

Quid per prius datur: The Thomistic Doctrine of the Double Order of Priority between the Created Gift and the Uncreated Gift

GUILLERMO JUÁREZ, O.P.

*Universidad del Norte Santo Tomás de Aquino
Buenos Aires, Argentina*

“THE GOOD OF GRACE in one individual is better than the good of nature in the whole universe.”¹ This impressive affirmation of St. Thomas allows us to glimpse the immense transformation that sanctifying grace works within us, a transformation that, from the most intimate part of man, extends itself to all his faculties and acts, making itself especially manifest in those who, living according to the beatitudes, have reached the summit of sanctity. But its profound significance could escape us if we do not recognize that the whole spiritual organism of grace, nourished within us by the vital influence of the Holy Spirit, is that which, in short, immediately habilitates us to possess and enjoy the Holy Spirit itself. In effect, “by the gift of sanctifying grace, the rational creature is elevated, so that it can freely use, not only the created gift, but also enjoy the divine person.”² The gift of grace is given in such a way that the soul who receives it, also receives its unfailing fountain, the Holy Spirit.³

¹ “Bonum gratiae unius maius est quam bonum naturae totius universi.” *ST* I-II, q. 113, a. 9, ad 2.

² “Per donum gratiae gratum facientis perficitur creatura rationalis, ad hoc quod libere non solum ipso dono creato utatur, sed ut ipsa divina persona fruatur.” *ST* I, q. 43, a. 3, ad 1.

³ “Gratia Spiritus Sancti recte dicitur aqua viva, quia ita ipsa gratia Spiritus Sancti datur homini quod tamen ipse fons gratiae datur, scilicet Spiritus Sanctus. Immo per

This beautiful Thomistic teaching, which is rooted in Sacred Scripture, via the profound and devout reading of St. Augustine,⁴ puts into focus the close link that exists between the created gift of grace and the Holy Spirit as uncreated gift. In this link we can affirm, on the one hand, the primacy of the Holy Spirit as the fount of grace, and on the other, the dependency that the giving of the Holy Spirit has with respect to the mediation of grace, a double primacy that involves, at the same time, a double perspective in explaining the communication of both gifts. The joint consideration of these two perspectives offers orientations and contents of particular importance for overcoming reductionist views about both the necessity for, and the specific nature of, created grace. A detailed study of this double priority has permitted us to determine, in the first place, the reason for the distinction between these elements according to which it is said that the gift of grace, or the influence of the proceeding divine person, are considered as the fountain of inhabitation, and from there, the coordination and the complementarity between the ascending and descending explanations of this mode of presence that we find in the *Opera omnia* of the Angelic Doctor.⁵

We propose, then, to deepen our analysis of this theme by considering in turn the fact of the conjoined donation of the person of the Holy Spirit with the created gift of grace, and the order of priority between them both. The exposition of St. Thomas has the double peculiarity of being confined to the *Commentary on the Sentences* and the *Summa*

ipsum datur gratia . . . Nam ipse Spiritus Sanctus est fons indeficiens, a quo omnia dona gratiarum effluunt.” *Super Ioan.* 4, lec. 2. That is what Rikhof emphasizes referring to the doctrine of St. Paul: “The presence of the Spirit is constitutive for being a Christian believer and a Christian community. The dignity and responsibility Christians have is based upon their being temples of the Holy Spirit. The intimacy they have with ‘Abba, Father’ is due to the presence of the Holy Spirit.” Herwi Rikhof, “Trinity,” in *The Theology of Thomas Aquinas*, ed. R. van Nieuwenhove and J. Wawrykow (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2005), 36–57, esp. 48.

⁴ Cf. François Bourassa, “Don de Dieu, Nom propre du Saint-Esprit,” *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 6 (1964): 73–82 ; “Le don de Dieu,” *Gregorianum* 50 (1969): 201–35; Gilles Emery, *La théologie trinitaire de saint Thomas d’Aquin* (Paris: Cerf, 2004), 298–99.

⁵ I refer to the relevant research in my doctoral thesis defended at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) in 2006 and published as a book two years later: *Dios Trinidad en todas las creaturas y en los santos: Estudio histórico-sistemático de la doctrina del Comentario a las Sentencias de Santo Tomás de Aquino sobre la omnipresencia y la inhabitación* (Córdoba: El Copista, 2008), esp. 499ff.

theologiae, and of being presented in a very synthetic way, especially in the latter work.⁶ However, even with the differences of nuance, there is a strict continuity between the one work and the other. For the sake of clarity, I will concentrate my remarks on the more developed contents of the *Scriptum*, completing them with what we can find in the *Summa*.

This present study is situated within a wider investigation covering the elucidation and exposition of the philosophical and theological sources of St. Thomas on this subject. Using some of the fruits of this research, I will try to put into relief the influence that the teaching of the *Summa Halensis* has had on this theme of sanctifying grace and the gift of the Holy Spirit.⁷ In this way we will be in a better position to recognize the originality, consistency, relevance and the implications of the Angelic Doctor's thought.

The Holy Spirit Is Given with the Created Gifts

The precise location in the *Scriptum* where St. Thomas treats the subject of the donation of the Holy Spirit is his commentary on distinction 14 of Book I. In the second question of this distinction, the young bachelor of the Sentences asks himself "in what sense" the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit takes place; that is, what is it that formally determines the accomplishment of this procession? The parallel development in the *Summa* is found in the Trinitarian section of the *Prima Pars* and comprises only the article 3 of question 43, dedicated to the study of the mission of the divine persons. In this article, the Angelic Doctor asks a very similar question, referring to the two invisible missions: "In what sense is

⁶ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum super Libros Sententiarum*, vols. 1–2, ed. Pierre Mandonnet (Paris: Lethielleux, 1929); vols. 3–4, ed. Maria F. Moos (Paris: Lethielleux, 1933, 1947); *Opera Omnia iussu Leonis XIII P.M. edita*, Tomus 4–12: *Summa theologiae* (Rome: Ex typographia polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide, 1888–1906). From here onward, the abbreviations for these works (*Summa*–*Scriptum*) will be used to facilitate reading.

⁷ *Summa Theologica seu Summa fratris Alexandri*, vols. 1–4 (Quaracchi: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1924–48). I have given a general presentation of this work in my *Dios Trinidad*, 37–38; cf. Kenan B. Osborne, *The History of Franciscan Theology*, Theology Series (New York: Franciscan Institute, 1994), 13–18; Francis L. B. Cunningham, *The Indwelling of the Trinity: A Historico-Doctrinal Study of the Theory of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Dubuque, IA: Priory Press, 1955), 253–62, 273–84. This *summa* is also known as the *Summa Halensis*. Here I use this name and, for quotations, the abbreviation *SH*.

a divine person invisibly sent?”⁸

In the *Scriptum*, this enquiry is articulated in two more specific ones that prepare the way for the two articles of the question. Thus, in article 1, Thomas asks if the Holy Spirit himself is given according to his temporal procession or solely the created gifts. In article 2, which supposes the first article is true, he asks how or through which created gifts the Holy Spirit is given.⁹ Article one, in turn, is subdivided into two queries (*quaestiuiculae*); that is, if the Holy Spirit himself is given with his created gifts and which of these gifts is given first.¹⁰ This final question has a central role in this study. However, to facilitate a more fitting understanding of the same theme, we ought to bear in mind the totality of the contents expressed in this question, especially those in the first part of the article.

The similarity of expression between the *Scriptum* and the *Summa Halensis* already allows us to glimpse the influence that this work had on the thought of St. Thomas that we are dealing with here. In effect, in the fourth and last chapter of his luminous treatise on the divine missions in common, the Master John of La Rochelle,¹¹ deals with the subject of the

⁸ “Tertio: secundum quid divina Persona invisibiliter mittatur.” *ST* I, q. 43, prol. “Videtur quod missio invisibilis divinae Personae non sit solum secundum donum gratiae gratum facientis.” *Ibid.*, a. 3. Some of these themes touched on in the subordinate questions in the *Scriptum* are considered, at least partially, in articles 1 and 2 of this question, dedicated to the study of the existence of mission and its temporal character, respectively, and in articles 5 and 6, where it is asked if the Son is sent invisibly and if the invisible mission reaches all those who participate in grace.

⁹ “Deinde quaeritur, secundum quid attendatur processio temporalis, et circa hoc duo quaeruntur: utrum ipse Spiritus Sanctus secundum processionem temporalem detur, vel tantum dona ejus, vel utrumque. Et si utrumque, quaeritur, secundum quae dona dicatur Spiritum Sanctum dari vel procedere temporaliter.” *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, prol.

¹⁰ “Videtur quod ipse Spiritus Sanctus non procedat temporaliter vel detur.” *Ibid.*, a. 1, qc. 1. “Ulterius quaeritur circa hoc, si utrumque datur, quid per prius datur.” *Ibid.*, qc. 2.

¹¹ *SH* I, n. 502–13. This treatise was written after 1244, as it quotes Saint Albert and Odo Rigaldi. Although the latter is an important source, the main redactor is considered to be John of La Rochelle. Cf. *SH*, vol. 2, *Prolegomena*, 266–67. Above all, chapter 1 of section 1 and chapters 2–4 of section 2 have been attributed to Master Odo. The chapters dedicated to the invisible missions (mem. 2, chap. 1–5) are a later addition. Cf. Jean Bouvy, “Les questions sur la grâce dans le Commentaire des Sentences d’Odon Rigaud,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 27 (1960): 290–343. For the complete teaching, consult: Ernest J. Primeau, “Doctrina Summae Theologiae Alexandri Halensis De Spiritu Sancti Apud Justos Inhabitatione” (PhD

coming of the Holy Spirit as gift. In the prologue of this chapter it is asked in what sense (*secundum quid*) it is said that the Son or the Holy Spirit are sent.¹² The main reply to this question is found in the first article, where the Franciscan master asks himself, in turn, if there is a mission because the Son and the Holy Spirit are given, or some appropriate gift, or both things.¹³ This question is subdivided, in the interior of the article, into two more: if in the mission only the proceeding person is given, or only the gift of grace appropriated to the person, or both;¹⁴ in this last case, what is given first, the proceeding person or the gift of grace?¹⁵ As we can see, the only relevant difference, as far as the organization of the contents, is that St. Thomas leaves to the end (article 2) the determination of the nature of the created gift *by which* is vouchsafed the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The guiding authority—not only in the arguments of the first question of article 1, but also in the further developments of this question of distinction 14—is the passage from the Letter to the Romans that refers to the simultaneous communication of charity and the Holy Spirit: “The love of God has been poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit which has been given to us.”¹⁶ To this argument in favor of the giving of the Holy Spirit himself is added another, which starts from the proper name Love and recalls the beautiful passage in which John of La Rochelle links to this name the *ratio* of gift.¹⁷ In the principal reply to this question and for

diss., Diss. Fac. Theol. Sanctae Mariae Ad Lacum, Mundelein, 1936), 42–75; Juan Gutiérrez González, *Génesis de la doctrina sobre el Espíritu Santo-Don desde Anselmo de Laon hasta Guillermo de Auxerre: Estudio histórico de teología dogmática* (PhD diss., University of Fribourg, 1966), 114–18.

¹² “Consequenter quaeritur de missione Filii et Spiritus Sancti secundum quid sit, hoc est secundum quid dicatur mitti Filius vel Spiritus Sanctus.” *SH* I, n. 511, prol.

¹³ “Utrum dicatur missio quia detur ipse Filius vel Spiritus Sanctus vel aliquod donum alterutri appropriatum vel utrumque.” *Ibid.*, a. 1. In articles 2 and 3 (n. 512–13) is asked, in turn, if the Son and the Holy Spirit are said to be sent on account of sanctifying grace or charismatic grace (*gratis datae*), and if they are said to be sent on account of an augmentation of sanctifying grace.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, n. 511, I. In this first part of article 1 the question is implicit. It is made clear at the beginning of the second part.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, n. 511, II: “Ratione praedictorum quaeritur, supposito quod in missione Spiritus Sancti conferatur utrumque, scilicet Spiritus Sanctus et dona eius, quod istorum dicitur per prius esse in anima sive in creatura rationali ad quam mittitur Spiritus Sanctus: vel ipse vel donum eius.”

¹⁶ Rom 5:5; *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, sc 1.

¹⁷ “Amor habet rationem primi doni, quia in ipso omnia ex liberalitate conferuntur.

gaining greater precision, St. Thomas has recourse, like the Franciscan Master, to the double comparison or reference that we find in that which proceeds, that is, the comparison to the principle and the comparison with regard to the end.¹⁸

According to the first comparison, there is no doubt that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. It is this procession that allows us to recognize the Holy Spirit's own identity as a distinct person in God. The doubt arises in the comparison at the terminus of the procession. Taking up and complementing the teaching of Master John, St. Thomas explains that this comparison is, in reality, a relation or reference of reason (*relatio rationis*) corresponding to the real relation of the soul of the just to the Holy Spirit: "this respect—he says—is placed in the Holy Spirit, not because he Himself is really referred to the other, but because the other is referred [really] to Him."¹⁹ From this principle, he will explain the constitutive relational structure of this temporal procession from the inverse real relation:

"Therefore, given that, in the reception of his gifts, our relation does not end solely in such gifts, as if we were to possess only them, but also in the Holy Spirit, because we have the Holy Spirit by a distinct way anteriorly, we do not so much say that only his gifts proceed into us, but also he himself. Thus it is said that the Holy Spirit is referred [in relation with] to us in that we are referred to Him."²⁰

Cum igitur Spiritus Sanctus sit amor, videtur quod habeat rationem doni. Sed non nisi quia datur. Ergo videtur quod ipse Spiritus Sanctus detur." *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, sc 2; *SH* III, n. 609, sol. 1. In the version of this argument offered in the *Summa* (I, q. 38, a. 2, ad 3), it appears with greater clarity that the name Gift "does not entail giving in act." About this subject, see Emery, *Théologie trinitaire*, 299.

¹⁸ *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, c.; cf. *ST* I, q. 43, a. 1, c.; q. 38, a. 1, c.; *SH* I, n. 511, II.

¹⁹ "Ipsemet Spiritus Sanctus procedit temporali processione, vel datur, et non solum dona ejus. Si enim consideremus processionem Spiritus Sancti ex parte ejus a quo procedit, non est dubium quin secundum illum respectum ipsemet Spiritus Sanctus procedat. Si autem consideremus processionem secundum respectum ad id in quo procedit, tunc . . . respectus iste in Spiritu Sancto ponitur, non quia ipse realiter referatur, sed quia alterum refertur ad ipsum." *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, c.; cf. *ibid.*, q. 1, a. 1.

²⁰ "Cum igitur in acceptione donorum ipsius non solum relatio nostra terminetur ad dona, ut ipsa tantum habeamus, sed etiam ad Spiritum Sanctum, quia aliter ipsum habemus quam prius; non tantum dicuntur dona ipsius procedere in nos, sed etiam ipsemet; secundum hoc enim ipse dicitur referri ad nos, secundum quod nos referimur in ipsum." *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, c.; cf. *Super Ioan.* 4, lec. 2.

John of Rochelle taught that the mission and the donation of the Holy Spirit end in the possession of grace, and in consequence, in the possession of the Holy Spirit as gift.²¹ Aquinas develops this idea teaching that the real relation of possession has its origin in the reception of the created gifts but does not end or linger in them “but it tends finally to Him by whom the said gifts are given,”²² at such a point we have him in a new way, that is, as a gift to be enjoyed. Because of this we can say that not only the created gifts are present or proceed in us, but also the Holy Spirit himself. In effect, given that the reference of the Holy Spirit to us signifies nothing else than our being referred to him; in saying that he proceeds into us, we are saying that he is possessed by us. St. Thomas ends his argument insisting on this “inverse mode,” which he has found to explain the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit:

“Consequently, the Holy Spirit Himself and his gifts proceed into us: since we receive also his gifts and by them we have in a new way the Holy Spirit Himself, in as much as by his gifts, we unite ourselves to the very Holy Spirit or He to us, assimilating us to himself by the [created] gift.”²³

The created gifts, whose reception has its origin in the relation of possession, are those that unite us to the Holy Spirit. As I have indicated above,²⁴ unlike Master John, Aquinas does not want, yet, to determine which gifts these are. What interests him for the moment is to show that these gifts involve a modification or change in the rational creature, that which allows us to recognize that the relation of possession in the rational creature is real. But from this relation, our mind conceives an inverse relation that registers no change whatsoever in its subject, the Holy Spirit. By this we say that the second relation is by reason (*secundum rationem*). Hence we are able to speak of a temporal procession to the rational creature, the invisible mission, and not simply of an assimilation of the rational creature to the proceeding person; we can speak of a real gift and not simply of a possession. In spite of the limit of the human intelligence

²¹ Cf. *SH I*, n. 511, II, a.

²² “Relatio creaturae non sistit in donis illis, sed ulterius tendit in eum per quem illa dona dantur.” *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, ad 2.

²³ “Et ideo procedit ipse in nos et dona ipsius: quia et dona ejus recipimus et per eadem ad ipsum nos aliter habemus, inquantum per dona ejus ipsi Spiritui Sancto conjungimur, vel ille nobis, per donum nos sibi assimilans.” *Ibid.*, c.

²⁴ Cf. *supra*, 4.

and language to express this mystery, the joint consideration of the real relation of possession and the relation by reason of donation allows us to better recognize the reality of the new presence of the Holy Spirit in souls of the just as well as his absolute transcendency.

Considering the argument in its totality, we can better recognize the progress that presupposes the recourse to the doctrine of the *relatio rationis*, by comparison with the reply that John of La Rochelle gives with regard to the same question.²⁵ Paradoxically, this doctrine permits Aquinas to emphasize the fact that the Holy Spirit is really present in the soul of the saint. In this way, it constitutes a powerful complement to the argument taken from the notion of enjoyment taken from the *Summa Halensis*.

On the other hand, it is important to emphasize, for the continuity of our enquiry, the sudden change of register that takes place at the end of the argument we have just analyzed. In effect, if at the first moment we are the agents of the assimilation by means of the created gifts, immediately afterward, it is the Holy Spirit himself who acts on us through those gifts, assimilating us to himself. Thus Aquinas introduces here the question of the double order of priority between the created gifts and the gift of the Holy Spirit, which will be the object of the following *quaestiuncula*.

The characterization of the donation of the Holy Spirit as a relation of reason allows us to overcome two particularly challenging objections concerning the compatibility with the divine simplicity and immutability, of this new mode of presence. In the reply to the first objection, St. Thomas explains that of the Holy Spirit “we are able to say he is in a new way in someone according to the new [real] relation of the same creature to Him,” just as, in general, we say that God relates in various ways to creatures, due to the real relations that creatures have to him “are diversified according to the differing effects by which they are assimilated to God.”²⁶ It is evident, therefore, that the composition does not occur in God but in the creature.

²⁵ SH I, n. 511, resp. I. The doctrine of *relatio rationis*, while not totally unknown to the Franciscan master, is not fully exploited by him in his explanation of the gift of the Holy Spirit. See my *Dios Trinidad*, 142–44, 172–74.

²⁶ “Cum dicitur Deus esse ubique, importatur quaedam relatio Dei ad creaturam, quae quidem realiter non est in ipso, sed in creatura. Contingit autem ex parte creaturae istas relationes multipliciter etiam diversificari secundum diversos effectus quibus

In his reply to the third objection, which points at the divine immutability, we can see how Aquinas recovers and completes the teaching of the *Summa Halensis*. In effect, Master John affirmed that the movement registered in the mission of the Holy Spirit ought to be understood by way of its effect.²⁷ Aquinas adds that, if we say that the Holy Spirit proceeds into us, it is not because any change is produced in him but because we ourselves are related to him in a new way. Hence the Holy Spirit himself can be designated as directing himself toward us under an aspect distinct from his ubiquitous presence. And that is what we mean when we say that he proceeds into our hearts.²⁸

The argument of the sufficiency of the operative virtue, more developed in the *Summa Halensis*, now appears entirely transformed. In effect, while there the operative sufficiency of the Holy Spirit is dealt with, in the final objection of this article the sufficiency of the created, infused virtue is treated instead.²⁹ The objection asserts that the infused virtue cannot be less sufficient than the acquired virtue in its own order and, therefore, does not require the presence of the Holy Spirit to achieve its task.³⁰ In his reply to this objection, Thomas shows that the new presence of the Holy Spirit is not due to any insufficiency of the infused virtue, but

Deo assimilatur; et inde est quod significatur ut aliter se habens ad creaturam quam prius. Et propter hoc Spiritus Sanctus, qui ubique est secundum relationem creaturae ad ipsum, potest dici de novo esse in aliquo, secundum novam relationem ipsius creaturae ad ipsum.” *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, ad 1; cf. ad 2.

²⁷ Cf. *SH* I, n. 511, I, ad 2. This is the great difference between the mission of the divine persons and the mission of a human messenger, who can be sent without achieving that which he was sent for. The movement, in this case, is realized only in the person who has been sent. Cf. *ibid.*

²⁸ “Non dicitur ipsemet in nos procedere, quia circa ipsum aliquid fiat; sed quia ex eo quod nos ad ipsummet aliter nos habemus, ipse potest significari sub alio respectu se habere ad nos. Et ita dicitur in nos procedere quantum ad illum respectum quem processio ponit ad id in quod est processio; licet non quantum ad illum quem ponit ad id a quo est.” *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a.1 ad 3; cf. ad 2; d. 15, q. 1, a. 1, ad 1.

²⁹ Cf. *SH* I, n. 511, I, obj. 3 and resp.; *SH* III, n. 609, sol. 1. In the following article of this question in the *Scriptum*, it is made explicit that this infused virtue is the correspondent of the gift of sanctifying grace, that is, charity and the other virtues informed by it.

³⁰ “Constat quod virtus infusa non est deficientior in operibus meritoriis, quam virtus acquisita in operibus politicis. Sed virtus acquisita sufficienter dirigit hominem in omnibus civilibus. Ergo infusa in omnibus meritoriis. Non igitur oportet, ut videtur, quod cum virtute infusa ipse Spiritus Sanctus detur, sed vel solus Spiritus Sanctus, vel sola virtus.” *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, obj. 4.

to its very perfection. In effect, by its perfection, this virtue unites and assimilates us to God, and by this union creates within us a new relation or reference to him. It is the real relation of possession, corresponding to the constitutive *relatio* of the temporal procession that is its invisible mission, donation or inhabitation. Hence, the more perfect or sufficient this virtue is, the more it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds or is sent by it and through it.³¹ As we can observe it, the anteriority of the created gift here gains priority over the uncreated gift.

The union of the soul of the just with the Holy Spirit, will be explained in a more detailed way in article 2, given that it is the key for determining which are the created gifts that formally realize the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit, which is his giving. I will concentrate my attention on the reply to the second objection of this article, because there Aquinas will return to the doctrine of the constitutive relation of this donation, combining it with the argument referring to the presence of the Holy Spirit in the saint as “fruit,” which is found in the *Summa Halensis*.

Master John had taught that the Holy Spirit is given to the just because, through the created gifts, the just enjoyed the Holy Spirit himself.³² Aquinas uses this reasoning to show that no new real relation whatsoever of the creature to God is sufficient to serve as the correlative of the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit, which is his donation. Since that which is given is possessed or contents in a new way, that is, as fruit or to be enjoyed, the possession or containment corresponding to the procession of the Holy Spirit as gift takes place, either by sanctifying grace, which gives us access to imperfect enjoyment, or by the gift of glory, through which we enjoy him perfectly:

In the procession of the Holy Spirit of which we are speaking here, that is, in as much as it contains in itself the gift of the Holy Spirit, it is not enough that there should be a new relation, what-

³¹ “Virtus infusa est multo sufficientior quam virtus acquisita, et ex ratione suae perfectionis habet quod nos maxime Deo conjungat et assimilet; secundum quam conjunctionem innascitur nobis novus respectus ad Deum. Unde quanto sufficientior est, tanto magis in ipsa Spiritus Sanctus procedere dicitur et cum ipsa.” Ibid., ad 4.

³² Cf. *SHI*, n. 511, resp. I.

ever it may be, of the creature to God, but it is necessary that it should be referred to Him as to the thing possessed, because that which is given to someone is in some way possessed by him. So, the divine person cannot be possessed by us except through perfect enjoyment, and is possessed this way by the gift of Glory; or according to imperfect enjoyment, and thus it is possessed by the gift of sanctifying grace.³³

Aquinas's argument offers another differentiating element with respect to the one used by Master John, given that he suggests again the change in register in the explanation of the donation of the Holy Spirit, which we have seen appear in the reply to the first *quaestiuncula* of article 1.³⁴ Effectively, the created gift is presented, above all, as preceding the uncreated gift. But later, toward the end of the passage, the same is said in a different register, which appears, moreover, superior. In this register the anteriority corresponds to the Holy Spirit himself:

Or better, as that by which we are united to the object of enjoyment in the sense that the divine persons themselves leave in our souls a certain seal of theirs, the gifts by which formally we enjoy, i.e., love and wisdom; by which the Holy Spirit is said to be a pledge of our inheritance.³⁵

³³ "In processione Spiritus, secundum quod hic loquimur, prout scilicet claudit in se dationem Spiritus Sancti, non sufficit quod sit nova relatio, qualiscumque est, creaturae ad Deum; sed oportet quod referatur in ipsum sicut ad habitum: quia quod datur alicui habetur aliquo modo ab illo. Persona autem divina non potest haberi a nobis nisi vel ad fructum perfectum, et sic habetur per donum gloriae; aut secundum fructum imperfectum, et sic habetur per donum gratiae gratum facientis." *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 2, ad 2; cf. *ST I*, q. 43, a. 3, ad 1. Reading the parallel text of the *Summa* without paying enough attention to this quote from the *Scriptum*, Rikhof, "Trinity," 44–45, affirms that the mission of the divine person implies not only the new divine presence and sanctifying grace, but also the graces *gratis datae*. See supra quote 13.

³⁴ We come across the same change of register with regard to these topics, with a certain frequency, in other passages of the Franciscan *Summa*. Cf. *SH I*, n. 511, I, ad 3; n. 511, II, resp.; *SH III*, n. 609, sol. 1.

³⁵ "Sicut id per quod fruibili coniungimur, inquantum ipsae personae divinae quadam sui sigillatione in animabus nostris relinquunt quaedam dona quibus formaliter fruimur, scilicet amore et sapientia; propter quod Spiritus Sanctus dicitur esse pignus hereditatis nostrae." *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 2, ad 2.

The created gift of grace or of glory is that by which the uncreated gift is enjoyed. But the divine person imprints the gift of sanctifying grace, as a certain personal seal, in our souls. Thus the gift of wisdom is recognized as a seal of the invisible mission of the Son, and the gift of love, as a seal of the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit.³⁶ We can affirm, therefore, that the two things are, at the same time, the cause and effect of each other. How can we maintain this affirmation without infringing the principle of noncontradiction? The reply to this question is found, beyond any doubt, in the distinction between registers or perspectives from which we can consider this mutual influence between the created gift and the uncreated gift.

Two Orders of Priority

The change in register in the description of the role that the proceeding persons play in the explanation of the temporal procession, which is their invisible mission, finds its fullest explanation in the reply to the second part of article 1 of the question dedicated to the study of the formal *ratio* of the donation of the Holy Spirit.³⁷ As was indicated above, this *quaestiuuncula* of the *Scriptum* has its parallel in the Trinitarian treatise of the *Summa*.³⁸ I will begin my analysis from this more concise and brief passage that reprises, a little more than fifteen years later, the initial teaching of St. Thomas as a bachelor of the Sentences in Paris.

In setting out the issues in the *Prima Pars*, the reasoning inclines decidedly to the anteriority of the Holy Spirit with respect to the created gift of grace. It does not appear true to say that the invisible mission of the person takes place “only according to the gift of sanctifying grace.”³⁹ In effect, the prepositional phrase “according to” (*secundum*) denotes the reference to a cause. Also, St. Paul says that it is through the Holy Spirit that we have charity. According to this, the divine person is the cause

³⁶ Cf. *In I Sent.* d. 15, q. 4, a. 1; SCG IV, ch. 23; ST I, q. 43, a. 5, c. and ad 2.

³⁷ This reply corresponds exactly to that of the second question of the first article of the chapter in which the *Summa Halensis* approaches the same set of problems: “Ad illud quod quaeritur cum utrumque conferatur animae, scilicet Spiritus Sanctus et gratia, quid per prius dicitur conferri animae.” SH I, n. 511, II.

³⁸ Cf. *supra*, 2.

³⁹ “Videtur quod missio invisibilis divinae personae non sit solum secundum donum gratiae gratum facientis.” ST I, q. 43, a. 3.

from which we have the gift of grace and not the other way round.⁴⁰ The solution that Aquinas offers to this objection could not be more precise nor more concise:

Sanctifying grace disposes the soul to possess the divine person; and this is signified when it is said that the Holy Spirit is given according to the gift of grace. Nevertheless the gift of grace is itself from the Holy Spirit; which is meant by the words “the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.”⁴¹

We can thus affirm, after all, a causality on the part of the created gift. Effectively, we can say that the Holy Spirit is given “according to” the gift of sanctifying grace because this gift *disposes* the soul to possess him.⁴² But at the same time, as the Apostle bears witness, the gift of grace “is from,” that is to say, proceeds from the Holy Spirit. So, if the created gift of grace dispositively causes the presence of the Holy Spirit in the soul of the saint, the Holy Spirit is the principle of the said gift, since through the Holy Spirit the love of God is poured into our hearts. In the *Tertia Pars*, when he explains the order of priority between habitual grace and the grace of Christ, Aquinas will insist again on the anteriority of the gift of the Spirit over the gift of grace. The Holy Spirit is present in the mind by grace because he is its cause. In effect “the principle of habitual grace, which is given with charity, is the Holy Spirit; he is said to be sent when he comes to dwell in the mind by charity.”⁴³ Invoking the beautiful pas-

⁴⁰ “Haec praepositio secundum denotat habitudinem alicuius causae. Sed Persona divina est causa quod habeatur donum gratiae gratum facientis, et non e converso; secundum illud Rom 5 . . . Ergo inconvenienter dicitur quod Persona divina secundum dona gratiae gratum facientis mittatur.” Ibid, obj. 2.

⁴¹ “Gratia gratum faciens disponit animam ad habendam divinam personam, et significatur hoc, cum dicitur quod Spiritus Sanctus datur secundum donum gratiae. Sed tamen ipsum donum gratiae est a Spiritu Sancto, et hoc significatur, cum dicitur quod ‘caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum.’” Ibid., ad 2.

⁴² Created grace is recognized thus as the gift placed at the ontological level of man so that he might be united to God. Cf. Jean-Hervé Nicolas, *Les Profondeurs de la grâce* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1969), 150–60.

⁴³ “Principium autem gratiae habitualis, quae cum caritate datur, est Spiritus Sanctus, qui secundum hoc dicitur mitti quod per caritatem mentem inhabitat.” *ST* III, q. 7, a. 13, c. This is a biblical term (Lk 11:13; 1 Cor 12:4–11, etc.) greatly developed by St. Thomas and his contemporaries: the Holy Spirit is the first gift and the *ratio* of all the

sage from Ezekiel 43:2, on the arrival of the glory of God in the temple, which makes the earth resplendent, Aquinas compares the relationship between the new divine presence within us and sanctifying grace, with that which exists between the sun and its light in the air: "Grace is caused in man by the presence of the divinity as light in the atmosphere by the presence of the sun."⁴⁴ Thus the Holy Spirit is the principle as agent that produces immediately grace and charity in the one in whom he dwells.

The explanation of the double priority between the created gift and the uncreated gift that Aquinas offers in the *Scriptum*, as well as being more explicit than in the *Summa*, allows us to appreciate much more the influence of the *Summa Halensis*. The question "what is given first?"⁴⁵ which dominates this first *quaestiuncula*, is certainly pertinent because—as we have seen in the parallel passage in the *Summa*—on one hand, we say that it is through the Holy Spirit that the created gifts are given, since he has the *ratio* of the first gift.⁴⁶ But, on the other hand, the created gifts dispose us to possess the Holy Spirit and all disposition is prior to the form for which it is prepared.⁴⁷ Although these two affirmations appear to contradict each other, in his brief reply, the young bachelor of the Sentences will manage to show how, in reality, they are mutually complementary and enriching. A synoptic presentation of the Thomas's treatment along with that, offered a few years earlier, by John of La Rochelle, will permit us to better appreciate his originality within the continuity of a common teaching:

other gifts of God. Cf. *In I Sent.* d. 18, a. 3; *ST I*, q. 38, a. 2, c.

⁴⁴ "Gratia enim causatur in homine ex praesentia divinitatis, sicut lumen in aere ex praesentia solis." *ST III*, q. 7, a. 13, c.

⁴⁵ "Ulterius quaeritur circa hoc, si utrumque datur, quid per prius datur." *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, qc. 2.

⁴⁶ "Et videtur quod Spiritus Sanctus: quia per ipsum dantur alia, et quia habet rationem primi doni." *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ "Sed e contrario videtur quod dona per prius. Quia dona ipsius disponunt nos ad hoc quod ipsum habeamus. Dispositio autem prior est eo ad quod disponit. Ergo etc." *Ibid.*, sc.

SH I, n° 511, II, resp.	In I Sent. d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, qc. 2, c.
Given that we are investigating which gift is understood as given anteriorly to the soul, that is, the Holy Spirit or grace: it has to be said that according to the comparison of the gift to the one from whom it is given, it is understood that in the first place the Holy Spirit is given because the Holy Spirit proceeds firstly from the Father to the soul . . . But according to the comparison of the gift to whom it is given, grace is understood as primary, as grace disposes the soul and then comes the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit. Hence that which was first in the order of intelligence on the part of it being conferred by God, is posterior on the part of the soul who receives it.⁴⁸	The order of some things according to nature can be doubly considered: on the part of the recipient or the material; and thus the disposition is anterior to that for which it is disposed; and thus we receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit before we receive the Holy Spirit Himself, because by these received gifts we are assimilated to the Holy Spirit; or on the part of the agent and the end; and thus that which is closest to the agent and the end, is said to be anterior; and thus we receive the Holy Spirit anteriorly to his gifts, as with the Son, who through his love gives us the other gifts. And this is to be anterior absolutely.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ "Cum ergo quaeritur cuiusmodi donum intelligatur per prius dari animae, scilicet Spiritus Sanctus vel gratia: dicendum quod secundum comparationem doni ad illud a quo datur, prius intelligitur dari Spiritus Sanctus, quia prius procedit a Patre Spiritus Sanctus ad animam . . . Secundum vero comparationem doni ad illud cui

From the double reference of the gift both to the giver and to the beneficiary, Master John distinguishes two different registers in considering the giving of the Holy Spirit and sanctifying grace. The first register is that which understands this giving by comparison to the one who is its eternal origin, that is to say, on the part of God who confers both gifts. In this mode we say that the Holy Spirit is anterior because he proceeds from the Father to the soul before the gift of grace. Thus we can say that this priority is given by mere proximity or nearness with respect to origin. If we bear in mind, moreover, that which proceeds first is the cause of that which follows, we will be able to recognize here, at least, the order of efficient causality. But this datum is not made explicit in the text. The second register is that which understands the said giving by reference to the beneficiary, that is, on the part of the soul that receives both one and the other gift. This is, without doubt, the order of material causality. Thus we say that the gift of sanctifying grace is anterior, which disposes the soul so that it may be able to receive the Holy Spirit.

In the conclusion of his argument, the Franciscan master confirms the implied paradox in the fact that the gift is anterior on the part of God who confers it, and posterior on the part of the soul that receives it. On doing this, he emphasizes something that, in reality, is present throughout the argument, and is what he really wishes to investigate, that is, the order according to the intelligence. If we attentively read the passage with this purpose in mind, we can confirm that the expression “is understood” at the beginning of the argument, in the explanation from order on the part of God, and in the corresponding argument from order on the part of the soul, is not casual. On the part of the soul, the uncreated gift is posterior in the same order of intelligence in that this gift is first on the part of God.

datur primo intelligitur gratia, quae est sicut disponens animam et deinde Spiritus Sanctus inhabitans. Unde illud quod erat prius in ordine intelligentiae ex parte Dei in conferendo, posterius est ex parte animae in recipiendo.”

⁴⁹ “Ordo aliquorum secundum naturam potest dupliciter considerari. Aut ex parte recipientis vel materiae; et sic dispositio est prior quam id ad quod disponit: et sic per prius recipimus dona Spiritus Sancti quam ipsum Spiritum, quia per ipsa dona recepta Spiritui Sancto assimilamur. Aut ex parte agentis et finis; et sic quod propinquius erit fini et agenti, dicitur esse prius: et ita per prius recipimus Spiritum

Finally, this distinction of registers or perspectives that the *Summa Halensis* offers allows us to affirm a certain priority of created grace without negating its dependence on uncreated grace, always understanding that the order according to which this priority is affirmed, does not presuppose temporality or succession. In fact, a little farther above, in stating the question, Master John notes with precision that a certain priority of nature is referred to, and that this priority is linked to that which apprehended on the part of intelligence, because it is a priority that human reason can grasp or distinguish, even when the gift of the spirit and the gift of sanctifying grace are given simultaneously: Master John says, “And I speak of the priority of nature according to the ratio of intelligence, not of [the priority] of time, because it is the case that [these gifts] are simultaneous in time.”⁵⁰

In the parallel argument of the *Scriptum* are mentioned “some elements” that are disposed according to a certain order. This means those ontological components involved in this donation: the rational creature, the Holy Spirit, and sanctifying grace.⁵¹ The first two are of the substantial order and the third is an accident of the genus of quality. The first relates to the two others as the recipient relates to that which is received. As Master John does in the setting of this same question, St. Thomas notes here, with a brief and concise affirmation, that the Holy Spirit and sanctifying grace are received in the rational creature according to an order that is not temporal but according to nature, and that this takes place in two distinct modes. There exists, therefore, two orders of anteriority and posteriority according to the nature between the gift uncreated and the created gift. Immediately afterward, he describes both orders in turn, in an inverse order to the description offered in the parallel text of the *Summa Halensis*.

When we say that by the created gift of sanctifying grace the Holy Spirit is given to us, we consider the material, more exactly, the recipient by whom both gifts are received, that is, the subject who is the rational

Sanctum quam dona ejus, quia et Filius per amorem suum alia nobis donavit. Et hoc est simpliciter esse prius.” Cf. Emery, *Théologie trinitaire*, 303–8.

⁵⁰ “Et loquor de prioritate naturae quae est secundum rationem intelligentiae, non temporis, quia constat quod simul sunt tempore.” *SH* I, n. 511, II, resp.; cf. Primeau, “Doctrina Summae Theologicae,” 50–51.

⁵¹ Master John had denoted them with great precision. See *SH* III, n. 610, ad 5.

creature. In this register, the created gift is presented as a disposition of the subject and the uncreated gift as the form to which that created gift disposes.⁵² Therefore the contrary argument that Aquinas offers in this question holds true, because that which disposes the subject to the action of the agent is anterior to the form that results from the said action.⁵³ We have, then, in this part of the reply, a clarification of what John was trying to explain, in the parallel passage, with the comparison of the gift to the soul that benefits from it: it deals with a comparison between the form, the Holy Spirit, with the material *in qua*, the rational creature, made possible by the disposition that is sanctifying grace.

According to Master John, when we talk about the charity that has been poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, we are talking about the priority considered on the part of God who confers both gifts. In his description of this new order according to nature, St. Thomas makes clear that the same order is taken on the part of the agent and the end. In effect, from this perspective the uncreated gift has priority, because the dispensation of the created gifts is ordered to him as to its end, and because he himself influences, as a mediating cause since he is the love by which this dispensation takes place. Rightly, referring to this mediating influence,

⁵² Explaining the quasi-formal causality of the uncreated gift by analogy with that of the divine essence in the beatific vision, Rahner loses sight of the proper value of this order of priority. Karl Rahner, "Zur scholastischen Begrifflichkeit der ungeschaffenen Gnade," in *Schriften zur Theologie*, vol. 1 (Einsiedeln: Benzinger Verlag, 1954), 347–75, esp. 369ff. The causality of the created gift on the uncreated is not causative but dispositive. Consequently, no contradiction exists between the teaching of the medieval masters on one hand and that of the sacred Scriptures and the Fathers on the other, as far as the order of priority goes between the two gifts (*ibid.*, 354–56), but a difference in the perspective from which the comparison between them is considered. Rahner's opinion finds vigorous support in the teaching of Matthias J. Scheeben. Cf. François Bourassa, "Les missions divines et le surnaturel chez saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 1 (1948): 41–98, esp. 49–50.

⁵³ "Sed e contrario videtur quod dona per prius. Quia dona ipsius disponunt nos ad hoc quod ipsum habeamus. Dispositio autem prior est eo ad quod disponit. Ergo et cetera." *In I Sent.* d. 14, q. 2, a. 1, qc. 2, sc. As we can see, St. Thomas is far from undoing the doctrine of the created habit as a disposing medium developed by the Franciscan masters. See the contrary opinion of Pedro U. López de Meneses, *Theosis: La doctrina de la divinización en las tradiciones cristianas: Fundamentos para una teología ecuménica de la gracia* (Navarra: Universidad de Navarra, 2001), 184–85. For this author, Aquinas opts decidedly for a description of a descending type of divinization.

he adds that the Son has given us all the other gifts through his love, which is the Holy Spirit.

At the conclusion of his argument, Aquinas resolves the paradox that Master John had placed at the end of his own argument. He clarifies that, if under one aspect, the created gift of grace has priority, absolutely speaking the uncreated gift is anterior. Therefore the priority assigned to the created gift over the uncreated gift is nothing more than relative, restricted to a particular consideration, because the disposition is, in the last analysis, an effect of divine action.⁵⁴

We can confirm, then, that we have in these brief and apparently simple explanations, a notable crossover of orders: one that is absolutely excluded, the order of time; two that are linked intimately: the order of nature and the order of intelligence; and two that are inverse: the order of efficient causality and that of material causality. The philosophical foundation for both medieval masters is the same; that is, the doctrine of “principle,” and the doctrine of order and of its modes, which Aristotle offers, particularly in Book V of the *Metaphysics*.

Nevertheless, order according to intelligence, which is structural in the explanation of Master John, is mentioned by Aquinas neither in the *Summa* nor the *Scriptum*. As noted in the above synoptic table, this is not the only differentiating element. With reference to the end, the explicit indication of the priority *simpliciter* of the uncreated gift is not found either in the *Summa Halensis* nor the *Summa*. Moreover, the reference to the Holy Spirit as form, particularly developed in the treaty on grace in the *Summa Halensis*,⁵⁵ is more explicit in the passage on the *Scriptum* than in that of the *Summa*. Finally, to indicate the anteriority of the Holy Spirit over created grace, Master John only says that it proceeds. In the *Summa*, St. Thomas presents it as a beginning of created grace without adding any other specification. But in the *Scriptum* he refers to both aspects. In effect, on one side, in the line of what is said in the *Summa Halensis*, he affirms that the Spirit is closer to the agent; on the other, in the

⁵⁴ Emery, *Théologie trinitaire*, 305, appropriately notes: “du côté de notre assimilation au Saint-Esprit suivant les conditions de notre nature humaine, la grâce créée est première, au titre de la priorité d’une disposition. Mais du côté de l’Auteur de la grâce (l’agent) et du côté de ce à quoi la grâce dispose (recevoir le Saint-Esprit en personne: la fin), le don du Saint-Esprit lui-même est absolument premier.”

⁵⁵ See esp. *SH* III, n. 609, sol. 1.

line of what is said in the *Summa*, he emphasizes the middle influence of the Holy Spirit.

The original resource of the theory of the *relatio rationis* permitted St. Thomas to complete the doctrine of Master John on the Holy Spirit as “fruit” and thus show, with greater profundity, that the Holy Spirit is really present in the rational creature. Moreover, the doctrine of the different orders of priority applied to explaining the relation of the Holy Spirit to the created gift, which he finds developed in Master John, permits him to better show *how* this new presence takes place. Reuniting both themes in one explanation we can say that, by the disposition of sanctifying grace operated by the Holy Spirit, there arises in the rational creatures a relation that has its terminus in the Holy Spirit himself, considered as form. If this relation is real, because it brings about a change in the rational creature, the inverse relation is by reason, because its subject, the Holy Spirit, is not modified by it; and while the first relation is the possession of the Holy Spirit in order to be enjoyed, the second is his inhabitation, his invisible mission and his donation.

The Love of God Poured into Our Hearts by the Uncreated Gift

In this study I have proposed a more profound analysis of the doctrine of St. Thomas on the communication of the created gift of grace and the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit to the soul of the saint, a communication that, being simultaneous, admits a certain order and includes diverse modes or types of order. Embracing and completing the teaching of the *Summa Halensis* on the giving of the Holy Spirit, Aquinas explains in his commentary on distinction 14 of the first book of the *Sentences*, that the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit constitutive of his invisible mission and his inhabitation, is the inverse relation to that which takes place in the soul of the just toward the Holy Spirit, by which we say that he possesses and enjoys him. This relation of possession is real, because it realizes a change in the rational creature, that is, the modification that takes place in the soul by the reception of the created gift. But the relation of donation or inhabitation is a relation of reason, because it is conceived by our mind due to the inverse relation, without it registering any change in its subject, the Holy Spirit.

Master John of La Rochelle taught in the *Summa Halensis* that the

giving of the Holy Spirit has its terminus in the Holy Spirit himself and not in his gifts. St. Thomas completes this affirmation, applying to it the doctrine of temporal procession as a *relatio rationis*. The real relation of possession has its origin in the reception of the created gifts but does not terminate in them; it tends subsequently toward the Holy Spirit himself. By this we can say not only that we possess the created gifts but also the uncreated gift; the former for use and the latter for enjoyment. For this same reason, we can say that they proceed in us; that is not simply the created gifts, but also the uncreated gift; and in affirming this we are doing nothing other than insisting on the same thing, but considering it from the inverse relation.

In this way, the argument by which Master John demonstrated the donation of the Holy Spirit along with his gifts having recourse to the notion of “fruit,” is completed by St. Thomas using the doctrine of the donation of the Holy Spirit as a relation of reason. From this doctrine he is able to explain, at the same time, the compatibility of the giving of the Holy Spirit with the divine simplicity and immutability, and the sufficiency of the infused virtue to achieve the conjunction with God, which is at the origin of this new presence.

Aquinas shows before that the created gifts by which is realized the giving of the Holy Spirit are those of grace and glory, because they give us access to imperfect and perfect enjoyment respectively. It is because they formally realize communion with God as end or beatitude, that these gifts give origin to the real relation of possession corresponding to the relation of reason, which is constitutive of the giving of the Holy Spirit.

Aquinas alludes here to a distinction of registers in the explanation of the conjoined donation of the created gift and the uncreated gift, which we find with a certain frequency in the *Summa Halensis*. The created gift appears, in the first place, as preceding the uncreated gift: it is by the use of the gift of grace that the just enjoys the gift of the Holy Spirit. But then, the proceeding person is presented as imprinting in the souls of the saints the gifts of sanctifying grace. It is the same change of register that we encounter at the end of the principal argument of the first *quaestiuncula* of article 1: thus, while we unite ourselves to the Holy Spirit through the created gifts, it is also he who assimilates us to himself through the said gifts.

Having demonstrated that the Holy Spirit himself is given with the

created gift, St. Thomas asks himself, in the second article of the said question, which of these gifts has priority? Like the order of the exposition of the material, the reply that he offers to this question is very similar to that which we find in the *Summa Halensis*. On one hand, Aquinas affirms, like John of La Rochelle, that the uncreated gift and the created gift are received according to an order of nature and not according to a temporal priority; on the other, he distinguishes in this order of nature two distinct modes. To point out these modes he has recourse to the distinction of registers already alluded to and he clarifies the distinction.

On the part of the *materia* or the receptive subject, which is the rational creature, the created gift is first, as it behaves with respect to the uncreated gift as the disposition with respect to the form, the first being always anterior to the second. This anteriority comprises a true and proper causality, as can be seen with total clarity in the text of the *Summa*. In effect, if sanctifying grace can be considered as anterior it is because the rational creature needs it, to be disposed to receive the Holy Spirit. Although the *Summa Halensis* abounds in explanations where sanctifying grace is compared to the Holy Spirit as the disposition to the form, its argument from the double order of priority is, on this point, less explicit than in the *Scriptum*.

On the part of the efficient and final cause, the uncreated gift is first, because the created gift is dispensed to be ordered to him and because he himself influences the said dispensation, as the love through which it is realized. In the text of the *Summa Halensis* this order was determined as a consideration on the part of God and the Holy Spirit; and the Holy Spirit was mentioned solely as the first one who proceeds. In the *Summa*, St. Thomas makes explicit that the Holy Spirit is the *principium* of the created gift, and in the *Scriptum* specifies that we are concerned here with a mediating causality and makes clear the role that the Holy Spirit fulfills as end.

Leaving implicit the order of intelligence that structures the argument of Master John, Aquinas emphasizes in the *Scriptum* the order of nature and the order of causality. Moreover, he resolves the paradox of the double order of priority between the created gift and the uncreated gift, advanced by the Franciscan Master, explaining that absolutely speaking the priority corresponds to the second, because the disposition is, in the final instance, an effect of divine action.

With this brief argument, St. Thomas deepens his teaching on the presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the just, explaining the way by which the uncreated gift relates to the created gift, by means of the application of the Aristotelian doctrine of different orders of priority, especially those corresponding to the four types of causes. The constitutive relation of this new presence of the Spirit is recognized, thus, from its foundation, the gift of grace that is compared to him as to its principle and as its terminus, in the way that the disposition is compared to the agent and to the form. Because of this we can say, with propriety and without contradiction, that the Holy Spirit is the unfailing fountain of sanctifying grace that disposes us to possess and enjoy the Holy Spirit himself. **N&V**