance to this study. Lonergan explains the constitutive function of meaning by use of an analogy, stating, "[J]ust as language is constituted by articulate sound and meaning, so social institutions and human cultures have meanings as intrinsic components."<sup>80</sup> Thus for something to be constitutive of another thing implies that it is an intrinsic part to the thing in question. In other words, it is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the thing in question to be or to exist. His analogy draws on the aspect of interrelationships, just as love at its core implies relationship.

Lonergan links authentic human existence to constitutive meaning in several ways. In his transcendental notions we observe an upward movement through the four levels of conscious intentionality to a human being's capacity for self-transcendence. "The transcendental notions, that is, our questions for intelligence, for reflection, and for deliberation, constitute our capacity for [religious] self-transcendence."<sup>81</sup> That capacity is realized by the truly authentic individual who is in love, for Lonergan goes on to say: "That capacity becomes an actuality when one falls in love. Then one's being becomes being-in-love."<sup>82</sup> Prior to attaining the level of religious self-transcendence one achieves moral self-transcendence. Lonergan links moral self-transcendent to authentic existence in desire, thrust, or 'eros of the spirit' that underpins conscious intentionality. He writes:

---

<sup>79</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 298.

<sup>80</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 78.

<sup>81</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105.

<sup>82</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105.

Now in so far as that thrust of the self regularly opts, not for the merely apparent good, but for the true good, the self thereby is achieving moral self-transcendence; he is existing authentically; he is constituting himself as an originating value, and he is bringing about terminal values, namely a good of order that is truly good and instances of the particular good that are truly good.<sup>83</sup>

A constitutive element of being-in-love is the expression of that love, wherein the inner word of love becomes an outer word.

One must not conclude that the outward word is something incidental. For it has a constitutive role. When a man and a woman love each other but do not avow their love, they are not yet in love. Their very silence means that their love has not reached the point of self-surrender and self-donation. It is the love that each freely and fully reveals to the other that brings about the radically new situation of being in love and that begins the unfolding of its life-long implications.<sup>84</sup>

Lonergan reveals the way that Christian doctrine is constitutive of the essence of an individual – both one’s knowing and doing:

[Doctrine] is cognitive inasmuch as it tells whence we come, whither we go, how we get there. It is constitutive of the individual inasmuch as the doctrine is a set of meanings and values that inform his living, his knowing, his doing.<sup>85</sup>

We conclude this section citing where Lonergan, in just a few paragraphs, directly addresses the question of meaning and ontology.<sup>86</sup> Lonergan writes:

In our third chapter we distinguished four functions of meaning: it is cognitive, constitutive, communicative, effective. Such functions have their ontological aspect. In so far as meaning is cognitive, what is meant is real. In so far as it is constitutive, it constitutes part of the reality of the one that means: his horizon, his assimilative powers, his knowledge, his values, his character.<sup>87</sup>

He goes on to say:

Such ontological aspects pertain to meaning, no matter what its content or its carrier. They are found then in all the diverse stages of meaning, in all the diverse cultural traditions, in any of

---

<sup>83</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 50.

<sup>84</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 112.

<sup>85</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 298.

<sup>86</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 356-58. While only a few paragraphs, it is clear that Lonergan is establishing a direct link between constitutive meaning and the ontological reality of a human being. This link is the cornerstone of our claim that love constitutes an intrinsic aspect of human existence.

<sup>87</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 356.

the differentiations of consciousness, and in the presence and absence of intellectual, moral, and religious conversion.<sup>88</sup>

By this examination of Lonergan's thoughts in *Method* we have demonstrated that Lonergan's notion of the constitutive function of meaning can be understood to apply to the meaning of individual human existence.

### **3-6 Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence**

In this chapter we examined Lonergan's technical-systematic depiction of love as three modalities: eros, philia, and agape, in both *Method in Theology* and later works. We now claim that Lonergan's portrayal of love as constitutive of both divine *gift* and human *response* constitutes an intrinsic aspect of the meaning of human existence. Jeremy Blackwood's insight into Lonergan's evolving notions of love as the triad of: intimate love, community love, and love of God, supports our claim. Muhigirwa Rusumbuka's comprehensive treatment of Lonergan's two ways of human development provides additional evidence for our claim. His discernment of Lonergan's methodology as both a movement from above downwards – an experience of God's love flooding the human heart – and a movement from below upwards – self-transcendence culminating in falling-in-love with God – is central to our stance.

Lonergan's portrayal and emphasis on the role of love in authentic human living, together with his notion of ontological meaning, supports our proposition that love is an existential or ontological aspect of human existence. In the next chapter Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic understanding of love and Lonergan's technical-systematic understanding of love will be compared and contrasted as a dialogue between the two theologians.

---

<sup>88</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 356.

## Chapter 4: Balthasar and Lonergan in Dialogue

In this chapter we hope to substantiate our claim that Lonergan and Balthasar's respective understanding of love mutually support the assertion that love is constitutive to the meaning of human existence. We will verify this claim in three parts by engaging Balthasar and Lonergan in conversation on the topics of love, meaning, and existence. In Part 1 we establish that both theologians' methodologies are not contradictory, rather that Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic approach highlights an affective aspect of human life, while Lonergan's technical-systematic approach underscores an intellectual aspect. In Part 2 we argue that Balthasar and Lonergan's notions of love are co-equal, differing only in the language they individually use to portray love. In Part 3, drawing on their depictions of the loving aspect of existential human life, we conclude that, for Balthasar and Lonergan, love is constitutive to the meaning of human existence. The three parts unfold as a conversation between Balthasar and Lonergan.

The conversation between Balthasar and Lonergan is framed as a dialogue in three topical areas: methodology, aspects of love, and ontological meaning. The dialogue proceeds by comparing and contrasting Balthasar and Lonergan through their own writings and by drawing on insights of scholars of their works. The dialogue, by addressing fundamental questions pertaining to the constitutive role of love in the ontological aspect of human existence, serves to provide an answer to the central question of this thesis: is love constitutive to the meaning of human existence?

In the two previous chapters we separately considered both Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic thoughts on the topics of love, meaning, and existence and Lonergan's technical-systematic thoughts on the same topics. While in *Love Alone is Credible* Balthasar's approach to love is

from above downwards and Lonergan's approach in *Method* begins from below moving upwards, here we establish that their respective methodologies are not dialectically contradictory.<sup>1</sup> Our previous analyses considered love in a context where love is both *gift* and *response*: God's love as *gift* and love as a human being's *response* to God's gift. Three modalities of love – eros, philia, and agape – were examined in both Balthasar and Lonergan's thought. For both theologians, their respective notions of love in the context of human existence were put forward. In this chapter we claim, though differing in the language they use, Balthasar and Lonergan's notions of love are co-equal.

We engage Balthasar and Lonergan in conversation in three sections: one on their respective methodologies; a second on love as truth and beauty; and a third on the meaning of love in human existence. Our prime objective is to reach a consensus on love as constitutive to the meaning of human existence. A secondary objective is to further the scholarly study of both Balthasar and Lonergan on their mutual understanding of love, meaning, and existence.

#### **4-1 Part – 1: Methodology**

In Part 1, we seek to establish that Balthasar and Lonergan's methodologies, as conveyed in *Love Alone is Credible* and *Method in Theology*, are not contradictory. We examine how Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic approach, which emphasizes a psychic-affective aspect of human nature, complements Lonergan's technical-systematic approach which underscores a cognitive-intellectual aspect. We suggest their disparate approaches can be compared and contrasted by invoking a theological-philosophical issue relating to the question of the priority of love over knowing. This question can be posed as follows: if God's gift of love is prior to human response

---

<sup>1</sup>In Chapter 3 we acknowledged that although Lonergan's method begins from below upwards, Rusembuka shows that in *Method* it also encompasses an aspect from above downwards;

(Balthasar's presumed downwards approach), how can human knowing (Lonergan's presumed upwards approach) lead to one's falling-in-love with God? Are not these two approaches contradictory? The crux of this apparent contradiction can be expressed another way by the Latin text, *Nihil amatum nisi praecognitum* (nothing is loved unless known before hand). This Latin dictum is now applied to Balthasar and Lonergan as a dialogical question to be affirmed or denied.

To help clarify the methodological issue raised by Balthasar and Lonergan's different approaches we draw on two quotes which capture the essence of the matter under consideration. Before doing so, we again note that Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic approach highlights an aesthetic or affective aspect of human life while Lonergan's technical-systematic approach underscores an intellectual or cognitional aspect. The importance of this observation will become clear in due course. Looking first at Lonergan's technical-systematic approach from below, we notice that his transcendental method<sup>2</sup> places love at the highest level of human intentionality consciousness:

As the question of God is implicit in all our questioning, so being in love with God is the basic fulfilment of our conscious intentionality.<sup>3</sup>

Lonergan's approach from below appears to be consistent with the intent of the Latin dictum, that is, being in love with God lies at the highest level of conscious intentionality. In other words, falling in love with God arises out of our desire to know and therefore knowledge precedes love. However, we discern that Lonergan also suggests that, implicit in one's questioning, there is a 'thrust' or 'desire' for knowing, a subject to which we shall return shortly.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lonergan's cognitional theory, which he calls a transcendental method, comprises a pattern of operations that proceeds through four levels: the empirical, the intellectual, the rational, and the responsible, *Method*, 9, 13.

<sup>3</sup> Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105.

Turning to Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic approach from above, he writes:

Divine Love can appear in such an overwhelming way that its glorious majesty throws one to the ground; it shines out as the last word and leaves one no choice but to respond in the mode of pure, blind obedience. Nevertheless, both the word and the response acquire their meaning only through a gift from the eternal Person to the finite person, a gift that includes the ability to respond as a finite creature to the infinite, and whose heart and essence is love.<sup>4</sup>

From this we infer that, for Balthasar, God's gift of love is prior to knowledge and therefore love precedes knowledge. Thus, Balthasar seemingly contradicts both the Latin dictum as well as Lonergan's transcendental method.<sup>5</sup> In addition to the gift of divine love, Balthasar speaks of a corresponding divine gift: being able to perceive and respond to God's gift of love. Having presented the issue of the priority of love in the words of each of the two theologians, we seek to establish in what way each is conveying a contrary, but non contradictory, representation of a new truth, a truth which, in Lonergan's terminology, can only be grasped from a 'new horizon.' Lonergan expresses this new horizon in terms of self-transcendence and being in love with God:

Being in love with God, as experienced, is being in love in an unrestricted fashion. [...] Just as unrestricted questioning is our capacity for self-transcendence, so being in love in an unrestricted fashion is the proper fulfilment of that capacity. That fulfilment is not the product of our knowledge and choice. On the contrary, it dismantles and abolishes the horizon in which our knowing and choosing went on and it sets up a new horizon in which the love of God will transvalue our values and the eyes of that love will transform our knowing.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 56-57.

<sup>5</sup> To our knowledge, Balthasar does not anywhere explicitly refer to Lonergan's Transcendental Methodology, but implicitly he seems to be critical of such approaches; He writes: "Neither religious philosophy nor existence can provide the criterion for the genuineness of Christianity. In philosophy, man discovers what is humanly knowable about the depths of being; in existence, man lives out what is humanly livable. But Christianity disappears the moment it allows itself to be dissolved into a transcendental precondition of human self-understanding in thinking or living, knowledge or deed." Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 51. Elsewhere he writes: "No [individual] I possesses the possibility or the right to master intellectually the freedom of the Thou that comes out to meet him, to deduce and understand ahead of time the way the Thou will act. I [as an individual] can 'understand' a love that has been given to me only as a miracle; I [as an individual] cannot understand it through empirical or transcendental analysis, not even in terms of knowledge about the human 'nature' that includes us both— for the Thou will always remain an 'other' to me." Balthasar, *Love Alone*, 52.

<sup>6</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105-106.



This new horizon embodies a spiritual-intellectual aspect of every human being, manifested by a desire for knowing *and* loving, an ‘eros of the human spirit.’ This aspect mutually shared by both Lonergan and Balthasar, revealed in the above quotes, is a human being’s *desire* for ‘perceiving’ *and* ‘knowing’ God’s love.

Both Lonergan and Balthasar speak about an intrinsic aspect of human nature, namely the human desire to know and love God. Each theologian uses a different means of expressing this attribute of desire. Lonergan expresses it in the technical-systematic language of knowing and loving while Balthasar expresses it in the dramatic-aesthetic language of perceiving and loving.<sup>7</sup> This aspect of desiring to know and love God is expressed in many diverse ways by Christian theologians. Saint Augustine expresses this desire as, “You stir man to take pleasure in praising you, because you have made us for yourself, and our heart is restless until it rests in you.”<sup>8</sup> Again Augustine says, “may my longing be for you.”<sup>9</sup> Blaise Pascal expresses this desire with the observation that the “heart has reasons which reason does not know.”<sup>10</sup> Lonergan himself, draws on Paul Tillich’s expression of being grasped by ultimate concern, Rudolf Otto’s *mysterium fascinans et tremendum*, and Ignatius Loyola’s consolation without cause.<sup>11</sup>

Each of the above representations expresses a quality of ineffable mystery that confounds reason and feeling: being restless, being grasped, being consoled, being overwhelmed, sensing glorious majesty, experiencing longing for. Lonergan expresses this desire as a questioning thrust, an ‘eros of the human spirit.’ He writes:

---

<sup>7</sup> In Lonergan’s critical realism theory, knowing is more than ‘just taking a look.’ Therefore the question arises whether perceiving is ‘taking a look.’ I am indebted to Darren Dias for bringing this to my attention.

<sup>8</sup> Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. by Henry Chadwick (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 3.

<sup>9</sup> Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, 256.

<sup>10</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 115.

<sup>11</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105.

[...] we have distinguished many conscious and intentional operations and arranged them in a succession of different levels of consciousness [...] as the many operations are conjoined in a single compound knowing, so too the many levels of consciousness are just successive stages in the unfolding of a single thrust, the eros of the human spirit.<sup>12</sup>

Balthasar, on the other hand, expresses this desire as a love that “cannot be revealed merely ontologically, but [...] at the same time [is revealed] in a spiritual and conscious way.”<sup>13</sup> For Balthasar the nature of the human person is such that one possesses an innate desire to perceive (or recognize) and understand God’s gift of love – this desire is also a gift:

If God wishes to reveal the love that he harbors for the world, this love has to be something that the world can recognize, in spite of, or in fact *in*, its being wholly other. The inner reality of love can be recognized only by love. In order for a selfish beloved to understand the selfless love of a lover [...] he must already have some glimmer of love, some initial sense of what it is.<sup>14</sup>

Independent of the question of whether knowledge precedes love, both theologians acknowledge that, within the human physical and psychological condition, there exists an intrinsic desire for seeking, perceiving, and knowing divine love. This desire, we infer, is manifested in a horizon that transcends and sublates the horizons depicted by Lonergan and Balthasar and in so doing offers a way to mitigate any seeming contradictions. However, we suggest the issue of the priority of knowing vs. loving can also be resolved in other ways, and to these other ways we now turn our attention.

Another approach argues that Balthasar and Lonergan’s methodologies are not dialectically contradictory but rather dialectically contrary. For this, we draw on Doran’s nuanced terms of dialectical contraries and contradictories as explicated by Brian Bajzek.<sup>15</sup> Bajzek writes:

---

<sup>12</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 13; see also 242.

<sup>13</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 77.

<sup>14</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 75.

<sup>15</sup> Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 14; Brian Bajzek, “Crisis, Encounter, and the Cross: Incarnating Value in an Ethics of Alterity,” LRI Graduate Seminar (November 10, 2017);

Doran identifies these two types [of dialectics] as (1) dialectics of contradictories, which present an either/or, and (2) dialectics of contraries, which present a both/and.<sup>16</sup> [...] opposed principles cannot be reconciled with one another. [...] In a dialectic of contraries, on the other hand, the choice is not one of either/or, but of the constant, creative push-and-pull of a both/and, a unity in tension, which results in a reconciling, creative dynamism, wherein both principles continue to exist in mutual benefit to the other.<sup>17</sup>

We observe above that Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic approach highlights an aesthetic or affective aspect of human life while Lonergan's technical-systematic approach underscores an intellectual or cognitional aspect. These two principles express a unity in tension – human consciousness. Bajzek refers to “the productive tension between the unfolding of unconscious neural demands manifested in the psyche, and the operations of intentional consciousness.”<sup>18</sup> Doran names these two dimensions of human consciousness the ‘sensitive-psychic’ and the ‘intellectual-spiritual.’ Thus Balthasar's ‘dramatic-aesthetic’ approach, in Doran's terminology, becomes a ‘sensitive-psychic’ approach. Similarly, what we call Lonergan's technical-systematic approach, in Doran's terminology, becomes an ‘intellectual-spiritual’ approach. Doran locates this sensitive-psychic level of consciousness as a lower level of Lonergan's four levels of cognitional intentionality. Bajzek succinctly and clearly explicates Doran's notion, writing:

Developing the sensitive-psychic's relation to the intellectual-spiritual, Doran describes how this first “way of being conscious” suffuses the intellectual-spiritual, either by supporting or conflicting with the subject's orientation toward the beautiful, the true, and the good.<sup>19</sup> In relation to the other levels of intentional consciousness, the sensitive-psychic is something akin to the structure's foundation—a lower, “subterranean” level, the support of which is felt all through the other operations. In this way, the sensitive-psychic underpins, overarches, and

---

Brian Bajzek, “Alterity, Similarity, and Dialectic: Methodological Reflections on the Turn to the Other,” *International Philosophical Quarterly* 57 (2017):249-66.

<sup>16</sup> Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 68.

<sup>17</sup> Bajzek, “Alterity, Similarity, and Dialectic,” 258; Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 10.

<sup>18</sup> Bajzek, “Crisis, Encounter, and the Cross: Incarnating Value in an Ethics of Alterity,” 11-12.

<sup>19</sup> Robert M. Doran, *The Trinity in History: A Theology of the Divine Missions, Vol. 1: Missions and Processions*, 3rd revised edition (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 199.

accompanies the very structure of subjectivity. Ideally, the sensitive-psyche dimension of consciousness strengthens and supports the intellectual-spiritual dimension.<sup>20</sup>

From our analysis thus far we have determined the following concerning the issue raised by the question of the priority of love and knowing. Firstly, the two approaches - one beginning from above, the other from below – can be reconciled in a horizon that transcends both. Secondly, the approaches can be reconciled by treating them as dialectically contrary not dialectically contradictory. Thirdly, the approaches can be reconciled by postulating an aesthetic-dramatic level of consciousness (Balthasar) that strengthens and supports a technical-systematic levels of consciousness (Lonergan). However, a fourth way to reconcile Balthasar and Lonergan’s approaches is to examine the possibility that each approach contains not either/or but both/and movements.

We postulate that Lonergan and Balthasar’s ‘ways,’ in fact, contain *both* an upwards movement *and* a downwards movement rather than solely an upwards *or* downwards movement. Balthasar’s downward movement of divine love, which we have called a theological-aesthetic approach,<sup>21</sup> is manifestly evident in *Love Alone is Credible*. However, he also engages a theological-philosophical approach,<sup>22</sup> which is foremost in Lonergan’s *Method in Theology*. Balthasar’s ‘third way’ functions as a means of reconciling the two approaches.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Bajzek, “Alterity, Similarity, and Dialectic,” 251.

<sup>21</sup> We have previously labeled Balthasar’s ‘beauty and glory’ approach to divine love as a theological-aesthetic approach See Chapter 2, 2-1, 2-2.

<sup>22</sup> Similarly, we have labeled Balthasar’s ‘eros and agape’ approach to divine love as a theological-philosophical approach. See Chapter 2, 2-1, 2-2.

<sup>23</sup> In Chapter 2, n. 27, we posited that Balthasar’s ‘third way’ can provide a resolution to seemingly contradictory dialectic positions, e.g., intellectual-spiritual (not to be taken in Doran’s sense of the term) issues. Balthasar notes the failure of ‘integralism’ as “it does not attempt to integrate the multiplicity of dogmas in a specifically intellectual or spiritual manner, but instead strives to shut down the opponent through an unintellectual and unspiritual use of force. The substitution of violent means for intelligence or spirit suggests that a genuine solution on an intellectual and spiritual level lay at that time out of reach.” *Love Alone is Credible*, 60.

In seeking to provide a convergence between a theological-philosophical approach to divine love (eros and agape) and a theological-aesthetic approach to divine love (beauty and glory) Balthasar insists the former approach must treat this divine love as a ‘miracle.’<sup>24</sup> He states: “I [as an individual] cannot understand [this love] through empirical or transcendental analysis, not even in terms of knowledge about the human ‘nature’ that includes us both— for the Thou will always remain an ‘other’ to me.”<sup>25</sup> Still, Balthasar leaves open a way to maintain both approaches as authentic approaches in their own right, for he states:

The two approaches converge. Already in the realm of nature, eros is the chosen place of beauty: whatever we love—no matter how profoundly or superficially we may love it—always appears radiant with glory; and whatever is objectively perceived as glorious —no matter how profoundly or superficially we experience it—does not penetrate into the onlooker except through the specificity of an eros.<sup>26</sup>

Once again we see a harmony being expressed by Balthasar between his ‘perceiving’ beauty and Lonergan’s ‘knowing’ or ‘experiencing’ divine love. This quote also coheres with Doran’s notion of a sensitive-psychic dimension of consciousness that supports and strengthens a spiritual-intellectual dimension.

The seeming tension between an upwards vs. downwards movement of love is explicitly taken on by Lonergan in *Method*. In Lonergan’s upwards movement, the highest level of consciousness is reached when one falls-in-love with God. Falling-in-love with God is effected through conversions at successive levels of self-transcendence: intellectual conversion at the second level, moral conversion at the third level, and religious conversion at the fourth level.<sup>27</sup> However, Lonergan expresses an important qualification to this sequence. He writes:

---

<sup>24</sup> The suggestion that Balthasar’s third way can be interpreted as a way of bringing together seemingly contradictory positions has been made previously.

<sup>25</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 52.

<sup>26</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 54.

<sup>27</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology* 122-123, 243

Though religious conversion sublates moral, and moral conversion sublates intellectual, one is not to infer that intellectual comes first and then moral and finally religious. On the contrary, from a causal viewpoint, one would say that first there is God's gift of his love. Next, the eye of this love reveals values in their splendor, while the strength of this love brings about their realization, and that is moral conversion. Finally, among the values discerned by the eye of love is the value of believing the truths taught by the religious tradition, and in such tradition and belief are the seeds of intellectual conversion.<sup>28</sup>

Lonergan also directly challenges the Latin dictum or rule, 'nothing is loved unless known beforehand.' He tells us that there is a "minor exception to this rule inasmuch as people do fall in love."<sup>29</sup> He further states that "the major exception to the Latin [rule] is God's gift of his love flooding our hearts. Then we are in the dynamic state of being in love."<sup>30</sup> In this last quote Lonergan concurs with Balthasar's notion of divine love as being a gift in two senses: first the gift of unbounded love itself, and second is the gift of being able to perceive this gift.<sup>31</sup>

We conclude Part 1 by affirming that Balthasar and Lonergan, far from offering competing approaches and reaching diverging conclusions on the nature of divine love, both provide a deeper understanding of the ineffable mystery of the gift of God's love. We therefore assert that the answer to the question: "are Balthasar and Lonergan's methodologies contradictory?" is no – they are not contradictory. Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic approach does not contradict Lonergan's technical-systematic approach. We will see how their respective approaches to love as truth and beauty are likewise complementary; each approach enriches our understanding of divine love as *gift* and human love as *response*, an understanding more fully grasped in a horizon that transcends and sublates both theologians' individual horizons.

---

<sup>28</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 243.

<sup>29</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 122.

<sup>30</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 122.

<sup>31</sup> See n. 13, above.

## 4-2 Part 2: Love as Truth and Beauty

Before engaging Balthasar and Lonergan in dialogue on love as truth and beauty, we review our analysis of Balthasar and Lonergan's notions of love in the previous two chapters. We considered Balthasar and Lonergan's differing portrayals of love in a heuristic structure of three modalities: eros, philia, and agape and concluded that these aspects of love are co-equal in their respective thought. In Chapter 2 we considered the way Balthasar portrays love from a dramatic-aesthetic perspective and in Chapter 3 we examined Lonergan's analysis of love from a technical-systematic perspective.

To further support our claim of co-equality, notwithstanding their use of differing language to refer to love, we draw on the insight of Pope Benedict XVI in his Encyclical *Caritas Deus Est*.<sup>32</sup> In his encyclical the pope specifically uses the words eros, philia, and agape to illustrate how they can convey an understanding of love in sacred scripture and Church teaching. It is in this vein that we bring into congruence the terms Balthasar and Lonergan use in referring to love. Pope Benedict XVI writes:

God's love for us is fundamental for our lives, and it raises important questions about who God is and who we are. In considering this, we immediately find ourselves hampered by a problem of language. Today, the term 'love' has become one of the most frequently used and misused of words, a word to which we attach quite different meanings. Even though this Encyclical will deal primarily with the understanding and practice of love in sacred Scripture and in the Church's Tradition, we cannot simply prescind from the meaning of the word in the different cultures and in present-day usage.<sup>33</sup>

In this section we seek to show that co-quality in the thought of Balthasar and Lonergan extends to love as truth and beauty.

---

<sup>32</sup>Pope Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, [http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_enc\\_20051225\\_deus-caritas-est.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html) (accessed May 11, 2018). Philia (the love of friendship) is only briefly addressed in the encyclical. Benedict XVI refers to its use in Saint John's Gospel in order to express the relationship between Jesus and his disciples.

<sup>33</sup>*Deus Caritas Est*, Part 1, 2.

Balthasar's aesthetic of beauty encompasses truth and Lonergan's cognitive-intentional approach to truth encompasses beauty. From a dramatic-aesthetic perspective of beauty, Balthasar's notions of truth complement, deepen, and enrich Lonergan. Similarly Lonergan's technical-systematic notions of truth, rooted in an aesthetic spiritual-intellectual consciousness, complement, deepen, and enrich Balthasar. Engaging Balthasar and Lonergan in a conversation on love as encompassing truth and beauty further supports our assertion that love is constitutive to the meaning of human existence. We explore Balthasar's thoughts on truth and love expressed in *Love Alone is Credible* and further developed by Gill Goulding in "Truth Unveiled."<sup>34</sup> For purposes of this study, we are limiting our focus on Balthasar's notions of truth to these two works, prescinding from Balthasar's foremost theological exposition of truth.<sup>35</sup> We consider Lonergan's thoughts on beauty and love in *Method in Theology* and John Dadosky's insightful development of Lonergan's notions of beauty in "Recovering Beauty in the Subject" and *The Eclipse and Recovery of Beauty: A Lonergan Approach*.<sup>36</sup>

In *Love Alone is Credible*, Balthasar, identifying the limitations of traditional philosophy, agrees with Ludwig Feuerbach who states that, "philosophy is in the end nothing other than anthropology."<sup>37</sup> Balthasar proposes that what is needed is a "new philosophy" founded on the truth of love because "where love is lacking, there can be no truth."<sup>38</sup> Thus, for Balthasar, the foundation of truth is love. Balthasar states that the phenomenon of divine love can only be understood in the realm of "experiences of "extraordinary beauty" where we grasp it, "in [a]

---

<sup>34</sup> Goulding, "Truth Unveiled: Balthasar and the Contemplation of Christian Truth."

<sup>35</sup> In particular, it is beyond the scope of this study to examine Balthasar's treatise on truth in *Theol-Logic: Truth of God*.

<sup>36</sup> See Chapter 1, n. 19, 20.

<sup>37</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 44.

<sup>38</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 44.



distinctiveness that otherwise remains veiled,” as an “aesthetic perception.”<sup>39</sup> Previously we observed that both Balthasar and Lonergan acknowledge that human beings possess an intrinsic desire for seeking, perceiving, and knowing divine love.<sup>40</sup>

Goulding, in setting the scene for her article on Balthasar and contemplation, concurs that this human desire encompasses truth as well as love. Drawing on Pope John Paul II’s Encyclical *Faith and Reason*, she writes:

There is then a graced desire for truth within human persons, and it finds expression in a search for truth that brings engagement with God; and contemplation of God also brings increased knowledge of the truth of oneself.<sup>41</sup>

Further, Goulding places this desire within the realm of mystery, therein supporting Balthasar’s perception of divine love as a ‘veiled distinctiveness.’ She writes:

The search for truth and the process of knowing, Balthasar asserts, must be both rooted and grounded in theology: ‘There is no such thing as a theologically neutral world for philosophy to investigate.’ For Balthasar ‘mystery’ is intrinsic to truth, not an optional additional extra.<sup>42</sup>

Balthasar, in *Love Alone is Credible*, unequivocally establishes the correlation between love and truth, writing:

[...] the horizon of the love [...] justifies everything presented as the ‘dogmatic’ aspect of faith: [...] love, which is truth, always remains infinitely more than we can achieve [...] <sup>43</sup>

He further elaborates his view that reason alone is not able to comprehend God’s love, which can only be ‘understood’ as a ‘miracle.’ He writes:

[...] because it is pure love, we are unable to achieve ‘insight’ into it in a gnostic manner with the resources of our own reason; an encounter with pure love and its gift for us remains the pure, inconceivable miracle.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 52-53.

<sup>40</sup> See above n. 11 & 13.

<sup>41</sup> Goulding, “Truth Unveiled,” 245.

<sup>42</sup> Goulding, “Truth Unveiled,” 246.

<sup>43</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 105.

<sup>44</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 105.

In *Love Alone is Credible*, love and truth are placed in dialectical tension, for implied in the very title of the book both love *and* credibility are emphasized. This raises the expectation of love being placed in a context one normally associates with Lonergan's seeking, experiencing, and understanding that which is true. Balthasar devotes an entire chapter to perceiving love.<sup>45</sup> For Balthasar, who states we are unable to achieve 'insight' into love, perceiving is not intellectually experiencing, questioning, grasping insight, and coming to understand truth, but rather is aesthetically perceiving extraordinary beauty in an encounter with an inconceivable miracle. Mystery is the horizon where one both intellectually and aesthetically encounters ineffable truth, a truth that remains veiled in mystery. The beauty of this truth can only be grasped by analogy – in the beauty in the love of a mother and child, in the beauty of great art, or in experiencing the finale of Mozart's *Jupiter* symphony.<sup>46</sup> Thus, dramatic-aesthetic perception is complementary to technical-systematic insight; both are embodied in a single unity that encompasses truth and beauty.

For Balthasar, God's gift of love comprises both a gift of unrestricted love for humanity and a gift for a human person to be able to perceive this gift. Goulding provides further insight into Balthasar's approach to the process of intellectual knowing. She writes:

The process of knowing for Balthasar is primarily God's act of disclosing or unveiling objective content to the thought of the receptive person who then awakens to knowing in wonder and amazement.<sup>47</sup>

She goes on to say:

Balthasar's premise for this whole process of knowing is that all meaning and all unity lie in God. Individuals can only know God by being 'in' God. God alone brings about being, which

---

<sup>45</sup> Balthasar, "5. Love Must Be Perceived", *Love Alone is Credible*, 75-82.

<sup>46</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 52, 53, 75, 76.

<sup>47</sup> Goulding, "Truth Unveiled," 246

unveils itself within the world. Therefore, the process of knowing is primarily God's action of disclosing or unveiling objective content to the receptive person.<sup>48</sup>

In *Love Alone is Credible* we glimpse faint echoes of Balthasar's approach to knowing truth. Goulding, by drawing on Balthasar's extensive theological expositions on truth in her article "Truth Unveiled", contributes important insights which make possible a Balthasar-Lonergan dialogue on truth and beauty.

Having seen how Balthasar's aesthetic of beauty encompasses truth, we now consider the way Lonergan's intellectual approach of truth encompasses beauty. Just as from a dramatic-aesthetic perspective of beauty, Balthasar's notions of truth complement, deepen, and enrich Lonergan, we claim Lonergan's technical-systematic notions of truth, rooted in an aesthetic spiritual-intellectual consciousness, complement, deepen, and enrich Balthasar. In *Method in Theology*, we propose that, for Lonergan, beauty lies principally in an anthropomorphic realm of the aesthetic beauty of art rather than in a theological realm as an aspect of theological beauty. In his four-level cognitional theory, Lonergan identifies the artistic pursuit of beauty as a specialized differentiation of consciousness. He writes:

Artistically differentiated consciousness is a specialist in the realm of beauty. It promptly recognizes and fully responds to beautiful objects.<sup>49</sup>

Like Balthasar, truth for Lonergan is a transcendental reality. Along with the pursuit of truth the pursuit of the transcendentals goodness and beauty are also pursuits (pursuit also referred to as desire or eros of the spirit). Lonergan writes;

Indeed, so intimate is the relation between the successive transcendental notions, that it is only by a specialized differentiation of consciousness that we withdraw from more ordinary ways

---

<sup>48</sup> Goulding, "Truth Unveiled," 247.

<sup>49</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 273.

of living to devote ourselves to a moral pursuit of goodness, a philosophic pursuit of truth, a scientific pursuit of understanding, an artistic pursuit of beauty.<sup>50</sup>

Loneragan places beauty in the realm of values to which we intentionally respond in feelings.<sup>51</sup> In an authentic human person, one who has achieved self-transcendence, such values include “the ontic value of persons or the qualitative value of beauty, understanding, truth, virtuous acts, noble deeds.”<sup>52</sup> He adds, “In general, response to value [in feelings] both carries us towards self-transcendence and selects an object for the sake of whom or of which we transcend ourselves.”<sup>53</sup>

Although in *Method in Theology* Lonergan does not explicitly engage the notion of beauty in a theological sense, none-the-less we submit a convergence between Lonergan and Balthasar can be obtained by drawing on the insights of Lonergan scholars. Drawing on Doran’s notion of two dimensions of human consciousness, we previously posited that, in the intellectual dimension of human consciousness, an aesthetic dimension (level) of consciousness can be seen to underpin Lonergan’s four levels of human cognitional intentionality.<sup>54</sup> Thus, Lonergan’s intellectual transcendental method for truth and value, underpinned by an aesthetic dimension encompassing beauty, brings Balthasar’s intellectual treatment of beauty as simply a ‘miracle’ within an aesthetic-intellectual unity. We suggest this unity enriches and deepens both Balthasar and Lonergan’s interpretations of truth and beauty in the context of love.

We turn now to John Dadosky’s perceptive discernment of Lonergan’s notions of beauty in “Recovering Beauty in the Subject.” Dadosky, agreeing with Doran’s notions of an aesthetic

---

<sup>50</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 13; We suggest that in this quote ‘notion’ is not to be construed in the sense of an ‘idea’ or ‘concept’ but rather as an impetus or driving force, in other words, an innate ‘desire’; cf. Chapter 3, n. 2, 28; note also, that here truth is placed in a philosophical realm.

<sup>51</sup> For Lonergan’s explication of the relationship between feelings and value, see *Method in Theology*, pp. 30-36.

<sup>52</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 31. Note here the reference to ‘ontic value’ to be explored further in the next section.

<sup>53</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 31.

<sup>54</sup> See above, n. 14-19.

dimension of human consciousness, sees a way to use this notion to position the contemplation of beauty within Kierkegaard's three spheres of existential consciousness: aesthetic, ethical, and religious. Dadosky brings together the thoughts of Kierkegaard, Balthasar, and Lonergan postulating an aesthetic sphere that is subsumed by ethical and religious spheres. He does this by viewing the spheres in terms of Lonergan's differentiation of consciousness. Dadosky writes:

By viewing the spheres in terms of differentiations of consciousness, Lonergan's theory of consciousness offers an interpretation of Kierkegaard's stages in such a way that addresses Balthasar's concern and retains the Danish thinker's significant achievements.<sup>55</sup>

Dadosky brings Lonergan, Balthasar, and Kierkegaard into convergence on the topic of beauty. Resolving seeming contradictions, he postulates an aesthetic sphere that is subsumed by ethical and religious spheres. He locates the contemplation of beauty in this aesthetic sphere. In this way, we suggest Dadosky is bringing beauty in a Kierkegaard's aesthetic sphere into harmony with a Lonergan ethical-philosophical sphere and a Balthasar religious-theological sphere. In order to accomplish this, Dadosky interprets Kierkegaard "within the polymorphic unity of consciousness expounded by Lonergan with his philosophical anthropology."<sup>56</sup> Importantly, for the purposes of our study, Dadosky confirms desire for beauty as an 'part of authentic human striving.' In this way Lonergan reinforces Balthasar by approaching aesthetic beauty as a manifestation of philosophical truth and as a constitutive aspect of human existence.

While Dadosky's article seeks to bring Kierkegaard, Balthasar, and Lonergan into congruence on beauty as a transcendental property of being, our interest in this topic is focused on establishing congruence between the thought of Balthasar and Lonergan. To this end we draw on Dadosky's observation that, for Lonergan, the "impetus or operator, the desire to know, is

---

<sup>55</sup> "Balthasar believed that Kierkegaard contributed to the loss of beauty by separating the aesthetic from the ethical and religious spheres." Dadosky, "Recovering Beauty in the Subject," 509.

<sup>56</sup> Dadosky, "Recovering Beauty in the Subject," 510.

primarily intellectual; it does not account explicitly for the *affective* dimension of the human spirit.”<sup>57</sup> I suggest this ‘affective’ dimension is analogous to Doran’s ‘aesthetic’ dimension described above. Dadosky points out Lonergan’s notion of a quasi-operator manifesting and moving beyond Lonergan’s four-level intentional consciousness. According to Dadosky, this quasi-operator or *élan vital*, “retains the achievements of each of these levels and allows one to find rest in love, and ultimately in unrestricted loving.”<sup>58</sup> Dadosky’s interpretation of Lonergan’s *élan vital* as a manifestation within Lonergan’s *dramatic* pattern of experience as “the desire to make oneself, to create a work of art”<sup>59</sup> can also be interpreted within Lonergan’s *aesthetic* pattern of experience as a desire “for the beauty of God in which all created beauty participates.”<sup>60</sup> Thus Lonergan’s aesthetic pattern of experience can be seen to complement, deepen, and enrich Balthasar’s notion of the beauty of divine love.

Balthasar’s dramatic-aesthetic approach to love as inclusive of truth and beauty does not contradict Lonergan’s technical-systematic approach. Their respective approaches enrich our understanding of divine love as *gift* and human love as *response* in a horizon that transcends and sublates both theologians’ individual horizons. Secondly, we assert that in a similar way their notions of love as truth and beauty offer complementary perspectives of a greater unity of God’s love for humanity. In Part 3 we place what we have discovered thus far in the context of the meaning of love in existential human living.

---

<sup>57</sup> Dadosky, “Recovering Beauty in the Subject,” 523, italics added.

<sup>58</sup> Dadosky, “Recovering Beauty in the Subject,” 523-24.

<sup>59</sup> For further explication of Lonergan’s notions of patterns of experience see Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, 202-12.

<sup>60</sup> Dadosky, “Recovering Beauty in the Subject,” 531. Dadosky places these words in the context of a religious sphere in the triad of Kirkegaard’s aesthetic, ethical, and religious spheres. However, we suggest, this ‘religious sphere’ can also be seen to parallel Balthasar’s theological ‘aesthetic sphere’ where one experiences extraordinary [divine] beauty; *Love Alone is Credible*, 52. In this way Lonergan’s ‘aesthetic pattern of experience’ complements Balthasar’s ‘aesthetic sphere.’

### ***4-3 Part 3: Meaning and Existence***

In Chapter 1 we indicated that the role of love in the meaning of human existence in the thought of Balthasar and Lonergan would be brought into dialogue under the rubrics ontological meaning and authenticity. We noted that although these systematic-technical terms derive from Lonergan, they are analogous to Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic terms of holiness (meaning) and genuineness (authenticity). It is important to clarify our understanding of two terms that Lonergan uses when speaking of ontology. In particular we need to differentiate the sense of 'ontic' as referring to actual existential human existence and the sense of 'ontological' as referring to a theoretical philosophic possibility. This is made clear when Lonergan refers to "ontic value", "ontic truth", and "ontic goodness" as "actual existents." This distinction between "what can be" and "what is" is brought out in the following passage:

By being is meant, not what can be, but what is. By general metaphysics is understood, not a study of some prior realm of possibilities, but an understanding of actual existents. There is analogy not only of being but also of the transcendental, and as the being of the subject grounds the account of the being of things, so the self-realization of the subject in inquiring, knowing, and willing grounds the account of the unity, ontic truth, and ontic goodness of things.<sup>61</sup>

In this vein one may speak of 'ontic authenticity' as representing the ontic sense or true essence of authentic (Lonergan) or genuine (Balthasar) human existence – the self-realization of a human at the highest level of human consciousness. In a similar way, when speaking of the constitutive meaning of an actual human person as contrasted to constitutive meaning in an abstract philosophic inquiry, we may place such constitutive meaning in the category of 'ontic constitutive meaning.' Thus we suggest ontic value, ontic truth, and ontic goodness exemplify ontic constitutive meaning. It remains to show that, for Lonergan, love is the essence of ontic

---

<sup>61</sup> Bernard Lonergan, "Metaphysics as Horizon," in *Collection*, ed. Fredrick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan CWL 4*. (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988), 188-204.

authenticity and, for Balthasar, love is the essence of genuine human existence. To accomplish this we now show how Lonergan's technical-systematic notion of constitutive meaning, by providing an intellectual-philosophical perspective to ontic human living, grounds Balthasar's aesthetic-theological depiction of divine love exemplified in a life of holiness. In this way Part 3, taking up the conclusions reached in Parts 1 and 2, brings together Lonergan and Balthasar on the central theme of our thesis: the constitutive meaning of love in human existence.

First, we need to distinguish two senses of the word 'ontology.' Lonergan's use of the word 'ontology' encompasses two senses – that of the possible and that of the actual. In *Method in Theology*, Lonergan devotes two brief sections to the topic of ontology: Section 1. Meaning and Ontology, and Section 2. Common Meaning and Ontology. In both sections he elaborates the actual or 'ontic sense' of the constitutive function of meaning which may be termed 'ontic constitutive meaning.' Lonergan writes:

In our third chapter [of *Method in Theology*] we distinguished four functions of meaning: it is cognitive, constitutive, communicative, effective. Such functions have their ontological [i.e., ontic] aspect. In so far as meaning is cognitive, what is meant is real. In so far as it is constitutive, it constitutes part of the reality of the one that means: his horizon, his assimilative powers, his knowledge, his values, his character.<sup>62</sup>

Here Lonergan is differentiating a sense of the real essence of a human being as an "actual existent" from a philosophical metaphysical possibility. In other words, an individual, as part of his/her reality, expresses ontic constitutive meaning. This true reality includes one's ontic value, ontic truth, and ontic goodness. In Section 2. Common Meaning and Ontology, Lonergan further says that there is common meaning for ontology and constitutive meaning that encompasses both an "aggregate of individuals," a community, or an individual member of that community. Thus

---

<sup>62</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 356.



both community and individuals possess what might be called ‘common constitutive meaning.’

Lonergan writes:

Such common [constitutive] meaning is doubly constitutive. In each individual it is constitutive of the individual as a member of the community. In the group of individuals it is constitutive of the community.<sup>63</sup>

A question arises relating to one’s ontic constitutive meaning: what is the nature of the community to which an individual belongs? Is it simply the Christian community or is it the greater community of all living human beings?<sup>64</sup> In the context of divine love, we suggest, it is God’s love for all humanity. Therefore love is constitutive of the meaning of all human existence.

Having established that for Lonergan constitutive meaning is an ontological aspect of one’s true being, we now proceed to establish the relationship of constitutive meaning to authenticity and love. We have previously shown that Lonergan places authenticity at the highest level of self-transcendence, religious self-transcendence achieved through religious conversion. Authenticity culminates in one’s falling-in-love with God without conditions; it is an other-worldly experience.

Religious conversion is being grasped by ultimate concern. It is other-worldly falling in love. It is total and permanent self-surrender without conditions, qualifications, reservations.<sup>65</sup>

While Lonergan, in *Method in Theology*, is primarily focused on Christians who are authentic or inauthentic insofar as they are either “genuinely in love with God, or failing in that love,”<sup>66</sup> authenticity and love are not limited to the Christian community but rather are an existential

---

<sup>63</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 357.

<sup>64</sup> This question raises the possibility of extending Lonergan’s line of thought to further not only inter-religious dialogue, but also dialogue between diverse cultural communities.

<sup>65</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 237.

<sup>66</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 292.

aspect of all human beings. Love encompasses the realm of beauty as well as truth, and goodness which together constitute the reality of human existence.

John Dadosky explores the way Lonergan construes transcendental beauty as encompassing a “whole” that encompasses truth and goodness. He writes:

Lonergan invokes the language of the “whole” when referencing transcendental beauty. [...] he has in mind the whole structure of conscious intentionality and its unrestricted orientation towards the intelligible, the true, and the good. Beauty pertains to this whole orientation: ‘beauty is self-transcendence expressed through the sensible.’<sup>67</sup>

Here Dadosky is proposing that beauty is an aspect of self-transcendence. Self-transcendence at the highest level of human conscious intentionality is achieved by falling-in-love with God. Thus love embodies truth and goodness. Dadosky references Augustine’s restless heart writing:

Only the beauty of God could quell Augustine’s restless heart, or, to put it in Lonergan’s terminology, beauty is the fulfillment of Augustine’s conscious intentionality.<sup>68</sup>

The notion of an aesthetic-dramatic operator encompassing beauty also coheres with Doran’s notion of a sensitive-psychic level of consciousness underpinning Lonergan’s four levels of cognitional intentionality elaborated above.

Having authenticated a correlation between Lonergan’s sense of the aesthetic quality of beauty with truth and goodness, we turn now to similarly confirm the analogous correlation of Balthasar’s sense of truth and goodness with beauty. These correlations will then be brought into convergence as the unity of love, beauty, truth, and goodness. Lonergan’s conscious intentionality’s upward movement of knowing truth to experiencing love contrasts with Balthasar’s aesthetic-dramatic’s downward movement of experiencing love as a credible knowledge of the truth of love. We previously noted that for Balthasar, love as beauty is explicit

---

<sup>67</sup> Dadosky, *The Eclipse and Recovery of Beauty*, 52.

<sup>68</sup> Dadosky, “The Proof of Beauty,” 3.

in *Love Alone is Credible* but implicitly love is also truth.<sup>69</sup> He noted that beauty must be perceived in an aesthetic realm while acknowledging a philosophic realm that reveals the truth of such beauty.<sup>70</sup> Balthasar draws on the Evangelist John to bring together love, beauty, and truth, writing:

The Logos reveals himself as ‘gracious love’, and thereby as ‘glory’ (the ‘divinely beautiful’), and precisely for this reason as the ‘truth’ (Jn 1:14).<sup>71</sup>

Bringing Lonergan and Balthasar into dialogue on truth and beauty enriches them both. For Balthasar, what is implicit – truth – becomes explicit; for Lonergan, what is implicit – beauty – similarly becomes explicit.

For Balthasar, the aesthetic-dramatic aspect of goodness can only be revealed in love and not as an a result of Lonergan systematic-technical operations of human conscious intentionality. None-the-less, Balthasar’s example of Thérèse’s life of goodness within her convent life and concern for her fellow sisters is brought out both in *Love Alone is Credible*, and his account of her life in “Thérèse of Lisieux.”<sup>72</sup>

#### **4-5 Summary: Love in the Constitutive Meaning of Human Existence**

To achieve our purpose of demonstrating the constitutive meaning of love in human existence we review the salient elements of our argument. We have established through a dialogue between Lonergan and Balthasar that beauty encompasses truth, goodness, and value. For Lonergan beauty is an aesthetic-dramatic operator that grounds human knowing. For Balthasar beauty is

---

<sup>69</sup> For purposes of this study we have prescinded from Balthasar’s major theological opus on truth, *Theo-Logic*, limiting our investigation in the main to *Love Alone is Credible*.

<sup>70</sup> “... in the experience of extraordinary beauty ... we are able to grasp a phenomenon in its distinctiveness that otherwise remains veiled.” Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 52

<sup>71</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 55.

<sup>72</sup> Balthasar writes of “human concern for our neighbor” and “why Thérèse of Lisieux can describe life in Carmel as the most apostolically fruitful life.” *Love Alone is Credible*, 116.

the means of both perceiving God's love and deeming it preeminently credible to human knowing.

Love for both Lonergan and Balthasar exists at the apex of human desiring – for Lonergan it grounds human conscious intentionality – the eros of the human spirit. For Balthasar love is a mystery to human knowing that “stands above any teaching concerning either the world or [human beings].”<sup>73</sup> Balthasar writes:

For the ‘glory’ of the self-manifesting love of God does not call into question any formal authority—neither that of the Church's Magisterium nor that of Scripture—but is rather definitively confirmed by this authority and thus provides the foundation for a deeper obedience, in both theory and practice, to that authority. But the ‘teaching’ about the God of love receives its urgency only in this twofold obedience in love, and through this obedience becomes present as the mystery of love that occurs as an event, here and now.<sup>74</sup>

The systematic-technical elaboration of constitutive meaning as the essence of human existence, together with the portrayal of this essence as authenticity reached at the highest level of human knowing culminating in one's falling-in-love with God, places love at the apex of beauty, truth, and goodness. Thus love, in Lonergan terms, can be understood as the constitutive meaning of human existence of all knowing human beings. Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic elaboration of love as mystery, encompassing beauty, truth, and goodness in *Love Alone is Credible* and his concrete example of the life of St. Thérèse as genuine human living also supports a claim that love alone constitutes the meaning of human existence.

---

<sup>73</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 149.

<sup>74</sup> Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*, 149.

## Chapter 5: Conclusion

In this study we have sought to engage Bernard Lonergan and Urs von Balthasar, two eminent Catholic theologians of the twentieth century, in a dialogue on love, meaning, and existence. In doing so we were responding to Doran's call to bring Bernard Lonergan and Hans Urs von Balthasar into contact with one another.<sup>1</sup> There were two objectives in bringing Lonergan and Balthasar into conversation. First was to underscore that, for both Lonergan and Balthasar, love is constitutive to the meaning of human existence. A second objective was to further the scholarly study of Lonergan and Balthasar on their understanding of the meaning of love in the context of human reality.

Although categories<sup>2</sup> of love, meaning, and existence, in and of themselves, represent broad and formidable topics of study, we endeavored to achieve what we believe to be credible results by limiting our study to examining Lonergan and Balthasar's thoughts expressed in three works.<sup>3</sup> Based on these works we engaged Lonergan and Balthasar in a dialogue on love. Our study focused on their notions of human and divine love conveyed in two books: Balthasar, *Love Alone is Credible*; and Lonergan, *Method in Theology*. Additionally, we argued that in Balthasar's depiction of St. Thérèse of Lisieux, her life and her authentic human existence provided a concrete example of human and divine love.<sup>4</sup> Based on our study we affirm that

---

<sup>1</sup> Doran, "Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations" (1997), 61.

<sup>2</sup> We have drawn on Anne Hunt's notion of categories of authenticity, love, and meaning in *Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology*, 206.

<sup>3</sup> Strictly speaking, this is not completely accurate as we have also selectively drawn on other works and sources that support the premise of our study. For the most part, however, our primary sources were three key books.

<sup>4</sup> Balthasar, "Thérèse of Lisieux."

*Lonergan and Balthasar's respective understanding of love mutually support the assertion that love is constitutive to the meaning of human existence.*

## **5-1 Summary**

In order to achieve our results we acknowledge the ways in which our study was limited in depth and scope. First, this project was not intended to be an exhaustive study of Lonergan and Balthasar's repertoire of writings that engage categories of love, meaning, and existence. Having selected three noteworthy oeuvres of both theologians, we believe we were able to achieve important results in furthering Lonergan-Balthasar comparative studies in topics that have drawn limited attention to date. These topics include: modalities of love – eros, philia, and agape; intellectual-aesthetic aspects of love – truth and beauty<sup>5</sup>; and acts of love – gift and response.

A second consideration pertains to our enquiry into ontological/existential<sup>6</sup> meaning, and authentic/genuine<sup>7</sup> human existence. In *Love Alone is Credible*, Balthasar does not explicitly address existential meaning, which can be interpreted more properly as a philosophical subject rather than a theological subject. For insight into Balthasar's thoughts on existential meaning we drew on St. Thérèse of Lisieux. Meaning, for Lonergan, is an important topic, one to which he devotes considerable thought and attention.<sup>8</sup> However, though devoting an entire chapter to meaning in *Method in Theology*, Lonergan devotes but a few brief passages to ontological

---

<sup>5</sup> Noteworthy exceptions are Dadosky's engagement of beauty and Goulding's on truth, both highlighted previously.

<sup>6</sup> Lonergan's systematic-technical human 'ontological' reality is in Balthasar's aesthetic-dramatic terminology a human 'existential' reality.

<sup>7</sup> While 'authentic' human life is Lonergan terminology, Balthasar prefers 'genuine' as a descriptor.

<sup>8</sup> Lonergan's understanding and articulation of meaning continued to evolve over his lifetime as evidenced in the 1982 set of interviews with him near the end of his life in 1984. Lonergan, *Caring About Meaning*.

meaning. Thus we looked to other scholars<sup>9</sup> in order to draw inferences on the ontological or constitutive meaning of an individual person.<sup>10</sup>

A third consideration relates to the importance we ascribed to methodological approaches. Bringing Lonergan and Balthasar into conversation necessitated bringing together Lonergan's technical-systematic anthropology with Balthasar's aesthetic-dramatic anthropology.<sup>11</sup> We established that both theologians' methodological approaches are not contradictory, rather that Balthasar's dramatic-aesthetic approach highlights an affective aspect of human life, while Lonergan's technical-systematic approach underscores an intellectual aspect.

## ***5-2 Co-equality of Love***

In this study we have distinguished three domains of love: modalities of love, intellectual-aesthetic aspects of love, and acts of love. We believe that in choosing *eros*, *philia*, and *agape* as three modalities of love we have been able to bring together the diverse terms that Lonergan and Balthasar use to convey love in its many human and divine manifestations.<sup>12</sup> In doing so we are in agreement with the thoughts conveyed by Pope Benedict in his encyclical *Caritas Deus Est*. In bringing together intellectual-aesthetic aspects of love – truth and beauty – we believe we have contributed insights that both support and extend the work of Dadosky and Goulding. While truth and beauty are perceived as transcendentals by both Lonergan and Balthasar, we submit that both truth and beauty are sublated by love which occupies the apex of human desiring for

---

<sup>9</sup> In particular we highlight the thoughts of Anne Hunt and Hilary Anne-Marie Mooney.

<sup>10</sup> We have established an equivalence between ontological meaning and constitutive meaning. Cf. Chapter 3, n. 87, 88.

<sup>11</sup> Chapter 1, n. 15.

<sup>12</sup> Blackwell provides a comprehensive account of Lonergan's evolving ideas and terminology on love in, *And Hope Does Not Disappoint*. To our knowledge, no similar work exists for Balthasar.

both theologians. We have shown that, for both Lonergan and Balthasar, love is exemplified by acts of love in both the human and divine realm. These acts comprise love as *gift* and love as *response*. Our enquiry supports a claim that in all three domains of love – namely modalities of love, intellectual-aesthetic aspects of love, and acts of love – Lonergan and Balthasar’s depictions of love can be considered to be co-equal.

### **5-3 Co-equality of Meaning and Authenticity**

Not only are Lonergan and Balthasar’s notions of love co-equal, the former representing an intellectual perspective, and the latter an aesthetic-dramatic perspective, but we suggested their notions of constitutive/existential meaning and authentic/genuine existence are similarly co-equal. In the two Balthasar works selected for this study existential meaning and genuine existence are not explicitly addressed. We have therefore taken the following approach. Beginning with Lonergan’s insight into the ‘meaning of meaning’<sup>13</sup> as explicated in *Method in Theology*, we have argued that constitutive meaning can be ascribed to an individual as well as to groups or a society. Though the passages in *Method* are sparse, none the less we believe Lonergan held such a view. In addition to the paragraphs previously cited (pp. 356-358, *Method*) we believe a case can be also put forward that Lonergan’s exposition of incarnate meaning (p. 73, *Method*) is analogous to constitutive meaning. Lonergan writes:

Incarnate meaning combines all or at least many of the other carriers of meaning. It can be at once inter-subjective, artistic, symbolic, linguistic. *It is the meaning of a person*, of 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.<sup>14</sup>

This description can be compared to Lonergan’s articulation of constitutive meaning:

---

<sup>13</sup> Lonergan, *Caring About Meaning*, 202.

<sup>14</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 73.



In our third chapter we distinguished four functions of meaning: it is cognitive, constitutive, communicative, effective. Such functions have their ontological aspect. [...] In so far as it is constitutive, it constitutes part of the reality of the one that means: his horizon, his assimilative powers, his knowledge, his values, his character.<sup>15</sup>

Further, it would seem that Lonergan cautions that although incarnate meaning can convey authenticity, its polar opposite where one is unauthentic, without meaning – vacant, empty – can also represent an ontological/constitutive aspect of human existence. Lonergan states:

Finally, as meaning can be incarnate, so too can be the meaningless, the vacant, the empty, the vapid, the insipid, the dull [be incarnate]<sup>16</sup>.

Thus, having first established from Lonergan's *intellectual* articulation of what it means to be an authentic person, we proceeded to establish an equivalence to Balthasar's *affective* expressions of genuineness in *Love Alone is Credible*. We further supported this co-equality by drawing on the life of St Thérèse as a concrete example of an authentic/genuine human life, thereby enriching both the intellectual-philosophical thought of Lonergan and the aesthetic-theological thought of Balthasar.

Love, meaning, and authenticity are not simply isolated abstract topics of philosophical or theological inquiry but need to be treated as a 'unity' or 'whole.' In this study we have endeavored to bring these topics into such a unity by drawing on the thinking of two highly regarded Catholic theologians of the twentieth century. In so doing we believe we have enriched Lonergan's technical-systematic explanations of human authenticity by citing St Thérèse as an exemplary model of a truly authentic human life. We believe we have also enriched Balthasar's aesthetic-dramatic portrayal of human and divine love by underscoring the importance of *knowing* embodied in the innate human desire to both *know* and *love* God.

---

<sup>15</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 356.

<sup>16</sup> Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 73.

### ***5-4 Implications***

By limiting a broad topic to a specific perspective, we believe this study has achieved important findings in the context of love and Christian/human living. While both Lonergan and Balthasar direct their thought to a Christian world view, we suggest that their views can encompass a horizon that encompasses all human life – that is love is constitutive to the meaning all human existence. This project has advanced Doran’s call for greater Lonergan-Balthasar studies and advances Lonergan-Balthasar scholarship by addressing the question of the meaning of love and human existence in the thought of these two theologians.

### ***5-5 Areas for Further Study***

The notion of holiness as manifestation of human response in love to the gift of divine love has not been addressed in depth in this study. This aspect of love deserves further study in the thought of Lonergan and Balthasar. Victoria Harrison decries the notable lack of research on the topic of human holiness<sup>17</sup>, one which she addressed in her study of Balthasar. Bringing together the thought of Lonergan and Balthasar might be explored further by drawing on Rudolf Otto’s numinous qualities of the Holy to establish a common ground for comparing and contrasting Lonergan and Balthasar.<sup>18</sup> As noted previously, Lonergan himself referred to Otto’s *mysterium fascinans et tremendum* while for Balthasar mystery is an important theme in his writings. I suggest the qualities of the Holy which Otto articulates can be useful in giving meaning to terms that Balthasar and Lonergan use when they speak of God as wholly Other, Mystery, Truth, or Love.

---

<sup>17</sup> Harrison, *Homo Orans*, 6.

<sup>18</sup> Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the non-rational factor in the ideal of the divine and its relation to the rational*, trans. by John W. Harvey (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973)

In the area of Lonergan studies, further research into Lonergan's thoughts of the relationship of constitutive meaning to incarnate meaning might well prove to be a fruitful area of investigation. Further study on the relationship of constitutive meaning and incarnate meaning to authenticity could serve to either validate or refute interpretations being put forward in this thesis.

In this thesis we have intentionally limited our study of Balthasar's and Lonergan's methodological approaches to the two key works: *Love Alone is Credible* and *Method in Theology*. As a result, our work is incomplete in the sense that it does not fully examine other works that can contribute to a fuller dialogue between these two theologians. We acknowledge the need to address the priority of love over knowing in later Lonergan thought, particularly the study of the relationship between love apprehended in feelings or affectivity, and love consciously apprehended as value. References for both Lonergan's and other scholars' thoughts on this topic can be found in Darren Dias' dissertation *The contributions of Bernard J. F. Lonergan to a systematic understanding of religious diversity*.<sup>19</sup> Dias, particularly draws on Charles Hefling's observation that Lonergan's account of the good as intelligible is apprehended first not by insight but by feeling.<sup>20</sup> A more comprehensive study of later Lonergan thoughts on love, meaning, and existence compared/contrasted to Balthasar's thoughts in his 15 volume theological trilogy : *The Glory of the Lord, Theo-drama, and Theo-Logic*, is left to other scholars.

---

<sup>19</sup> Darren Dias, "Human Development from Above Downward," in *The contributions of Bernard J. F. Lonergan to a systematic understanding of religious diversity*, Toronto (2008) Thesis: 106-111.

<sup>20</sup> Dias, *The contributions of Bernard J. F. Lonergan to a systematic understanding of religious diversity*, 106; Charles C. Hefling, Jr., "The Meaning of God Incarnate according to Friedrich Schleiermacher: or, Whether Lonergan is Appropriately Regarded as 'A Schleiermacher for Our Time,' and Why Not," *Lonergan Workshop 7* (1988), 111.



## BIBIOGRAPHY

### Primary Bibliography

- Balthasar, Hans Urs von and Scola. Angelo. *Test Everything: Hold Fast to What Is Good*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1989.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. "The Perfectibility of Man." In *Hans Urs von Balthasar*, ed. Martin Redfern. London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1972, 73-116.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Short Primer for Unsettled Laymen*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Theology of Karl Barth: Exposition and Interpretation*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press: 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thérèse of Lisieux." In *Two Sisters in The Spirit: Thérèse of Lisieux & Elizabeth of the Trinity*. Translated by Donald Nichols and Anne Englund Nash. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992, 15-262.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introduction." In *My work: In Retrospect*. San Francisco: Communio Books, c1993, 9-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Retrospective." In *My work: In Retrospect*. San Francisco: Communio Books, c1993, 111-119.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Explorations in Theology Volume 4, Spirit and Institution*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Love Alone is Credible*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theo-Logic Volume 2, Truth of God*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2004.
- Lonergan, Bernard. *Method in Theology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.
- Lonergan, Bernard J. F., Pierrot Lambert, Charlotte Tansey, and Cathleen M. Going. *Caring About Meaning: Patterns in the Life of Bernard Lonergan*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Thomas More Institute, 1982.
- Lonergan, Bernard J.F. "Finality, Love, Marriage." In *Collection*, ed. Fredrick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan CWL 4. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988, 17-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Metaphysics as Horizon." In *Collection*, ed. Fredrick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan CWL 4. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1988, 188-204.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Understanding and Being*, ed. Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli, CWL 5. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer." In *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, ed. Robert C. Croken, Frederick E. Crowe, and Robert M. Doran, CWL 6. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1996, 160-182.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Are Judgments of Value?" in *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, ed. Robert C. Croken and Robert M. Doran, CWL 17. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Supplementary Notes on Sanctifying Grace." In *Early Latin Theology*, trans. Michael Shields, ed. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour, CWL 19. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2011, 563-665.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Unpublished Document 1600DTE070.  
<https://wwwp.bernardlonergan.com/pdf/91600DTE070.pdf> (accessed February 19, 2018).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cur Deus Homo?* Trans. Michael Shields. Available from the Lonergan Center, Boston College.

### **Secondary Bibliography**

- Bajzek, Brian. "Alterity, Similarity, and Dialectic: Methodological Reflections on the Turn to the Other." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 57 (2017):249-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Crisis, Encounter, and the Cross: Incarnating Value in an Ethics of Alterity." LRI Graduate Seminar. November 10, 2017.
- Blackwood, Jeremy W. "'What Was Going Forward' in Lonergan's Development on Love." In *And hope does not disappoint: love, grace, and subjectivity in the work of Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J.*, 145-170. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 2017.
- Combes, André. *The Spirituality of St. Thérèse: An Introduction*. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 1950.
- Costello, Stephen. *Philosophy and the flow of presence: desire, drama and the divine ground of being*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.
- Crowe, Frederick E. *Lonergan*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992
- Dadosky, John D. "The Dialectic of Religious Identity: Lonergan and Balthasar." *Theological Studies*, 60 no. 1 (Mar 1999): 31-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Centering the Church: A Development in Ecclesiology Based on Balthasar and Lonergan," *Lonergan Workshop* 20 (2008): 93-103.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Recovering Beauty in the Subject: Balthasar and Lonergan Confront Kierkegaard." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 83 no.4 (2009): 509-532.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Proof of Beauty: From Aesthetic Experience to the Beauty of God." *Analecta Hermeneutica* vol. 2 (2010):1-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Eclipse and Recovery of Beauty: A Lonergan Approach*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press (2014).
- Dias, Darren. "Human Development from Above Downward." In *The contributions of Bernard J. F. Lonergan to a systematic understanding of religious diversity*. Toronto (2008) Thesis: 106-111.

- Doran, Robert. *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations." *Theological Studies*. 58 no. 1 (Mar 1997): 61-84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A New Project in Systematic Theology." *Theological Studies* 76 no. 2: (Jun 2015): 243-259
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Essays in Systematic Theology 4: Lonergan and Balthasar: Methodological Considerations." (2009). <https://www.lonerganresource.com/pdf/books/1/4%20-%20Lonergan%20and%20Balthasar.pdf> (accessed June 24, 2018).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What is Systematic Theology?* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Drilling, Peter. "Relating the Theologies of Hans Urs von Balthasar and Bernard Lonergan on Divine Action in the World." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 81 no.3 (2016): 267 - 283
- Farrell, Thomas J. "Writing, the Writer, and Lonergan: Authenticity and Intersubjectivity," in *Communication and Lonergan: common ground for forging the new age*. Thomas J. Farrell and Paul A. Soukup, eds. Kansas City, MO : Sheed & Ward, 1993, 23-47.
- Flanagan, Joseph. *Quest for Self-Knowledge: An Essay in Lonergan's Philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press ,1997.
- Goulding, Gill K. "Truth Unveiled: Balthasar and the Contemplation of Christian Truth." In Lambert Zuidervaart, Allyson Carr, Matthew Klaassen, Ronnie Shuker eds., *Truth Matters: Knowledge, Politics, Ethics, Religion* Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press 2013, 245-262.
- Harrison, Victoria S. "Homo Orans: von Balthasar's Christocentric Philosophical Anthropology." *The Heythrop Journal* 40 no. 3 (1999: 280-300.
- Hefling, Charles C. Jr., "The Meaning of God Incarnate according to Friedrich Schleiermacher: or, Whether Lonergan is Appropriately Regarded as 'A Schleiermacher for Our Time,' and Why Not." *Lonergan Workshop* 7 (1988).
- Henrici, Peter. "The Philosophy of Hans Urs von Balthasar." In David L Schindler, ed. *Hans Urs von Balthasar: His Life and Work*. San Francisco: Communio Book, Ignatius Press. 1991. 149-161.
- Hunt, Anne. "Psychological Analogy and Paschal Mystery in Trinitarian Theology." *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 197–218.
- Kerr, Fergus. *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Knitter, Paul F . *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan, S.J.* In *Horizons*, 1983 , Volume 10 , Issue 2 , 384-386.
- Lawrence, Frederick G. "Lonergan's Search for a Hermeneutics of Authenticity: Re-originating Augustine's Hermeneutics of Love." In Gerald Whelan, ed. *Lonergan's Anthropology: The Next Fifty Years of Vatican II*. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press. 2015. 19-56.
- McShane, Philip, ed., "An Interview with Fr. Bernard Lonergan, S.J." In *A Second Collection: Papers*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996, 209- 230.

- Morelli, Mark D. and Morelli, Elizabeth A. *The Lonergan Reader*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Mooney, Hilary A. *The Liberation of Consciousness: Bernard Lonergan's Theological Foundations in Dialogue with the Theological Aesthetics of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Frankfurt am Main: J. Knecht, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "‘It's Not Names that Save Us, But the Choices We Make' (Basil of Caesarea) Lonergan and Early Christian Writers on the Anthropological, Spiritual and Theological Significance of Human Authenticity." In *Ricerche Lonerganiane Offerte a Saturnino Muratore*. Edited by Edoardo Cibelli and Cloe Taddei Ferretti, 321-331. Naples, Italy: Istituto Italiano per Gli Studi Filosofici, 2017.
- Moser, Matthew A. Rothaus. "Truth as Love." In *Love Itself Is Understanding: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theology of the Saints*, 97-146. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, Publishers, 2016.
- Mudd, Joseph C. *Eucharist as Meaning: Critical Metaphysics and Contemporary Sacramental Theology*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2014.
- Nichols, Adian. *A Key to Balthasar: Hans Urs von Balthasar on Beauty, Goodness, and Truth*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 2011.
- Otto, Rudolf. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the non-rational factor in the ideal of the divine and its relation to the rational*. Trans. by John W. Harvey. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Pope Benedict XVI. *Deus Caritas Est*, [http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_enc\\_20051225\\_deus-caritas-est.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html) (accessed May 11, 2018).
- Rusembuka, Muhgirwa F. *The Two Ways of Human Development According to B. Lonergan: Anticipation in Insight*. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 2001.
- Rosenberg, Randall S. "Christ's Human Knowledge: A Conversation With Lonergan And Balthasar." *Theological Studies* 71 no. 4 (2010): 817 – 845.
- Schindler, D. C. *Hans Urs von Balthasar and the Dramatic Structure of Truth. A Philosophical Investigation*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2004: 1-27.
- Snedden, Elizabeth J. *The Eros of the Human Spirit: The Writings of Bernard Lonergan, SJ*. New York: Paulist Press (2017).
- Thérèse, Gaucher, Guy, and Kane, Aletheia. *The Prayers of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux: The Act of Oblation*. Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 1997.
- Thérèse. *Story of a Soul: The Autobiography of St. Therese Of Lisieux*. Washington: ICS Publications, 1975.
- Tortorelli, Kevin. *Christology with Lonergan and Balthasar*. Ely, Cambridgeshire: Melrose Books, c2005. 1st ed.
- Yenson, Mark Leslie. *Existence as prayer: the consciousness of Christ in the theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, c2014. 205-203



Walker, Adrian J. "Love Alone: Hans Urs von Balthasar as a Master of Theological Renewal."  
*Communio: International Catholic Review* 32 (Fall 2005), 1-24