

ECCLESIASTICA XAVERIANA

ORGANO DE LAS FACULTADES ECLESIASTICAS
DE LA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATOLICA JAVERIANA

VOLUMEN VII - 1957

CONTENIDO:

SECCION TEOLÓGICA

Vicarious reparation in relation to devotion to the Sacred Heart.

CARL J. MOELL, S. J.

De valore argumenti patristici in theoria preecepti non rigorosi circa mortem Christi.

FERDINANDUS VELASQUEZ, S. J.

SECCION CANÓNICA

Diezmos y primicias.

LIBORIO RESTREPO, S. J.

SECCION CIENTÍFICA

Introducción a la historia de los terremotos colombianos.

JESUS E. RAMIREZ, S. J.

REVISTA DE LIBROS

CONSEJO DE REDACCION:

Por la Facultad de Teología: P. Carlos Bravo, S. J.

Por la Facultad de Derecho Canónico: P. Juan A. Eguren, S. J.

Por la Facultad de Filosofía: P. Jaime Vélez, S. J.

Por la parte de Ciencias: P. Hernán Posada, S. J.

DIRECTOR:

Guillermo González Quintana, S. J.

SUBDIRECTOR:

Enrique Herrera Gómez, S. J.

DIRECCION Y ADMINISTRACION:

Carrera 10 N° 65-48

Teléfonos: 49-44-34 y 49-56-00

Bogotá, D. E. - Colombia S. A.

Suscripción Ordinaria anual: \$ 6.00 (Exterior: U. S. \$ 3).

Suscripción de Benefactor anual: \$ 50.00 (Exterior: U. S. \$ 50).

VICARIOUS REPARATION IN RELATION TO DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

CARL J. MOELL, S. J.

INTRODUCTION

Sin and reparation are almost as old as the human race itself. Ever since Adam's disobedience, ours has been a fallen race — under the pressure of concupiscence and temptation adding personal sins to the sin of the race, yet ever seeking to expiate its crimes, to appease the just anger of an offended God, and thus reconciled to be received back into the lost friendship of God.

There is a mystery in the malice of sin, but a greater mystery in the redemptive love of God who sent His Son to be a propitiation for our sinful race — a mystery in His redemptive death on the cross and in our vital contact with that death through Mass and the sacraments, which enable us individually to expiate sin completely and to share once again the friendship of God's grace.

The reality of sin in our world and the pressing need of expiation for sin has never slipped far from the consciousness of man. For if the worldly-minded have ignored sin or tried to explain away its presence, the friends of God have been quick to redouble their efforts by word and by the example of their penitential lives to offer satisfaction to the offended justice of God even for others, and thus to appease God on behalf of sinful humanity. In the Old Testament we read of the men of God interposing themselves between God and sinful men in the spirit of vicarious reparation.

It is not because sin and reparation are new to our world that they are preached with such vigor today. Two factors have influenced this renewed emphasis.

The first factor is the modern expansion, and consequent «shrinking», of our world. With the development of modern inventions, of speedy communication and means of travel,

our world has became «one» in a way it has never been «one» before. Individual problems take on an international aspect. With two World Wars in less than fifty years, we are only too aware of the devastating worldwide consequences of sin, even in the temporal and material order.

The second factor is the modern increase in devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. The last hundred years —beginning with Pius IX's extension of the feast of the Sacred Heart to the entire Church in 1856 and extending to Pius XII's commemorative encyclical *Haurietis aquas* in 1956—can deservedly be called the century of the Sacred Heart. With this widespread propagation of devotion to the Sacred Heart it was inevitable that the call to consecration and reparation would be answered by the devout faithful who see in the Sacred Heart of Jesus the sign of our salvation, and in the devotion to His Heart an extraordinary remedy for the extraordinary evils of modern times. The worldwide proportions of sin would now be counterbalanced by worldwide reparation to the Sacred Heart of Him who «is a propitiation for our sins, not for ours only but also for those of the whole world» (1 Jn 2: 2).

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the theological meaning of reparation, especially of vicarious reparation in the sense of reparation or expiation made by one man for the sins of others. Such vicarious reparation is but one phase of the general problem of reparation for sin. Since in the present supernatural economy the basis of all reparation possible to men is the «vicarious reparation» offered by Christ for the sins of all men (objective redemption), it is only by union with Christ that men are able to apply the effects of Christ's reparation to themselves individually and to their fellow-men (subjective redemption), and thus to repair their own sins and the sins of others. Christ's reparation is the basis of our reparation. But the object of this study is to determine the precise content of *our* reparation, i. e., what one man can do toward repairing the sins of others.

We will first study the meaning of reparation for sin in general, and then of reparation as it is practiced in devotion to the Sacred Heart. Our sources will be, of course, the documents of the *magisterium*, especially the Council of Trent

and the pronouncements of the recent popes on devotion to the Sacred Heart. It will be necessary to study the terminology used to express this atonement for sin, v. g., reparation, satisfaction, expiation, and then to determine the precise meaning attached to the words in the documents of the Church.

Schematically, the study is divided in this way: Chapter One, after presenting a preliminary investigation of the meaning of reparation and related words, summarizes the Church's teaching on sin and the vicarious reparation offered by Christ for the sins of all men.

Chapters Two and Three study in general man's reparation, based on his union with the reparation of Christ, and especially the reparation offered by one man for the sins of others. Chapter Two does this from a theocentric point of view, for sin is above all an offense to the divine majesty of God. Chapter Three does this from a Christocentric point of view, for in our present supernatural order sin has the added malice of rejecting Christ's redemption.

Finally in Chapter Four this teaching on theocentric and Christocentric reparation is studied as it is found in devotion to the Sacred Heart, i. e., in the public cult approved by the Church. Here we see the importance of reparation in the mind of the recent popes, especially Pius XI and Pius XII.

Our special task, therefore, is to determine the meaning and content of reparation as it is found and practiced today in the public cult which the Church renders to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

CHAPTER ONE

SIN AND REPARATION

A man is said to make reparation for sin, his own or the sins of others, when he performs certain actions which he intends to contribute in some way to the destruction or removal of sin in himself or others. Hence we must first analyze sin, since it is sin and its effects which we seek to

repair. We must have at least a preliminary working knowledge of the terminology used to express this reparation. And finally, we must study the vicarious reparation for sin offered by Christ, for Christ's reparation is the basis, source, and exemplar of all our reparation.

I. SIN

A. DEFINITION

Sin (1) in its most general sense is an evil of some kind with reference to an action, and hence the privation of some good. In this general sense there are several types of sin: *peccatum naturæ* —a natural defect, such as a limp in walking; *peccatum artis*— an artistic defect, such as the inability to write legibly; *peccatum voluntatis* —a defect in the will, a freely willed moral evil. Only the last is sin in the strict sense.

General definition of sin in the strict sense: Sin is a *voluntary deordination in the moral order* (2).

1) Sin is a *deordination*. Deordination includes both acts and states. Sin, found primarily in an act, is also in the state which results from the act. Every act that does not attain its proper end is an evil act.

2) Sin is a *deordination in the moral order*. In sin in the strict sense there is always question of a lack of conformity to the norm of morality.

3) Sin is *voluntary*, because it is in the moral order. Morality always implies a relation to the will.

Sin may also be defined more simply as a morally evil act or state. Sin is primarily an evil *act*, but also the *effect* of an evil act. It is *evil*, because it is a denial of the proper

(1) For the entire section on sin, cf. Ludovicus Billot, S. J., *De personali et originali peccato*, ed. 6; Josephus F. Sagüés, S. J., *De peccatis*, STS, ed. 2; v. 2, nn. 814-821; Ludovicus Lercher, S. J., *Institutiones Theologicae Dogmaticæ*, ed. 4, v. 2, nn. 640-641; Charles Journet, «Le péché comme faute et comme offense», *Trouble et Lumière*, ECarm, 21-29; P. De Letter, S. J., «Offence against God», IER 87 (1957) 329-342.

(2) ST 1-2, 72, 1: «ad rationem peccati duo concurrunt: scilicet actus voluntarius; et inordinatio eius, quæ est per recessum a lege Dei». *De Malo*, 7, 3: «peccatum... importat actum malum moraliter». Cf. 2S 24, 3, 2.

order of human acts to their last end, God; it is *moral* because it involves liberty and a relation to man's final end or to the norm of morality.

However the definition of sin be worded, it must always include two elements: deordination and voluntariety.

B. DIVISIONS

Because it is either an act or a state, sin is divided, first of all, into *actual* sin (a morally evil act) and *habitual* sin (a morally evil state resulting from the morally evil act) (3). Formally habitual sin is a state of culpability and aversion from God on the part of the sinner.

Original sin is the morally evil state produced in all of his descendants by Adam as the result of his sin. *Personal* sin is a morally evil act or state produced in the person himself who performed the act.

Depending on the gravity of the morally evil act, sin may be *mortal* or *venial*.

Of these divisions our primary concern is personal sin and mortal sin, both actual and habitual, for it is personal mortal sin that most completely fulfills the definition of sin.

Since the concept of sin is analogous, the two notes of deordination and voluntariety are found in every sin according to an analogy of proper proportionality and attribution. The prime analogate is mortal sin which is perfect or complete in deordination, and perfect or complete in voluntariety.

Mortal sin is perfect or complete in deordination: a turning away from God as final end (formal element) and a turning toward a creature as to a final end (material element). Hence the very principle and foundation of the moral order, the final goal, is removed, and another is substituted. Once it is destroyed, the moral order itself is destroyed; hence its gravity. Mortal sin is also perfect or complete in voluntariety, because sufficient reflection and full consent are always found in every mortal sin.

(3) ST 1-2, 87, 6: «in peccato duo possunt considerari: scilicet actus culpeæ, et macula sequens. Planum est autem quod, cessante actu peccati, remanet reatus in omnibus peccatis actualibus». This *macula* is the habitual sin; cf. Billot, 5-6.

C. EFFECTS

Sin may be considered psychologically, morally, and theologically. The psychological consideration is omitted here.

I. Moral Consideration

Morally considered, sin produces a triple effect expressed by the terms: *reatus culpæ*, *reatus paenæ*, *reatus maculæ*. The word *reatus*, as it is used today, is primarily the effect of an actual sin left in the habitual sin. Originally the word meant a debt or obligation of undergoing accusation or blame.

1) *Reatus culpæ*: guilt. The guilt of an actual sin is the habitual sin itself, or the obligation resulting from the actual sin of undergoing the indignation of the one offended, and the further obligation of offering satisfaction. Guilt, being evil and worthy of hatred, is said to carry with it the obligation of bearing the *odium abominationis vel indignationis*, by which a person wishes another to be freed of some evil. In this sense, a person can hate himself because of his guilt, and in Sacred Scripture God is said to hate the sinner.

2) *Reatus paenæ*: punishment. The punishment of a sin is the obligation of undergoing the privation of some physical good or the infliction of pain which hinders physical good or well-being. A person who deprives another of some good inflicts evil on him and wishes this evil on him; in this sense he hates that person. This is an *odium inimicitiae*, if it is unjustifiable; or an *odium vindictæ*, if it is justifiable. The one punishing desires the punishment because of the order of justice.

3) *Reatus maculæ*: stain. In reality the stain of sin is the same as the guilt, but it differs in concept. It is properly a lack of beauty in the soul as a result of the guilt. Guilt is an habitual lack of ordination to God, man's last end; the stain is a lack of the same orientation to God, insofar as the ordination is the beauty and ornament of the soul.

2. Theological Consideration

Theologically sin can be considered in the order of pure nature or in the supernatural order. Sin is a turning away

from God; but this aversion from God is different in an order of pure nature and in a supernatural order. In the order of nature, sin would be a privation of natural justice or of right order to the final end of nature. In the supernatural order, sin is a voluntary privation of sanctifying grace by which man was formally constituted an adopted son of God. By sinning gravely the sinner for his part rejects grace, and consequently God no longer preserves it in the soul. Only sin in the supernatural order is treated here, for it is in that order that sin occurs and in that order that Christ offered His reparation for sin (4).

Revelation presents us with a picture of the manifold effects of sin in the present order, especially of original sin and mortal sin (5). Only those effects which directly follow from sin as a disorder and offense to God are mentioned here: 1) Sin is a loss of sanctifying grace; 2) Sin is an offense against God and entails the enmity and anger of God; 3) Sin brings upon man a debt of guilt and punishment.

The malice of sin will appear more clearly by considering the two parties involved in sin: God who is offended and man, the sinner (the sin of the angels is not considered here). In both cases sin is an evil: a *malum Dei* and a *malum hominis*.

a) Malice of Sin

Malum hominis. For man himself sin is a human evil in the moral order, formally and intrinsically opposed to the rule of nature and to rational nature as such. Hence it is rightly called an *actus turpis, in honestus*; for it degrades man and renders him worthy of contempt and disgrace. Sin is also an evil for man in the sufferings that follow upon it: physiological, psychic, moral, and social disorders.

(4) This is the ordinary meaning of considering sin *theologically*. Sometimes, however, the word *theological* is used in distinction to a *philosophical* consideration, i. e., sin can be considered philosophically as a human evil or as contrary to the order of reason, and theologically as an offense against God. But neither consideration completely excludes the other. Therefore, it is better to consider sin both theologically and philosophically as an offense against the divine law and against reason, in opposition to a purely philosophical consideration of sin as an offense against reason but not against the divine law. Cf. the condemnation of Alexander VIII, ES 1290; Sagüés, n. 849. The present consideration views sin especially as a deliberate transgression of the divine law, as an offense against God.

(5) Paulus Galtier, S. J., DIR, n. 448.

But sin has even worse effects in the supernatural order, for it destroys that order as far as it can: sanctifying grace, infused virtues, incorporation in Christ. The intrinsic nature of sin, as a *malum hominis*, is a turning away from the supreme, unchangeable Good and a turning toward a changeable, created good. The result is privation of grace, charity, and God Himself as object of friendship and beatitude.

From this viewpoint sin is *finite* and not absolutely, intrinsically infinite; although secondarily and indirectly it is infinite, because it has a relation to the infinite God (6).

Sin as an evil for man is a moral stain, an act of disobedience, a violation of the law inscribed in his true destiny. But the full malice of sin appears when we see it not merely as a disobedience to God's law, but for what it truly is —an *injury* and *offense* offered to the infinite God Himself.

Malum Dei. Sin is an evil for God, for sin is always —sometimes formally, at other times at least implicitly—*contempt of God*, directed against God under one or more of His many titles to man's submission: supreme Lawgiver, Creator, Lord, Redeemer, Judge, Friend.

Although it cannot touch God directly, sin of its very nature is destructive of God, for in choosing a finite good as last end sin does away with God as far as it can. Sin would, if that were possible, destroy God. This is the extrinsic effect of sin, the offense itself, insofar as it is related to God who is truly said to be injured and offended, not intrinsically, but in the light of a just moral estimation.

The malice of an offense increases with the dignity of the person offended, who in this case is infinite. Hence sin as an offense, an injustice, an injury, is in some sense *infinite* (7). Sin wrongs an infinite right and repels an infinite object *absolutely*. It is not sufficient just to «take God back» again as last end, but an infinite Person had to atone because an infinite Person had been defrauded of His right. Sin is so great that only the God-Man could condignly satisfy for it.

(6) St. Thomas, *De Malo*, 2, 9, ad 5: «a bono infinito aliquis avertitur actu finito; et ideo peccatum essentialiter finitum est, licet habeat aliquam habitudinem ad bonum infinitum».

(7) ST 3, 1, 2, ad 2: «peccatum contra Deum commissum quandam infinitatem habet ex infinitate divinae maiestate: tanto enim offensa est gravior, quanto maior est ille in quem delinquitur». Cf. *De Malo*, 2, 9, ad 5.

b) Offense against God

Sin is an *offense to God*, since the honor due to Him as the final end is denied Him. Moreover, sin is an *injury* in the strict sense, i. e., an offense against God's right of proprietorship over man, and not merely against His right as supreme Lawgiver (8).

That sin is an offense to God is evident whether sin is considered formally as entailing contempt of God, or whether sin is considered as directed against God Himself.

Sin does not deprive God intrinsically of any physical or moral good. Nor does it take from God even extrinsically anything that would render Him even morally less than He was (as happens in the case of a man to whom honor is denied). But God is not indifferent to the external glory and honor due to Him from His creatures. Nor does God take it lightly when this honor is denied or violated, and hence does not demand reparation. It is of faith that God is subjectively offended by sin and hence looks upon the sinner as His enemy until strict satisfaction has been given (9).

The offense to God involved in sin is indicated in the fonts of revelation when they speak of God as angry because of man's sin, as demanding victims of propitiation, as reconciling man to Himself through Christ, as forgiving sins. The metaphorical scriptural expressions express no change in God but only in man who by sin is worthy of anger and hate, and who by repentance becomes worthy again of love and forgiveness (10).

(8) Not all theologians admit this, v. g., Vasquez: sin is never a strict injury to God, because God is not intrinsically affected by sin; De Lugo: sin is only rarely a strict injury (cf. Galtier, DP, nn. 27, 29, for a refutation). For Suarez, sin always involves a strict injury; cf. *Opera Omnia*, 22: DP, disp. 2, s. 3, n. 6; 11: Opusc. VI: *Disputatio de Justitia Dei*, s. 3, nn. 9, 11-12.

(9) Pius XII in HG warned against recent attempts to pervert the concept of sin as a real offense against God for which Christ offered satisfaction in strict justice; AAS 42 (1950) 570: «peccati originalis notio, definitionibus tridentinis posthabitis, pervertitur, unaque simul peccati in universum, prout est Dei offensa, itemque satisfactionis a Christo pro nobis exhibite» (ES 3018).

(10) C. Araus. II (ES 174): «per offensam prævaricationis Adæ»; C. Trid., Sess. 5 (ES 788): «incurrisseque per offensam prævaricationis huiusmodi iram et indignationem Dei», Sess. 14, c. 8 (ES 904): «velut iniurit et contumeliosi Spiritui Sancti»; Leo XIII, TF, ASS 33:275: «unigenitus Filius Dei, factus homo, violato Patris numini cumulatissime pro hominibus uberrimeque satisfecit... continuo quievere cœlestes iræ; conturbato... hominum generi Dei reconciliata voluntas».

Summary: Sin displeases God, for it is opposed to His goodness. Sin is an act which God must resent, for it is a transgression of His command and denies Him the honor due to Him from a rational creature. Hence God prohibits sin under penalty of guilt and punishment. According to the common estimation of men, no more is needed to have a real offense. Since all honor is due to the final end, to be freely given by rational creatures, God surely must take ill the free denial of this honor, and hence demand satisfaction for it.

II. REPARATION

The salvific work of Christ has as its essential purpose to re-establish the rights of God overthrown by sin, to repair the damage caused to man by sin, and to reconcile once again man the offender to God the Offended. This idea has been expressed at various times by different words with different shades of meaning and emphasis: ransom, redemption, expiation, satisfaction, reparation. Even today there is no one term used exclusively by theologians or by the Church in her official pronouncements. Pius XI in the encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* uses reparation, expiation and satisfaction, at times with no appreciable difference of meaning (11). It will be necessary, therefore, to study the more important of these terms.

A. REDEMPTION

Redemption from sin was sometimes designated as the payment of a ransom, since by sin man fell into a triple slavery to sin, death and the devil. In biblical usage the word *redemption* means primarily freedom procured through payment of a price; secondarily it means simply liberation. This is St. Thomas' meaning when he says that Christ's passion effected our salvation by way of redemption (12). Hence, redemption comes to mean freedom from the state

(11) Enrico Agostini, S. C. J., *Il Cuore di Gesù*, 185. Cf. the title of MR: «de communi expiatione SS. Cordi Iesu debita» (AAS 20 (1928) 165), and the introductory paragraphs: «de honestæ, quæ dicitur, satisfactionis officio» (166). Later Pius XI says: «honestæ satisfactionis... seu reparacionis, quam dicunt, officium Sacratissimo Cordi Iesu præstandum», and again: «quod quidem debitum reparationem vulgato nomine vocamus» (169).

(12) ST 3, 48, 6, ad 3; cf. 3, 48; 4-5.

of injustice brought on by sin and restoration to the state of justice and friendship with God.

Finally, in its fullest sense redemption means the liberation of the human race from the state of perversion into which it had fallen as the result of Adam's sin and its own sins. In this meaning many aspects of sin and reparation are included. A more generic word is *salvation*, which embraces not only our reconciliation with God and restoration to grace, but our education to a life of holiness through the example and teaching of Christ (13). The aspects of redemption considered here are those that concern sin as an offense to God and a moral disorder involving the double *reatus* of guilt and punishment.

B. EXPIATION AND PROPITIATION

The word *expiation* derives from the Latin *piare*, to placate the divine wrath by a sacrifice; hence *piaculum*, a means for placating the divinity (14).

Expiation is the act of enduring the full penalty of a wrong or crime. To expiate sin means properly to repair sin not by merely covering it over but by actually effacing or removing it, and thus to render God propitious (15). The ideas of expiation and propitiation, expressed by the same word in Greek, are related ideas, for God is not appeased or rendered propitious unless sin is expiated, and the same redemptive act produces the double effect of expiation and propitiation.

Although sacrifice is not mentioned, neither is it excluded, and the Old Testament sacrifices actually had this double effect. In the New Testament Christ is a victim of expiation and propitiation, whose final effect is reconciliation of the sinner with God (16).

(13) Galtier, DIR, nn. 447-448; cf. H. Lesêtre, «Rédemption», DB 5/1: 1007-1016; Ferdinand Prat, S. J., *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, ed. 38, 1:507-508.

(14) «Espiazione», DTD, 121.

(15) Compare the definitions of expiation given in EC and DTD. The first focuses on the element of removing sin: «l'atto, con cui si ripara... l'offesa e il torto recati alla divinità con il peccato» (EC 5:607); the other focuses on placating God: «l'atto con cui l'uomo cerca di placare l'ira divina determinata da un peccato, da un' offesa, e di propiziare di nuovo il favore celeste, assoggettandosi a una pena». (DTD 121-122). Both elements are present in each definition, but there is a difference of viewpoint.

(16) Prat, Note E., «Propitiation, Expiation, Rédemption»; 1:504-508; cf. Prosper Hartmann, S. C. J., *Le Sens Plénier de la Réparation du Péché*, 25-58; A. Médébielle, «Expiation», SDB, 3:1-262.

C. SATISFACTION

The word *satisfaction* has several different, though somewhat related meanings. It is sometimes used for the fulfillment of a desire or expectation, with no connotation of a debt to be paid (indemnification of a creditor) or of an injury to be repaired (satisfaction for moral guilt). Satisfaction is sometimes used for the payment of any material debt, the satisfaction of a creditor. But more often it is used with reference to moral guilt, and this in one of two ways. If the moral fault is only an apparent or supposed wrong, falsely imputed to an innocent person, satisfaction comes to mean a defense or proof of innocence. If there is guilt due to a real moral fault, satisfaction means compensation for the injury inflicted on the other person, i. e., expiation for the crime (17).

As used by the Church in her official teaching and by the theologians in explaining the teachings of faith, satisfaction has different meanings (18). Omitting the very general sense of reparation for every injury, whether material or personal, we may group the theological meanings of satisfaction under two headings: satisfaction in a strictly theological sense as used in the treatise on soteriology, and satisfaction in a juridical sense as used in the treatise on the sacrament of penance (19).

1. Theological Meaning

Satisfaction in the strictly theological sense is reparation for the injury or offense offered to God by sin, and is sometimes called expiation. In this sense Christ by His passion and death satisfied for our sins (20).

(17) For a complete study of the word *satisfaction*, cf. August Denefle, S. J., «Das Wort *satisfaction*», ZKT 43 (1919) 158-175.

(18) For a history of the word *satisfaction* and its various meanings in the course of the Church's history, cf. P. Galtier, S. J., «Satisfaction», DTC; 14/1: 1129-1210, esp. 1131-1190.

(19) L. Richard, «Sens théologique du mot *satisfaction*», RevSR 7 (1927) 87-93, stresses the differences rather than the similarities. Cf. the two treatises in the manuals.

(20) Cf. C. Trid., Sess. 6, c. 7 (ES 799), Sess. 14, c. 8 (ES 904). Of the Vatican Council's *Schema constitutionis dogmaticæ de doctrina catholica*, which was discussed but not enacted because of the untimely termination of the Council, one of the annotations reads: «Christus ipse voluntate etiam humana vadem se constituit coram Deo ad satisfaciendum Deo offenso pro culpa et pena totius humani generis» (CL, 7:543, note 333; cf. entire c. 15, p. 515). Cf. also CL, 7:561, 566; and Leo XIII quoted in note 10 above.

Once a sin has been committed the sinner is bound first of all to retract his sinful intention and then to offer suitable satisfaction. Since sin involves a double obligation —of guilt, *reatus culpæ*, because of the personal offense to God in every sin; and of punishment, *reatus pœnæ*, because every sin is also a violation of the divine law —satisfaction is payment or rather compensation for both of these debts (21).

St. Thomas described satisfaction both with respect to the *culpa* (22) and with respect to the *pœna* (23). Moreover, he joins in his explication two seemingly opposed definitions of satisfaction, one referring to past sins and the other to avoidance of future sins (24).

Not all authors speak of satisfaction in exactly the same way. Sometimes formal expiation of sin is stressed, and the virtue of justice predominates. Sometimes formal compensation for the offense given to God is stressed, and the idea of the virtue of religion predominates. The full Catholic doctrine of satisfaction includes both elements (25).

2. Juridical Meaning

Satisfaction in its narrowest, juridical, sense is compensation for the temporal punishment still due to sin after the guilt and the eternal punishment has been forgiven. This compensation can be made in two ways: 1) by suffering punishments which God inflicts in this world or in purgatory

(21) Galtier, DIR, nn. 485-486; DP, n. 483; cf. Roman Catechism, 2, 5, 62: «satisfactio nihil aliud est, quam iniuriae alteri illatae compensatio».

(22) ST 3, 48, 2: «ille proprie satisfacit pro offensa qui exhibet offenso id quod seque vel magis diligit quam oderit offensam. Christus autem, ex caritate et obedientia patiendo, maius aliquid Deo exhibuit quam exigeret recompensatio totius offensæ humani generis».

(23) ST 1-2, 87, 6: «Actus enim peccati facit hominem reum pœnæ, inquantum transgreditur ordinem divinæ iustitiae; ad quem non redit nisi per quandam recompensationem pœnæ, quæ ad æqualitatem iustitiae reducit...».

(24) The first: «injuriae illatae recompensatio secundum justitiae æqualitatem»; the second: «causas peccatorum excidere, nec earum suggestionibus aditum indulgere». St. Thomas explains, 4S 15, 1, 1, sol. 3 (ST Sup. 12, 3): «iustitia non ad hoc tantum tendit, ut inæqualitatem præcedentem auferat, puniendo culparum præteritam, sed etiam ut in futurum æqualitatem custodiat, quia secundum Philosophum... 'pœnæ medicinae sunt'. Unde et satisfactio quæ est iustitiae actus pœnam inferentis, est medicina, curans peccata præterita et præseverans a futuris. Et ideo quando homo homini satisfacit, et præterita recompensat, et a futuris cavet... Et ideo in satisfactionis definitione duo ponit: scilicet abscisionem causarum quantum ad primum, et remittentiam liberi arbitrii ad ipsum peccatum quantum ad secundum». Cf. Deneffe, 172-173; Joseph Lécuyer, C. S. Sp., «Note sur une définition Thomiste de la satisfaction», DC 8 (1955) 21-30.

(25) Cf. Galtier, DIR, nn. 484-488.

(and this is sometimes called *satispassio*), 2) by freely inflicting on oneself some painful work which God accepts in compensation for the punishment which was to be inflicted (and this is *satisfactio* in its strictest and proper meaning). Satisfaction, therefore, comes to mean: compensation for the temporal punishment due to forgiven sin by penitential works freely undertaken (26). Trent speaks of this satisfaction in its sessions on justification and the sacrament of penance (27). Man's satisfaction (for the temporal punishment due to forgiven sin) depends for its efficacy upon Christ's satisfaction (for both *culpa* and *pæna*) for the sins of all men (28).

Satisfaction is widely used in the documents of the Church. The doctrine of Christ's vicarious satisfaction expresses in the mind of the Church not the whole of, but an important aspect of, our redemption. Satisfaction in the juridical sense has come to have the very precise meaning just described (29).

D. REPARATION

Not all theologians are completely satisfied with the word satisfaction and seek a more comprehensive term, such as reparation. Satisfaction focuses on God, who is offended by sin and to whom compensation is offered. But the effects of this satisfaction in man —forgiveness of the guilt and restoration to grace— are not sufficiently stressed. Satisfaction takes sin as the starting point, whereas in the work of redemption the initiative comes from God, and hence the explanation should begin with God who «so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son» (Jn 3: 16), God who «has first loved us, and sent his Son a propitiation for our sins» (1 Jn 4:10) (30).

(26) Lercher, 4/2 pars altera, n. 578. Usually, however, *satispassio* is reserved for the sufferings in purgatory or for enforced sufferings in this life which are not willingly accepted, such as a man suffering a prison sentence. Cf. CG 3:158.

(27) Cf. Sess. 6, c. 14 and can. 30 (ES 807, 840), Sess. 14, cc. 8-9 and can. 3 (ES 904, 906, 923).

(28) Cf. *id.*, Sess. 14, c. 8 (ES 904).

(29) «Compensatio pœnae temporalis ob iniuriam Deo per peccatum illatam debite» or «voluntaria perpessio pœnae temporalis ad reparandam iniuriam Deo per peccatum illatam». Lercher, 4/2 pars altera, n. 578; González Rivas, STS, 4, n. 168.

(30) Cf. Agostini, 186.

1. Reparation as used by the Church

Like satisfaction, reparation is also widely used by the Church (31). The liturgy, especially, offers many examples (32). The word *reparation* is used by the Church to denote man's redemption from sin, but its meaning is not always so precise. In its broadest meaning it is practically synonymous with redemption in the wide sense (33), and hence refers at times to Christ's redemptive work, at other times to our reception of Christ's redemption.

2. Description of Reparation

Reparation, according to the description of Agostini (34), implies: 1) a loss, a destruction or a damage (partial or total); 2) a return, a restoration or compensation (partial or total) of the object which was lost, destroyed or damaged. Hence reparation comes to mean: a restoration or reconstruction (chiefly in the physical order) and a compensation or satisfaction (in the moral order). In fact, the injurious act cannot be cancelled or undone, it can only be compensated for by a contrary act. If this compensation is completely and fully acceptable to the one offended it is called satisfaction. The idea of reconstruction (chiefly in the physical order) is also used in the moral. Complete reparation demands the re-establishment of the thing to its primitive state, a return to the normal relations of friendship, in brief a *restitutio in integrum*. This is the full meaning on both the physical and moral planes.

(31) Pope St. Leo I, Ep. 108 (ES 146): «per poenitentiae medicinam spes vitæ reparetur æternæ»; C. Araus. II (ES 194): «(ut) natura per Adam perdita per illum [Christum] repararetur»; C. Trid., Sess. 6, c. 14 (ES 807): «Hic enim iustificationis modus est lapis reparatio...».

(32) Postcommunion, Ember Saturday of Advent and on February 2: «ut sacrosancta mysteria, quæ pro reparationis nostræ munimine, contulisti»; postcommunion on December 8: «illius in nobis culpæ vulnæ reparant»; second responsorium at Matins during Christmas octave: «dies... reparationis antiquæ»; feast of the Holy Family, lesson 4 at Matins: «Misericors Deus cum humanae reparationis opus... perficere decrevisset...».

(33) Compare the postcommunion for the fourth Sunday of Advent: «ut reparationis nostræ ventura sollemnia», and the collect for Ember Wednesday of Advent: «ut redemptionis nostræ ventura sollemnis». Lercher uses reparation in this wide sense, v. g., «Reparatio (redemptio) objectiva... Reparatio (redemptio) subjectiva...» (3, n. 3). P. Démann, «L'Idee de la Réparation», VS 86 (1952) 60f, says reparation is almost the same as redemption in the wide sense.

(34) Agostini, 192.

This *restitutio in integrum* is perhaps better expressed by reparation than by satisfaction. Satisfaction of its nature considers only the person offended, and indicates the pleasure produced in the creditor by the completeness of the compensation offered.

Reparation is more complete and comprehensive. It includes the aim intended also in the restored order. It expresses exhaustively both negatively (cancellation of the effects of the injurious act) and positively (restoration of the violated order, reconciliation) the complete work to be undertaken whenever the rights of another have been violated in any way in the moral-juridical order.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the theological meaning and content of reparation as used by the Church in reference to our acts of reparation. We must begin with a preliminary description not yet completely developed in all details. For we want to leave the way open to include in reparation whatever the Church wishes to be included. At times reparation may refer to atonement for the temporal punishment (satisfaction in the juridical sense). But usually the recent popes in speaking of reparation, especially in connection with devotion to the Sacred Heart, include much more. Our preliminary description is broad enough to include everything that we can do to atone for sin. This, as we shall see, is the object of the virtue of penance —*jus divinum reparandum*.

3. Divisions (35)

a) The first division of reparation in the wide sense has already been mentioned: *objective* redemption, Christ's vicarious satisfaction or reparation for the sins of all men; and *subjective* redemption, the application of the fruits of Christ's redemption to individual men. The last part of this chapter summarizes the doctrine of objective redemption. The rest of the study concerns subjective redemption.

b) *Condign* and *congruous*. Satisfaction or reparation is said to be condign when the moral value of the good work is equal to the offense. The equality is to be judged qualitatively rather than quantitatively. It is the dignity and moral

(35) Cf. Agostini, 206-208 and cc. 5-6.

dispositions of the one making reparation that confers value on his works. Hence Christ's reparation for men was condign and superabundant.

Satisfaction or reparation is said to be congruous when the moral value of the good work is not objectively equal to the offense, but the creditor, because of his goodness, accepts it as adequate reparation.

c) *Personal* and *vicarious*. Personal reparation is the reparation offered by the sinner for his own sins. Vicarious reparation is the reparation offered by another in the name of the sinner. Christ's reparation was vicarious, offered for the sins of all men. In the application of the benefits of Christ's reparation, each individual person must co-operate with Christ in order to offer reparation for his own individual sins: this is personal reparation. But each individual can also help to offer reparation for the sins of others: this is vicarious reparation as intended here.

d) *Theocentric* reparation is reparation offered to God, the Blessed Trinity (or by appropriation to God the Father) by Christ and by men in union with Christ. *Christocentric* reparation is reparation directed to Christ our Redeemer in so far as sin in the present economy involves a rejection of Christ's redemption.

E. VICARIOUS REPARATION OR SATISFACTION (36)

Vicarious reparation or satisfaction is the voluntary suffering of some evil with the intention of obtaining for another the condonation of his debt. This debt can be the obligation of repairing for the offense or the obligation of undergoing the penalty for the sin. The intention can be to compensate for the offense, or to placate the person who orders the penalty, in order that he forgive the guilty one; or to obtain both of these ends together, as Christ did for the human race. Christ underwent death out of love, i. e., both out of zeal for re-establishing His Father's glory, and

(36) Galtier, DIR, nn. 489-490. Cf. EC, 11:889: «*Soddisfazione Vicaria*. Etimologicamente (*satis facere*) indica compensazione sufficiente in vece e a favore di una persona, per un debito materiale o morale, di cui essa per propria colpa e debitrice, secondo giustizia, verso una terza persona. In teologia il termine ricorre nel concetto della Redenzione operata da Gesù Cristo in nostro favore... e nel concetto di Corpo mistico e di Comunione dei Santi».

out of love for the human race, restoring man to grace and the friendship of God.

Two conditions are required for vicarious satisfaction:

1) There must be some real *solidarity* between the guilty person and the person who offers the satisfaction. This solidarity can be natural, v. g., such as exists between relatives, or between Christ and men because of Christ's humanity. But the solidarity must at least be moral, v. g., a union of wills by which the lover wishes to satisfy for the loved one.

2) On the part of the one offended, or the legislator who inflicted the penalty, there must be an *acceptance* of the substitution, so that on the basis of the above solidarity one person may satisfy for another.

III. REPARATION OF CHRIST

In the actual supernatural order in which we live, reparation for sin consists of two parts, the first and most essential part of which is the vicarious reparation offered by Christ through His passion and death on the cross (objective redemption). The mystery of our redemption by Christ is: 1) the fact that Christ's death has a certain value in God's eyes, whereby God is prepared only in virtue of and in view of this death to forgive sin and grant grace; 2) the fact that this death is of avail even to those who know nothing of it, and is so causally connected with the salvation of men that independently of it no one is saved.

A. SATISFACTION

It is of faith that Christ redeemed us by way of satisfaction, i. e., 1) that among the modes or aspects of Christ's redemption we find the aspect of satisfaction (37), and 2) that Christ satisfied in our stead: His satisfaction was vicarious. Christ obtained for us the condonation of sin by presenting to God something, His death, which in the eyes of God was a

(37) ST 3, 48, 6, ad 3; cf. Galtier, DIR, nn. 461; 431-433, 469, Joseph Lécuyer, C. S. Sp., «La Causalité efficiente des mystères du Christ selon saint Thomas», DC 6 (1953) 115; Prosper Grech, «Theorie ad explicandam redemtionem apud Protestantes recentiores in Anglia cum doctrina catholica comparata», DC 8 (1955) 96-97.

reparation or compensation for sin, so that the pardon granted was really given in view of the payment or expiation or compensation of Christ. But the formal element was the love of Christ which inspired Him to offer His life as satisfaction for the sins of men. Just as in sin God is offended not so much by the illegitimate pleasure taken but in the disobedience involved, so in satisfaction the most important thing is not the suffering but the love which freely accepts the suffering in reparation for sin.

Satisfaction as the payment or compensation for the double *reatus* of guilt and punishment includes a double element: the satisfaction must be *voluntary* and it must be *penal* (38).

Satisfaction becomes formal satisfaction only by the voluntary acceptance of punishment, because only in this way does the material or penal expiation of sin have moral value, and hence become pleasing and acceptable to God (39).

(38) This is the more common explanation as given by Galtier, DIR, nn. 486-488. St. Thomas explains why voluntariety and penality are required in satisfaction for the personal offense to God (*culpa*), when he says, ST 3 Sup. 15, 1: «exigit quod satisfactio per opera poenalia fiat. Recompensatio enim offendit importat adæquationem quam oportet esse eius qui offendit ad eum in quem offensa commissa est. Adæquatio autem in humana iustitia attenditur per subtractionem ab uno qui plus habuit iusto, et additionem ad alterum cui subtractum est aliquid. Deo autem quamvis, quantum ex parte sua est, nihil subtrahi possit, tamen peccator, quantum in ipso est, aliquid ei subtrahit peccando... Unde oportet, ad hoc quod recompensatio fiat, quod aliquid subtrahatur de peccante per satisfactionem quod in honorem Dei cedat. Opus autem bonum, ex hoc quod est huiusmodi, non subtrahit aliquid ab operante, sed magis perficit ipsum. Unde subtractio non potest fieri per opus bonum nisi poenale sit. Et ideo, ad hoc quod aliquid opus sit satisfactorium, oportet quod sit bonum, ut in honorem Dei sit; et poenale, ut aliquid peccatori subtrahatur». Cf. *ibid.*, s. 3; Alanus M. Fenech, O. P., «Notio Thomistica Satisfactionis Vicariae Iesu Christi Mediatoris», MT 6 (1953) 65-78.

In regard to the voluntariety and penality required in satisfaction for the violation of the divine law (*pœna*), he says, ST 1-2, 87, 6: «Actus enim peccati facit hominem reum pœnæ, in quantum transgreditur ordinem divinae iustitiae; ad quem non reddit nisi per quandam recompensationem pœnæ, que ad æqualitatem iustitiae reducit; ut scilicet qui plus voluntati suæ indulxit quam debuit, contra mandatum Dei agens, secundum ordinem divinae iustitiae, aliquid contra illud quod vellet, spontaneus vel invitus patiatur... ut scilicet vel ipse pœnam sibi spontaneus assumat in recompensationem culpe præterite, vel etiam a Deo illatam patienter sustineat: utroque enim modo pœna rationem satisfactionis habet. Pœna autem satisfactoria diminuit aliquid de ratione pœnæ. Est enim de ratione pœnæ quod sit contra voluntatem. Pœna autem satisfactoria, etsi secundum absolutam considerationem sit contra voluntatem, tamen tunc, et per hoc, est voluntaria. Unde simpliciter est voluntaria, secundum quid autem involuntaria». Cf. Fenech, MT 7 (1954) 20-43.

Cf. the discourses of Pius XII on crime and punishment, given to the Italian Catholic Jurists: AAS 47 (1955) 60-71, 72-85; DR 16 (1954-55) 275-289, 349-365.

(39) CG 4:55, ad 20: «in satisfactione vero, dum quis, ad placandum eum

B. VICARIOUS SATISFACTION

Christ's death was satisfaction for sin. But since Christ was sinless, it was vicarious satisfaction, offered for men to obtain the condonation of the double debt of guilt and punishment due to their sins. Christ underwent death out of a motive of charity, i. e., of zeal for His Father's glory injured by sin and of love for the human race which He restored to grace and the friendship of God.

Vicarious satisfaction is not mere substitution or assumption of the guilt of one person by another. Nor is it properly and formally the punishment of an innocent person in place of the guilty one, since only a guilty person can be punished. But an innocent person can take upon himself the obligation of paying the debt due to another's sin (40).

The two necessary conditions, solidarity between the guilty person and the one making satisfaction, and acceptance of this substitution by the offended person, were both verified in Christ's vicarious satisfaction for men.

1. *Solidarity*. There must be some real principle of solidarity between the persons and their actions. «If one died for all, then all died» (2 Cor 5:14). Sometimes this solidarity between Christ and the human race is called a «mystical identification» of Christ and men (41).

It is clear from revelation that an intimate union exists between Christ and men, a union of true solidarity which is juridical, moral and natural. Theologically, the most important of these is the juridical, based on God's free decree.

By this divine decree a double solidarity or a double *insertion* between Christ and the human race is effected. The first solidarity is the *insertion of Christ* into sinful humanity in order to share human nature, weakness, suffering, death, sin. The second solidarity is *our insertion into Christ*, head of the mystical body.

quem offendit, voluntarie poenam assumit, satisfacientis caritas et benevolentia aestimatur; ST 3, 79, 5: «in satisfactione magis attenditur affectus offerentis quam quantitas oblationis». The sufferings of this life can be satisfactory, provided they are at least willingly accepted, if not deliberately chosen; cf. ST 3 Sup 15, 2, and ad 1; CG 3:158.

(40) Galtier, DIR, nn. 488-490.

(41) Cf. Timotheus Zapelena, S. J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, pars altera, ed. 2, Romae, 1954, 535; Cyril Vollert, S. J., «We Died with Christ»; RfR 4 (1945) 341-346.

The first union or insertion refers to objective redemption in which the mystical body is prepared but not yet formally constituted. The second refers to subjective redemption in which by faith and baptism we are incorporated into Christ to form with Him one body in the one Holy Spirit. We are speaking here of the first solidarity (42).

Our solidarity with Christ is also moral, founded on knowledge and love. 1) Christ from the first moment of the Incarnation perfectly knew the divine decree by which He was appointed by God mediator, priest, victim, vicar of the human race in the work of redemption. 2) Christ also knew individually all men whom He was to redeem. 3) Christ also loved with a tender love both His Father and His divine will, and all men individually and collectively. Love is the bond of a profound unity (43).

Our solidarity with Christ is natural, i. e., Christ became one of us, He assumed our nature, and as man He was our priest and the victim for our sins (44).

2. *Acceptance.* The second condition, acceptance of the substitution of Christ for the human race, was had in the very decree of the Incarnation by which God sent His only-begotten Son to be the redeemer of the human race.

C. CONCLUSION

In contrast to the picture of the effects of sin, revelation presents us a corresponding picture of the manifold benefits of Christ's reparation. Of these effects, those which follow directly from reparation for sin as a disorder and offense to God are: 1) restitution or restoration of sanctifying grace lost by sin; 2) satisfaction or reparation for the offense against God, and reconciliation to God, for sin entails the enmity and anger of God; 3) a payment of the debt of guilt and punishment (45).

(42) Zapeleña, 539-540. Cf. Pius XII, MC, AAS 35 (1943) 206, and the comment of Sebastianus Tromp, S. J., *Textus et Documenta* (series theologica, n. 26), p. 86, n. 29b.

(43) Zapeleña, 551-552; cf. MC, AAS 35 (1943) 229-230, and Vollert, 344-347.

(44) Zapeleña, 552-553.

(45) Galtier, DIR, n. 448.

CHAPTER TWO

THEOCENTRIC REPARATION

In the divine economy Christ's death is only the first part of the reparation of sin (1). The second part is the application of Christ's reparation to individuals, giving them the power to repair sin. There is no individual reparation independent of Christ's sacrifice of reparation on the cross; in this sense all reparation is vicarious, the application of Christ's reparation. On the other hand, no adult is saved without his free co-operation; in this sense all reparation is personal.

Chapter Two explains the various elements involved in a discussion of reparation on the part of sinful man: penance, contrition and satisfaction; applies these elements to individual and vicarious reparation; considers the place of Mass and the sacraments in reparation.

I. FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

A. PENANCE

We are speaking of the *virtue* of penance, referred to by the Council of Trent in its sessions on justification and the sacrament of penance (2). St Thomas defines this virtue as «displeasure or disapproval with regard to a past deed, with the intention of removing its result: God's anger and the debt of punishment» (3). St. Thomas distinguishes interior and exterior penance, the internal detestation of sin and its external manifestation which derives its moral value from the internal act of the will (4).

An act of the virtue of penance could arise from various

(1) C. Trid., Sess. 6, c. 3 (ES 795): «Verum, etsi ille pro omnibus mortuus est, non omnes tamen mortis eius beneficium recipiunt, sed ii dumtaxat, quibus meritum passionis eius communicatur».

(2) Sess 6, c. 6 (ES 798): «emoventur adversus peccata per odium aliquod et detestationem, hoc est, per eam penitentiam, quam ante baptismum agi oportet»; cf. c. 14 (ES 807); Sess. 14, c. 1 (ES 894).

(3) ST 3, 85, 1, ad 3: «displacentia seu reprobatio facti præteriti cum intentione removendi sequelam ipsius, scilicet offensam Dei et restum poenæ»; cf. ST 3, 90, 4: «Pertinet autem ad penitentiam ut detestetur peccata præterita, cum proposito immutandi vitam in melius».

(4) ST 3, 84, 8-9, and 8, ad 2; Galtier; DP; n. 9.

motives, v. g., religion, gratitude, charity, prudence. Thus penance in its broadest meaning can include a complexity of acts of many different virtues. But the more common opinion of theologians, followed by St. Thomas, is that a special virtue of penance also exists, i. e., that detestation for all sins or for sin in general can arise from a special motive not found in any other virtue. This special virtue of penance is important in the study of reparation (5).

By a single act of the special virtue of penance the sinner detests all sins specifically in that they are an offense and personal injury to God, and he desires, insofar as he can, to expiate that offense and so remove the consequences of sin (6). The more common opinion, followed by St. Thomas and Suarez, is that the formal object of this virtue is *jus divinum reparandum*: the specific goodness in the act of the sinner compensating for the injury given to God by sin or repairing the divine rights injured by sin (7).

It is probable that the object of the virtue of penance can also be extended to include the divine rights in their full extension, i. e., insofar as they are to be recognized and observed by all men and to be repaired whenever violated. Thus the same virtue which impels a man to detest his own sins and to respect God's rights, would also induce him to detest all sins, even those of other men, which violate the rights of God, and to love and respect God's rights everywhere (8).

(5) Galtier, DP, nn. 20-23.

(6) ST 3, 85, 2: «in pénitentia invenitur specialis ratio actus laudabilis, scilicet operari ad destructionem peccati præteriti in quantum est Dei offensa, quod non pertinet ad rationem alterius virtutis»; cf. 4S 1, 1, sol. 3.

(7) Galtier, DP, nn. 26-27.

(8) Suarez, 22: DP, d. 2, s. 1, nn. 10-11; Galtier, DP, n. 30. Cf. «Du mérite et de la réparation», AJP 6 (1863) 2226-2243. The second part, col. 2233-2239, treats the question of penance for the sins of others. According to this article the virtue of penance has as object only personal sins of the individual sinner and *in no way* the sins of others. Detestation of sins committed by others belongs to another virtue distinct from the special virtue of penance, viz., charity. This, he says, is the common opinion, followed by St. Thomas. He bases his explanation on the impossibility of one man making an act of contrition (first and primary act of the virtue of penance) for another. Sorrow is a generic concept which is specified in penance as referring to personal sins only.

In regard to this opinion we may note the following points: 1) The quotations from St. Thomas given in the AJP article refer to contrition. No one admits the possibility of one man making an act of contrition for another. Contrition is so personal that it must be placed by the individual sinner himself. St. Thomas sometimes, but not always, clearly refers penance to one's personal

Penance, in the strict sense of a virtue which seeks to repair or to avoid one's own personal sins, is found only in those persons who have sinned or who can sin. Hence Christ, absolutely and intrinsically impeccable, did not have the virtue of penance. But penance in a wider sense of respect for the rights of God in their full extent and of detestation and sorrow for every violation of them, can be had by everyone (9).

Although this wider sense of the word is legitimate as explained, still the word *penance* as ordinarily used is understood to refer exclusively to one's own sins. This explains the action of the Holy See in 1893, prohibiting and condemning the titles: *Cor Jesu Pænitens*, *Cor Jesu Pænitens pro nobis*, *Jesus Pænitens*, *Jesus Pænitens pro nobis* (10).

The material object of the special virtue of penance includes everything which can be attained by reason of the formal object. Since penance includes not only a turning from sin but also the procuring of reparation for sin, its material object may be similarly divided into *objectum aversionis* and *objectum prosecutionis*.

Of penance in the strict sense, the object of aversion is only personal actual sins, past or future. Hence there is no strict penance for original sin (11).

Of penance in the broader sense as detestation of every injury done to God, the object of aversion can also include the sins of others. In this sense individual men can hate and desire to repair to some extent —even as Christ hated and actually did repair— not only the sins of their fellowmen, but even the disobedience and ingratitude of Adam.

sins, especially when speaking of contrition and penance together. v. g., ST 3, 85; 1; 4S 14, 1, 1, sol. 3; ST 3 Sup. 2, 3; *ibid.*, 5 and ad 2. But St. Thomas does not always restrict penance in this way; v. g., ST 3, 84, 2, ad 3. 2) Perhaps the disagreement is more verbal than real. The author of the AJP article says *no penance* for the sins of others; Galtier says *no strict penance* for the sins of others, but in a wider sense of the word admits an extension of the object of penance to include the sins of others (the formal object, *jus divinum reparandum*, indicates no restriction to personal sins). Both admit contrition only for personal sins. In practice there is uniformity in restricting the use of the word *penance* to personal sins in order to avoid confusion.

(9) ST 3, 15, 1, ad 5; 46, 6, ad 2 and ad 4; Suarez, 22: DP; d. 2; s. 1; n. 11; 19: *De Vita Christi*, d. 33, s. 2, n. 3; Galtier, DP, n. 33.

(10) ASS 26:319; cf. «Loigny et le Coeur de Jésus Pénitent», NRT 25 (1893) 496-507, for background and preliminaries (more disciplinary than doctrinal) to this final decree. Cf. Suarez, 17: *De Incarn.*, d. 4, s. 5, n. 27.

(11) Cf. ST 3 Sup. 2, 2; ST 3, 84, 2, ad 3.

The *objectum prosecutionis* of the virtue of penance includes everything the penitent can do toward the reparation of his own sin and the sins of others. Internal acts of all the virtues are included, for by such acts one gives honor and glory to God in compensation for injury. Hence the act of every virtue can be commanded by the virtue of penance, ordered or directed to the purpose of penance. External and corporal acts are included, by which one removes sin and fortifies himself against sin; v. g., mortification, prayer, spiritual and corporal works of mercy (12).

Penance as a special virtue whose formal object is *jus divinum reparandum* obviously enters prominently into a study of reparation for sin. But even granting its existence, this special virtue need not be the explicit motive of a man's acts of penance and reparation. The teaching and prescriptions of the Church regarding the practice of penance, both sacramental and extra-sacramental, have in mind, not necessarily this special virtue, but detestation of sin arising from any supernaturally good motive, as is clearly taught by Trent, for example, in distinguishing perfect contrition from attrition (13).

B. CONTRITION

Contrition is the primary act of penance from which all other acts proceed. Formal contrition is explicit detestation of sin. Virtual contrition is that disposition of will which of itself would produce detestation of sin if the intellect adverted to the sin (14).

In its definition of contrition as «deep sorrow and detestation for sin committed, with a resolution to sin no more», Trent mentions three elements: detestation, sorrow, resolution (15).

(12) Galtier, DP, nn. 35-36.

(13) Sess. 14, c. 4 (ES 897-898); Galtier, n. 33.

(14) Galtier, DP, n. 37; cf. Trent, Sess. 6, cc. 6-7 (ES 798-799).

(15) Sess. 14, c. 4 (ES 897): «animi dolor ac detestatio est de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi de cetero». Cf. St. Thomas' definition (ST 3 Sup. I, 1) which includes contrition as a virtue and as part of the sacrament: «dolor pro peccatis assumptus cum proposito confitendi et satisfaciendi». Contrition as an act of the special virtue of penance St. Thomas defines: «dolor voluntarius pro peccato, puniens quod dolet se commisso. In hoc enim quod additur *punitio*, ad specialem virtutem contrahitur».

The Church teaches that God has always required contrition as a prerequisite for any forgiveness of sin (16). This is reasonable. For man by turning away from God and turning to a creature offered an injury and personal offense to God. To restore the moral order, this injury and offense must be repaired as far as possible. Now reparation is at least possible to this extent, that the sinner detests his offense and compensates for it by now offering the homage he had once denied. Retraction and reparation of an offense consists first of all in detesting the offense and in humbly begging pardon.

It is clear then that contrition is so necessary and so personal that no one can place an act of contrition for another (17).

Trent distinguishes two types of contrition according to the effect produced by each: perfect contrition or contrition in the strict sense (which proceeds from charity) and imperfect contrition or attrition (which proceeds from a consideration of the malice of sin or from the fear of hell and of sin's punishments) (18). Perfect contrition (with an implied desire for the sacrament) reconciles the sinner to God; imperfect contrition does not.

C. SATISFACTION

The general principles of satisfaction for sin in the order of subjective redemption are summarized in the following *asserta*. The first three refer to satisfaction in the theological sense, reparation or expiation for the offense to God, i. e., for the guilt and for the eternal punishment; the fourth refers to satisfaction in the juridical sense of atonement for the temporal punishment due to forgiven sin (19).

FIRST ASSERTUM: *Man can satisfy congruously in this life for his sin.* This is certain even for a sinner who under the influence and with the help of grace disposes himself for justification. In this very disposition or preparation at least

(16) C. Trid., Sess. 14, c. 4 (ES 897); cf. ST 3, 86, 2.

(17) ST 3, 48, 2, ad 1: «In quantum etiam duo homines sunt unum in caritate, unus pro alio satisfacere potest... Non autem est similis ratio de confessione, et contritione».

(18) Sess. 14, c. 4 (ES 898).

(19) Galtier, DP, nn. 485-501; Lercher, 4/2 pars altera, nn. 583-586; González Rivas, STS, 4, nn. 168-177.

some compensation is offered to God for the offense given; for every act of penance is the effort to offer at least some compensation to God for the injury inflicted.

SECOND ASSERTUM: *Man cannot satisfy condignly for the offense of mortal sin.*

THIRD ASSERTUM: *The justified man can satisfy condignly for the guilt of venial sin.* This is common and certain doctrine, for in venial sin the internal principle of satisfaction, sanctifying grace, is retained in the soul, while in mortal sin it is lost and hence can only be repaired *ab extrinseco*, by the infusion of grace and charity.

FOURTH ASSERTUM: *Man can satisfy condignly for temporal punishment due to forgiven sin.* To do this certain conditions are required: the same conditions, with the exception of the penitential nature of the work, which are required for condign merit:

- 1) On the part of God: acceptance of the compensation.
- 2) On the part of man: *status viae* and state of grace. Our penitential acts derive their supernatural value from union with Christ by sanctifying grace (20).
- 3) On the part of the work: that it be good (or at least indifferent), supernatural, free, and penal (or penitential). In the state of fallen nature all good works have a penal element and hence are satisfactory.

In a certain sense, therefore, man redeems himself — not from the guilt and eternal punishment of sin but only from temporal punishment. Even here it is only by the merits of Christ that he is justified and hence capable with the aid of grace of performing condign satisfaction. The satisfaction he offers is really his own, but it is also Christ's since it derives its value from Him (21).

II. PERSONAL REPARATION

Everything said above about penance, contrition and satisfaction applies primarily to reparation for one's own

(20) Cf. C. Trid., Sess. 14, c. 8 (ES 904); ST 3 Sup. 14, 2.

(21) C. Trid., Sess. 14, can. 14 (ES 924): «per Christum Iesum peccata redimunt».

personal sins. Acts of the virtue of penance in the strict sense include everything the penitent can do to repair his sin. An act of contrition is always required for any remission of sins, mortal and venial, in a person who has the use of reason (22).

The Council of Trent describes the complete process of reparation for sin in an individual adult. Moved by God's grace, the individual must first dispose himself for justification by various acts including hatred and detestation of sin. Justification itself follows upon this preparation: sins are remitted, the interior man is sanctified and renewed through the voluntary reception of sanctifying grace and infused gifts, due to the merits of Christ's passion communicated to him in baptism (23).

Baptism effects the complete remission of the guilt of sin, the eternal punishment and all temporal punishment due to all sins, original and personal. Hence no penance is imposed upon the newly-baptized (24).

If unfortunately the justified man should fail to live in the «newness of life» begun by baptism, if he should sin after baptism, God in His mercy has provided another remedy, the sacrament of penance. But penance differs from baptism in that even after sins have been forgiven, a debt of temporal punishment may still remain (25).

Satisfaction for this temporal punishment is of two kinds: *extra-sacramental (ex opere operantis)*, if the penitential work is voluntarily undertaken or if the temporal punishments sent by God are patiently borne in the spirit of satisfaction (26); and *sacramental (ex opere operato)*, if the penitential work is enjoined by the priest in the administration of the sacrament of penance. An indulgence is also a remission before God of temporal punishment *ex opere operato*, although not in virtue of the sacrament, through a legitimate dispensing of the treasury of the Church (27).

(22) ST 3, 87, 1.

(23) Sess. 6, cc. 5-7 (ES 797-799).

(24) ST 3, 68, 5, and ad 1; 69, 1-2.

(25) C. Trid., Sess. 6, c. 14; Sess. 14, cc. 1-2 (ES 807, 894-895).

(26) Cf. *id.*, c. 9 (ES 906); ST 3 Sup. 15, 2.

(27) For explanation, cf. Galtier, DP, no. 603-617.

This same process of reparation for sin in an individual adult was described by Pope Pius XII in a special discourse on Passion Sunday, March 26, 1950, a worldwide «Day of Penance» during the Holy Year (28).

III. VICARIOUS REPARATION

Not all men respond to God's grace calling them to repentance and reparation. Is there anything a just man can do to help secure the essential individual co-operation of other men in their own personal reparation of sin? Is there any part of reparation a just man can perform in place of another?

A. DIRECT REPARATION

Penance in the strict sense applies only to personal sins. In the wider sense of detestation of all offenses to God and desire to repair them as far as possible, penance can also include under its *objectum aversionis* the sins committed by others. Under the *objectum prosecutionis* come everything a person can do to repair sin, whether his own or the sins of others. Internal acts of all the virtues, commanded by the virtue of penance, can be offered to give glory and honor to God in compensation for the injury of sin. External acts can be offered for the same intention. In addition to the good example thus given to the sinner, these acts also have an impetratory and meritorious value for the sinner's conversion.

Contrition is so necessary and so strictly personal that it can be had only for one's own sins.

To atone for the temporal punishment due to the forgiven sins of another the same two conditions are required that were required for the vicarious satisfaction of Christ on behalf of man (29). For the substitution to be valid, God's acceptance of the satisfaction of one man on behalf of another

(28) DR 12 (1950-51) 14-15.

(29) For one of the most complete studies on this topic, cf. two articles by I. Muscat, C. M., «De virtute satisfactoria operum bonorum in ordine ad alios», DTP 14 (1937) 225-254, 329-349.

is required, for there is question of a debt owed to God. The solidarity or bond of unity which is the basis of this reversibility of satisfaction is the supernatural solidarity that results from our insertion into Christ, the solidarity of men with Christ in the mystical body. For the mystical body was formed by Christ on the cross for the purpose of extending and applying His redemptive work to all men of all time. From this solidarity and union results the communion of saints, or sharing of spiritual benefits by the members of Christ (30).

Theology teaches that one man can pray for others (formal prayer), i. e., by his prayers he can petition or impetrates graces and benefits for others. Moreover, a just man can also offer the imprecatory value of his good works for others (virtual prayer). This imprecation or prayer for others is called a *suffrage* in the wide sense of the word. Besides, a just man on earth can congruously merit for others. Finally, he can also condignly satisfy for the temporal punishment due to the forgiven sins of others. Satisfaction for temporal punishment is called a *suffrage* in the strict sense.

1. Satisfaction for the Living

It is common and certain doctrine that a just man in this life can transfer to another living just man satisfaction for temporal punishment (31).

Satisfaction differs from merit: merit makes a man pleasing or more pleasing to God; satisfaction, as the voluntary suffering of punishment in payment for temporal punishment due to forgiven sin, is not so personal as merit. Primarily satisfaction is not concerned with the one who satisfies or the one for whom satisfaction is made, but looks to God, to whom the satisfaction is offered. Hence God can allow the satisfaction to be made by someone other than the guilty man.

(30) Leo XIII, *Miræ caritatis*, May 28, 1902, ASS 34:649: «Nihil est enim aliud sanctorum communio, quod nemo ignorat, nisi mutua auxillii, expiationis, precum, beneficiorum communicatio inter fideles vel cœlesti patria potitos vel igni piaculari addictos vel adhuc in terris peregrinantes, in unam coalescentes civitatem, cuius caput Christus, cuius forma caritas». See Chapter Four for passages from Pius XII, ST 3 Sup. 13, 2: «Actus unius efficitur alterius caritate mediante, per quam omnes unum sumus in Christo». For a recent study of the communion of saints, see Albert Michel, «La Communion des saints», DC 9 (1956) 1-130.

(31) Cf. Roman Catechism, 2, 5, 76; Muscat, 229-250; Galtier, DP, n. 596.

This satisfaction is satisfaction in the strict sense of payment of a debt, and not merely impetration or merit by which one man might petition or merit for another the grace to satisfy for his own sins, or by which he might impetrated and obtain from God a free condonation of the satisfaction.

The general conditions necessary to satisfy for temporal punishment, already given, must be specified as applied to vicarious satisfaction:

1) On the part of God: acceptance of the substitution.

2) On the part of the one making satisfaction: a) In regard to his *being*: the same two conditions: *status viae* and state of grace. b) In regard to his *acts* of satisfaction: the same conditions: works that are good (or at least indifferent), free, supernatural, and penal. c) In regard to his *intention*: the intention to offer or apply his satisfaction to someone else.

3) On the part of the one for whom the satisfaction is offered: a) At least a virtual acceptance of the satisfaction, which every person in the state of grace is presumed to have if he still has punishment due to forgiven sin. b) The sins must have been forgiven, because temporal punishment is not remitted before the guilt has been forgiven. c) State of grace. This is not the same as condition b); a man may still owe temporal punishment for forgiven sins and then commit another mortal sin. Such a sinner is unworthy in the sight of God to receive the forgiveness of any temporal punishment while in the state of enmity with God.

2. Satisfaction for the Dead

In virtue of the same bond of unity, the communion of saints, the transfer of satisfaction for temporal punishment can also take place between the living and the poor souls in purgatory (32). It is of faith that the souls in purgatory can be helped by the suffrages or satisfactions of the living. It is certain that this refers to strict satisfaction by which the living pay the debt of temporal punishment for the dead.

It is the more common opinion that in the present economy of divine Providence, God never remits the debt of

(32) Muscat, 343-349; Michel, 64-67, 121-123; ST 3 Sup. 71, 2.

temporal punishment due to forgiven sin except by the application of condign satisfaction either by the person himself or by others making the satisfaction for him. Hence the remission of temporal punishment for the souls in purgatory is never by way of impetration for a gratuitous condonation but always of a real payment of the debt.

Besides the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass offered for the dead, one of the commonest ways to help the souls in purgatory is by gaining indulgences for them. An indulgence for the poor souls is a clear example of vicarious satisfaction.

B. INDIRECT REPARATION

Personal and vicarious reparation both tend to the complete destruction of sin. But there are limits to vicarious satisfaction. Since the *reatus culpæ* can only be removed by contrition, which is strictly personal, vicarious satisfaction in the order of subjective redemption is restricted to atonement for the *reatus pœnae temporalis*. Such vicarious satisfaction is an act which gives honor and glory to God in compensation for the dishonor of sin; it is also an act of fraternal charity, beneficial to man for whom it cancels the debt of punishment.

Nevertheless, there are ways by which one man indirectly can contribute to the removal of another man's guilt. Taking penance in the wide sense of everything a man can do toward the removal of sin in himself and in others, there is the possibility of meriting and impetrating for others the grace of conversion (33).

The good works of a just man are meritorious, propitiatory, impetratory, and satisfactory. These various effects can be but different aspects, found together in the same good work, provided the respective conditions are fulfilled.

1) Condign merit has as object an increase of grace and glory and is strictly personal, for of its very nature it makes the person holier and more pleasing to God. It cannot be

(33) Agostini, 243. Cf. the article cited earlier, «Du mérite et de la réparation», AJP 6 (1863) 2226-2243. The first part, col. 2226-2233, treats the question of whether a just man can merit the conversion of sinners. The answer of theologians is that in the present economy of salvation no condign merit, but only congruous merit, is possible for the conversion of sinners.

given to another. But congruous merit can be offered for others. Congruous merit, more like prayer in this respect, refers not to justice but to God's mercy and liberality. Theologians teach that the justified man can congruously merit for others all graces that he can merit for himself, plus the first actual grace which he cannot merit for himself (34).

2) The same is true of strict propitiation which seeks to eliminate in God the impression of disgust and injury, *odium vindictæ et abominationis*, caused by sin. This supposes contrition for the sins committed. Since contrition is strictly personal, so is propitiation in the strict sense (35). But propitiation is also used in a wider sense. In Sacred Scripture the just are said to propitiate God on behalf of sinners, to appease God and thus obtain from Him graces of conversion for sinners. In the New Testament Christ is a «propitiation» for our sins (Rom. 3:25; 1 Jn. 2:2; 4:10).

3) Impetration can be formal or virtual. Formal imprecation is properly a prayer of petition, a request for a favor from God. Virtual imprecation is the implicit petition contained in every good work of the just man, or the offering of a specific good work for some special intention or petition.

Obviously, formal imprecation can be offered for others (36). More commonly theologians say the same for virtual imprecation. In fact, there is hardly any doubt about it, because of the Holy See's approbation of associations such as the Apostleship of Prayer, whose members offer the satisfactory and impreatory value of their good works for the intentions of the Holy Father and of the other members (37).

The prayer of a just man has the double effect of merit and imprecation (38). Condign merit refers to the justice of God and is strictly personal, while congruous merit and imprecation refer to God's mercy and liberality and can be

(34) Cf. ST 1-2, 114, 6. Agostini, 251-252, refers merit to condign merit only, and for imprecation gives the principle given above for congruous merit: the just man can impetrare and obtain for others all graces that he can ask and obtain for himself, and in addition also the first grace. But in a note (18) he refers «meriting» the conversion of another to congruous merit, which in this respect is similar to prayer.

(35) Agostini, 249.

(36) Cf. ST 2-2, 83, 7-8.

(37) SAO, n. 3a, *Manuale*, 14: «Vi nostræ unionis cum Christo hæc oblatio nostris actionibus vim impreatoriam et satisfactoriam confert».

(38) ST 2-2, 83, 15.

had even for others. Congruous merit is not infallible, while formal impetration is, if the conditions of impetration are fulfilled: «to ask — for ourselves — things necessary for salvation — piously — perseveringly» (39). The condition of «praying for oneself» is required for the infallibility of the effect of impetration, because the effect of prayer for another man may be impeded by the obstinate will of the man himself. But lack of proper disposition to receive the full effect of prayer, on the part of the sinner who is prayer for, does not *per se* destroy the effect of the just man's prayer. Actual grace, unlike sanctifying grace, does not demand a previous disposition in the person, but can be given even to the unworthy. God's liberality and benevolence toward the sinner in this case is not due to the merits of the sinner but to the meditation of the just (40). In other words, the prayer of the just man obtains actual graces for the sinner; but the actual conversion of the sinner depends also on his good will in using these graces.

The same motives that induce us to satisfy for temporal punishment due to the forgiven sins of others also induce us to pray for others, especially for the conversion of sinners (41).

4) The satisfactory value of good works as explained refers to the vindictive aspect of satisfaction and is chiefly satisfaction *ex opere operantis*. But the offering of the satisfactory value of our good works for others can also include the satisfactory value of good works that others offer for us during our life or after death. The Heroic Act of Charity in favor of the poor souls, so highly praised and recommended by the Church, does just this (42).

There is also a medicinal aspect to satisfaction which is strictly personal, intended for the correction of the sinner himself. But in a certain sense the punishment of one person can have a medicinal effect on others. In fact, the moral law is safeguarded by the sanction of punishments which deter men from violating the law, for example, by capital punish-

(39) ST 2-2, 83, 16: «ut scilicet pro se petat, necessaria ad salutem, pie, et perseveranter»; cf. ST 2-2, 83, 15, ad 2.

(40) Agostini, 250, note 13; ST 2-2, 83, 7, ad 2; cf. ST 3 Sup. 72, 3.

(41) Cf. ST 2-2, 83, 7, and ad 3.

(42) Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, 2, DP, nn. 697-698.

ment which the state may inflict and by the eternal punishment of the souls in hell (43).

C. SUMMARY

The communion of saints exists on earth among the members of the mystical body and to the benefit of even those not yet members of the Church. The just can pray and merit congruously for each other, especially the graces necessary for perseverance. They can also satisfy for temporal punishment due to the forgiven sins of another. The just man can pray and congruously merit the conversion of sinners. He cannot satisfy for them, because they are still in sin. But his penitential works retain their propitiatory value to incline God to mercy and clemency toward sinners. Finally, infidels, formal heretics and schismatics, those excommunicated and excluded from participation in the spiritual goods of the Church can still receive the benefits of the prayers and merits of the just in the way explained for sinners. The Church encourages prayers and good works offered to obtain the grace of conversion for those outside the true Church.

IV. MASS AND THE SACRAMENTS IN THE REPARATION OF SIN

Reparation for sin seeks primarily the honor and glory of God, whose rights are violated by sin. Satisfaction for temporal punishment intends this. The primary intention is not man and a betterment of his unfortunate condition as sinner, though it is true that man himself benefits by reparation. In fact, from the viewpoint of benefit or utility it is only man who benefits, since God can receive nothing that confers any benefit upon Him (44).

In considering the virtue of religion or worship, St. Thomas (45) lists three groups of exterior acts: adoration, by which a man offers God the worship of his body; acts by

(43) Cf. ST 3 Sup. 13, 2; 1-2, 87, 3, ad 2; 6, ad 3; CG 3: 144; Joseph Lécuyer, C. S. Sp., «Reflexions sur la théologie du culte selon saint Thomas», RT 4 (1955) 339-362.

(44) Joseph Lécuyer, C. S. Sp., *op. cit.* and «Note sur une définition Thomiste de la satisfaction», DC 8 (1955) 21-30.

which a man offers his external goods to God, such as sacrifices, oblations, vows; and finally, acts by which something divine is received by men, such as the sacraments or the holy name invoked in oaths, abjurations, and invocations. God is worshipped by man's acceptance of the benefits of God, by man's reception of the sacraments.

Reparation for sin refers to God's justice in two ways: as coming under the special virtue of penance (a potential part of justice), and in a wider sense as coming under the virtue of religion (another potential part of justice) or as being commanded by the virtue of religion. This fourth section considers the principal acts of worship, Mass and the sacraments, in their relation to reparation.

A. MASS

Christ's reparation for sin, His redemptive act, was His sacrifice on the cross. This same sacrifice is renewed in the Mass where the benefits of Christ's redemption are applied to souls (46).

1. Participation in the Mass

In the Eucharistic Sacrifice Christ offers Himself to His heavenly Father, but it is Christ as head of His mystical body. Hence His members are also to be united to Him in that sacrifice, united to Him as *offerers* and *victims* of the sacrifice. In *Mediator Dei* Pius XII clearly teaches the participation of the faithful as offerers in the Mass inasmuch as they offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice with the priest, and their participation in the Mass inasmuch as they offer themselves as victims with Christ (47). The new statutes of the Apostleship of Prayer offer an example of this teaching of *Mediator Dei* in practice (48), for associates of this league offer their good works in union with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass,

(45) ST 2-2, introd. to qq. 84, 85, and especially 89.

(46) Pius XII, MD, November 20, 1947, AAS 39 (1947) 547: «Christianæ religionis caput ac veluti centrum Sanctissimæ Eucharistiae Mysterium est»; cf. 547-552, on the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

(47) MD, AAS 39: 552-559; cf. also Pius XII, *Menti nostra*, AAS 42 (1950) 657-702; exhortations to the Lenten preachers, AAS 35 (1943) 105-116; 46 (1949) 182-187; instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, AAS 33 (1941) 389-391.

(48) SAO, nn. 1, 3a, 3b; *Manuale*, 12, 13-14.

since it is only by contact with the sacrifice of the cross that man's works have any value for the spread of the Kingdom of God on earth.

2. Fruits of the Mass (49)

Christ is priest and principal minister (principal offerer) in the Mass; the celebrant is the priest or secondary minister (ministerial offerer), who consecrates and sacrifices *in persona Christi*; the entire Church is called the general offerer of the Mass, and the faithful who assist or co-operate in some way are called the special offerers.

The ends of the Mass as stated by Trent and repeated by Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* (50) are adoration, thanksgiving, impetration, and propitiation or satisfaction. Every sacrifice includes adoration, thanksgiving, and impetration. But now in the state of fallen nature a sacrifice takes on the added note of propitiation of the divine justice and expiation for the sins of men. The fruits of the Mass are the benefits which God confers on men in view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

As an action of Christ Himself, the Mass applies the merits of Christ, and thus is a most efficacious means to placate the divine wrath against sinners and to incline God to bestow benefits on men.

These benefits are the *impetratory*, *propitiatory*, and *satisfactory* (or expiatory, fruits of the Mass (51).

The Eucharistic Sacrifice as *impetratory* obtains the following benefits: a) the grace of conversion to true penance and reconciliation with God; b) victory over temptations; c) suitable occasions for good works and progress in the spiritual life; d) special protection of divine Providence in spiritual and temporal needs; e) temporal goods conducive to salvation.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice as *propitiatory*: a) is capable of remitting mortal and venial sin; b) everts calamities, plagues, common and private evils which God is prepared to

(49) For this entire section, cf. Cappello, I, *De Eucaristia*, nn. 539-545; Michel, 101-104.

(50) AAS 39: 549-550.

(51) This is Cappello's terminology, n. 552. As he notes, some prefer just impetration and propitiation (which included satisfaction); others prefer just propitiation (which includes impetration and satisfaction).

inflict as punishment for sin; c) averts more terrible spiritual punishments which God in justice determines to inflict unless placated for sin.

God is justly angry because of sin and hence refuses at least the more special and abundant helps leading the sinner to penance; by the Mass God is appeased and grants these more special helps He would otherwise have denied. Thus the Mass directly and indirectly confers these helps by which a man is led to penance and the remission of his sins: indirectly, in virtue of its propitiatory value which appeases God's anger and thus allows Him to bestow these helps; and directly, in virtue of its imprecatory value in that it immediately moves God to bestow these helps.

The Mass does not directly remit either mortal or venial sins. It does so indirectly, by bestowing grace to elicit good acts which dispose the soul to obtain forgiveness. Nor does the Mass increase sanctifying grace *ex opere operato*.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice as *satisfactory*: a) deletes temporal punishment; b) remits other punishments or penitential works voluntarily undertaken to wipe out punishment due to sin.

These benefits of the Mass come to various groups of persons.

a) The *general fruit*, which is produced in common by the fact that the priest in the name of Christ and the Church always prays and offers for the whole Church, benefits all the faithful, living and dead, provided they place no obstacle. This fruit is imprecatory and probably also propitiatory, at least in part.

b) The *special fruit*, which comes to those who assist at Mass or co-operate in some way, is not the same for all, but depends on the degree of co-operation. It is imprecatory, propitiatory and satisfactory. It is at least extrinsically probable that this special fruit can be offered for another, so that in offering Mass for someone the person can offer the fruits *ex opere operantis* of his good act and probably also this special fruit *ex opere operato*.

c) The *personal fruit*, which comes to the celebrant, is imprecatory, propitiatory and satisfactory, and comes to him

independent of his intention. More probably this fruit cannot be offered for another; at least not all of it can be transferred.

d) The *ministerial* fruit, which according to the celebrant's intention is applied to a definite person or a definite intention, is impetratory, propitiatory and satisfactory.

This summary of the fruits of the Mass helps to complete the picture of reparation for sin, for it shows how the Mass applies Christ's reparation to individual men and how the Mass can also be offered for others.

B. THE SACRAMENTS

The sacraments are acts of worship of God by which God's benefits are received by men. Sacraments are personal in the sense that they must be received individually; no one can receive a sacrament in place of another. Earlier the sacraments were considered in relation to individual reparation for sin. Now we speak of them in relation to vicarious reparation and ask if there is any way by which the benefits of the sacraments, in addition to their purely personal aspects, can also be applied to others (52).

1. Is it possible to offer in favor of another the *ex opere operato* satisfactory value of Christ's redemption, which comes to one through the Mass and the sacraments, v. g., baptism, penance, extreme unction? There are some cases where this seems to be possible: a) the Heroic Act, by which a person cedes to the poor souls all the satisfactory value of his own works and of works offered for him during life and after death; b) the *ex opere operato* fruits of the Mass; c) indulgences offered for the dead, but not for the living. But in these cases, it is not strictly the *ex opere operato* effect of a sacrament that is transferred to another; the Mass is the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Eucharist, not its sacramental aspect (53).

2. Can at least part of the sacramental penance (satisfaction) be performed by another? (54). On his own authority, the penitent is not free to have someone else fulfill his

(52) Cf. Michel, 104-107.

(53) Cf. Agostini, 251-253.

(54) Cappello, 2, n. 250.

penance (55). It is generally admitted that the confessor can permit the penitent to have someone else fulfill his penance, or the confessor himself can agree to perform at least part of it. But if the confessor does not expressly say so, the penance is understood to be personal and to be performed by the penitent himself as part of the sacrament.

3. Can Holy Communion be «offered» for another? The general effects of the Holy Eucharist are enumerated by Trent (56) and by Pope Eugene IV in his Instruction to the Armenians (57). The end proper to the Holy Eucharist is the perfection and conservation of charity, which is the supernatural life of the soul, by union with Christ and with His mystical body (58). Most theologians, with St. Thomas, deny that the Holy Eucharist *primo et per se* remits temporal punishment *ex opere operato*. Indirectly and secondarily, it seems that it can do so, since it has the power to remit the guilt of venial sin (hence it seems that a part of the temporal punishment would also be remitted), and of its very nature tends to inflame the soul with love of God which remits not only guilt but also temporal punishment (directly *ex opere operantis*, but indirectly, due to the influence of the Sacrament).

Since primarily the Holy Eucharist is the spiritual food of the soul—and food benefits the one who takes it—directly and *ex opere operato* the Holy Eucharist benefits only the recipient. But indirectly and *ex opere operantis* Holy Communion can benefit others: the living by means of impetration, congruous merit and satisfaction; the dead by means of suffrage or satisfaction. The prayers of preparation and thanksgiving have special efficacy because of the fervor of the soul at that time. Holy Communion as a supernaturally good work has all the effects of a good work but in a very especially elevated way (59). While the impreatory and congruously meritorious value of good works cannot be completely transferred to others, since everyone continually

(55) Cf. Alexander VII's condemnation (ES 1115).

(56) Sess. 13, c. 2, can. 5 (ES 875, 887).

(57) ES 698.

(58) Cf. Cappello, 1, nn. 233-242.

(59) Cappello, 1, n. 244.

needs God's help and grace, the satisfactory value can be transferred to others, especially to the souls in purgatory (60).

4. What is the meaning of «Communion of Reparation»? The Apostleship of Prayer Manual gives three meanings, not necessarily distinct or exclusive of each other (61). The *first* considers Holy Communion psychologically as a particularly apt occasion —while Christ is physically present—to honor and adore Christ, to beg pardon for ourselves and for others, and to offer ourselves and our penitential works in reparation and petition for the grace of conversion for all sinners. *Second* meaning: we receive Holy Communion for those who culpably do not receive. This Holy Communion has a double aspect: it is an act by which we wish in some way to honor God in place of those who do not so honor Him; it is also an act offered for others, to beg for them the grace of conversion. *Third* meaning: while Christ is physically present with us —in the state of victim and wishing to assimilate us to Himself as victim—we offer Him, or ourselves with Him, to God the Father to appease the anger of God, to offer reparation and to petition the conversion of sinners. This meaning emphasizes the victim of reparation; we make a personal oblation of ourselves to Christ or of ourselves with Christ to God the Father in reparation for sin.

CHAPTER THREE CHRISTOCENTRIC REPARATION

«Christocentric» reparation does not imply that there is another reparation independent of Christ. As used by Agostini (1) the word indicates reparation directed to Christ in His human nature in contrast to reparation directed to

(60) Cf. ASS 1:438; a note (added to the rules of an association which requires its members to offer Holy Communion for other members at stated times) explains the meaning thus: «Offerre S. Communionem est expressio, quam catholici omnes intelligunt; non enim agitur de actione sacrificiali; sed agitur de oblatione lato sensu accepta, quæ fieri potest Deo, in bonum proximi, sicut offerri possunt Deo in proximi bonum merita cuiuslibet alterius boni operis. Maxime cum in præsenti agatur de opere sacratissimo, cuiusmodi est sacra synaxis, ob quam fideles sanctior fit, intima unione cum Deo; ideoque eiusdem preces fiunt multo efficaciores».

(61) *Manuale*, 110-113.

the Blessed Trinity, to God the Father, or to Christ as God. It is based on the words of Pius XI when he speaks of reparation from a motive of love: «to suffer together with Christ, suffering and “covered with opprobrium”, so that we may bring Him some comfort in His sufferings, insofar as our human weakness permitts» (2). All reparation for sin is irrevocably bound to Christ, the one mediator between God and sinful man.

I. REPARATION TO GOD THE FATHER THROUGH CHRIST

Theocentric reparation is based on a motive of justice, satisfying for the dishonor given to God by sin (3). This satisfaction for sin, both Christ's on the cross and ours in union with Christ, like every act of worship, is offered to the Blessed Trinity, but by appropriation it is said to be offered to God the Father to whom the work of creation is attributed and who represents in the Blessed Trinity the principle from which all proceeds (4).

Since satisfaction is primarily offered to the Blessed Trinity, i. e., to the three Divine Persons, it follows that it is truly offered to Christ as God (5). This way of speaking is theologically accurate, as Rahner notes (6), and is used by the Church in the official Act of Reparation to the Sacred Heart of Jesus:

... We now offer, in reparation for these violations of Thy divine honour, the satisfaction Thou didst once make to Thy eternal Father on the cross and which Thou dost continue to renew daily on our altars... (7).

(1) Agostini, 208, 275-297.

(2) MR, AAS 20 (1928) 169.

(3) *Ibid.* This does not mean that love is absent in reparation that seeks to satisfy divine justice. The work of redemption by which Christ satisfied divine justice is eminently a mystery of love. See next chapter.

(4) Agostini, 207-208 and note 11; cf. Suarez, 17: *De Incarn.*, d. 4, s. 5, nn. 8-9.

(5) Suarez, 17: *De Incarn.*, d. 4, s. 5, n. 13.

(6) Karl Rahner, «Einige Thesen zur Theologie der Herz-Jesu-Verehrung», in Josef Stierli, *Cor Salvatoris, Wege zur Herz-Jesu-Verehrung*, 189; reprinted with some changes in Karl Rahner, *Schriften zur Theologie*; 37408.

7) AAS 20 (1928) 185; Latin on p. 179.

In the encyclical *Mediator Dei*, Pius XII says:

The sacred liturgy is... the public worship which our Redeemer as Head of the Church renders to the heavenly Father, as well as the worship which the community of the faithful renders to its Founder, and through Him to the eternal Father (8).

In his earlier encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, Pius XII had condemned the teaching that prayers should not be directed to Christ but only to the Father through Christ: «Christ is Head of the universal Church as He exists in both His natures», the «Man Christ Jesus» is «mediator of God and men», but He «is also the Son of God and God Himself» (9).

In the present supernatural order in which man sins and in which he repairs sin, all reparation depends completely on the vicarious reparation offered by Christ on the cross for the sins of all men. All reparation is «Christocentric» in that no reparation is possible independent of Christ. Our reparation is always in union with Christ's sacrifice on the cross through the Mass and the sacraments. All our reparation is «through Christ Jesus» (10). The Morning Offering of the Apostleship of Prayer derives its value from union with the redemptive sacrifice of Christ (11).

II. REPARATION TO CHRIST AS MAN

In the present supernatural economy, besides involving an injury and offense to God, sin has the added malice of a rejection of Christ our Savior who came into the world to redeem men from sin. In view of this additional disorder, this insult to Christ, a new form of reparation has arisen, Christocentric reparation or reparation directed to Christ in His sacred humanity.

Our plan has been to speak first of reparation in general (both theocentric and Christocentric) and then in the final chapter to study both forms of reparation as found in devotion to the Sacred Heart. But in treating Christocentric reparation

(8) AAS 39 (1947) 528.

(9) AAS 35 (1943) 236-237.

(10) Cf. Pius XI, MR, AAS 20 (1928) 170-171; Pius XII, MC, AAS 35 (1943) 232-233.

(11) Cf. SAO, n. 3b; *Manuale*, 14.

in general it will frequently be necessary to refer to it in relation to devotion to the Sacred Heart, since it is chiefly, though not exclusively, in this devotion that Christocentric reparation finds its most common expression today; hence even this general explanation must be clarified from authors who treat of the subject as found in devotion to the Sacred Heart (12).

Sin has a double malice in regard to Christ: it is a denial of the honor due to Him as our Redeemer, and it is the cause of His sufferings.

Christ is King of all men, individually and socially, by His natural right as Son of God and by His acquired right through redemption, and as such He is to be honored by men, individually and socially. It is God's plan «that all men may honor the Son even as they honor the Father» (Jn. 5:23). Sin is the denial of this honor (13).

Sin, moreover, is the cause of Christ's sufferings. Sin can cause no suffering to God in His divine nature, but sin can and did bring pain and sorrow to the sacred humanity of Christ. «He began to be saddened and exceedingly troubled. Then he said to them, "My soul is sad, even unto death. Wait here and watch with me"» (Mt. 26:38).

From these two disorders—dishonor and suffering—have come two forms of reparation directed to Christ as Man: reparation of honor and reparation of consolation. The first is a tribute of honor and glory offered to Christ in compensation for the dishonor involved in every sin. The second is a protestation of love and sympathy offered to Christ to console Him for the sorrow and sadness caused by sin. The second differs from the first in the motive which inspires it and in its essential content, for consolation tends to remove, not the offense caused by the sin or the punishment which follows upon sin, but the sadness which sin has caused in

(12) An example of Christocentric reparation in another context is St. Ignatius Loyola's third prelude in the contemplations of the Third Week of the Spiritual Exercises, where he bids the exercitant «to seek for sorrow, compassion, and shame because the Lord is going to His suffering for my sins»; «to ask for sorrow with Christ in sorrow, anguish with Christ in anguish, tears and deep grief because of the great affliction Christ endures for me» (*The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, A New Translation, by Louis J. Puhl, S. J., nn. 193, 203).

(13) Agostini, 276-277; cf. the encyclicals AS and TF of Leo XIII, QP of Pius XI.

Christ. This, too, is a disorder which should be removed by an offering or compensation of consolation (14).

Reparation that seeks to honor Christ in compensation for the denial of honor, even to Christ as Man, involved in sin is similar to reparation that seeks to honor God in compensation for the dishonor of sin. It poses no new problem; in fact, the same act directed to Christ as Man also gives glory to God. But reparation of consolation is something new; it cannot be offered to God, but only to Christ as Man, for consolation supposes suffering. Consolation, therefore, will receive special study.

The encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* speaks of this type of reparation, motivated by a love that desires to suffer together with Christ, in order to bring Him some comfort in His sufferings (15). In the description of Pius XI we note the special characteristics of this reparation of consolation: *love* in the one who offers consolations and *suffering* in the one who is consoled. Sin is looked upon not so much as bringing dishonor but rather as the cause of sadness and sorrow. In the Garden of Olives it was the weight of sadness and sorrow that moved Our Lord to seek consolation from His disciples and later to receive it from an angel when the disciples slept. «He began to feel dread, and to be exceedingly troubled. And he said to them, "My soul is sad even unto death. Wait here and watch!... Simon, dost thou sleep? Couldst thou not watch one hour?..."» (Mk. 14:33-34). «And there appeared to him an angel from heaven to strengthen him» (Lk. 22:43).

Agostini speaks of consolation as something not intended for all, but only for chosen souls who are more sensitive to the feeling of Christ and hence more desirous to offer consolation. A certain degree of fervor and perfection is required, he says, since only a friend can console another. He answers the objection arising from the title of Pius XI's encyclical, *de communi expiatione SS. Cordi Iesu debita*, by saying that just as love of God is obligatory but not all respond to it in such a way as to arrive at the same heights of sanctity, so the request for consolation is made to all but not all respond in the same degree (16).

(14) Cf. Agostini, 277 and note 7.

(15) Cf. AAS 20 (1928) 169.

(16) Agostini, 280 and note 13.

But it is important to note that in the mind of the popes reparation is an obligation upon *all*, and insofar as consolation is part of reparation it is incumbent upon all. True it is that only a friend can console another, but every person with the slightest degree of sanctifying grace in his soul is a friend of God and hence in a position to offer consolation to Christ, at least in this minimum degree. The capacity and desire to offer consolation in an ever increasing degree will grow with the increase of charity and sanctifying grace. But our first concern is the common obligation of all the faithful, arising from the fact that their sins have caused suffering to their Redeemer, just as earlier we spoke of the common obligation of all sinners, arising from the fact that their sins involve an injury and offense to God.

A. GENERAL MEANING OF CONSOLATION

The moving force behind consolation is love in the one who desires to console a friend in his sorrow. Consolation is based on the bond of union that exists between two friends: consolation is characteristic of a friend who undergoes evil on behalf of his friend (17). St. Thomas indicates that in regard to the evils that come into his life man needs two things, mercy (because of the evil he himself has done) and consolation to sustain him in the evils that come to him from outside (18).

Two things are needed for joy: the procuring of one's own proper good and knowledge of this fact. The actions of others can be a source of joy to us if in some way they are united to us so as to become a proper good for us. St. Thomas lists three ways in which this can come about: 1) If the action of another procures some good for us, for then his act is pleasing to us. 2) If the action of another is one of praise for our good qualities, for it is always pleasing to a person to know that he is loved and esteemed by others. 3) If the good

(17) St. Thomas, *In Ep. ad Coloss.*, c. 2, lect. 1: «consolatio est amici, si pro eo sustineat mala».

(18) *In Ep. II ad Cor.*, c. 1, lect. 2; cf. the entire final section. In c. 7, lect. 2, St. Thomas describes consolation: «Consolatio enim est remedium contra tristitias. Naturale enim est quod semper delectatio et gaudium tristitiae opponitur; et... omnis delectatio debilitat vel totaliter tollit tristitiam. Si delectatio sit contraria tristitiae, totaliter absorbet tristitiam: si autem non sit contraria, debilitat et diminuit eam. Et inde est quod quando quis est in tristitia, quandocumque duntiantur sibi aliqua laeta, diminuitur tristitia».

action itself of another is esteemed as one's own proper good, due to the bond of love which makes a person esteem his friend as another self, as one with him through love (19).

How does a man console his friend in sorrow? St. Thomas gives two ways. The first is also indicated by Aristotle. Since sadness tends to burden a person and wear him down, it is somewhat like a burden or load to be carried, from which the person seeks to be relieved. When he sees others grieving over his lot he imagines that they, too, are carrying the load with him in an effort to relieve him. And so he carries the burden of his grief more easily, just as a material load is more easily carried by a number of men together.

Another and better way to explain how a friend consoles his friend in sorrow is this. The fact that friends grieve over a man's sorrow shows him that his friends love him; and it is always pleasing and consoling to know that one is loved by others. The very presence of a friend is consoling, because it assures him that his sufferings are valued by his friends. The hard part of suffering is the fear that the suffering is useless. Consolation shows the person that he is loved, that his friendship is cherished, that his sufferings are of value (20).

B. CONSOLATION TO GOD?

If the moving force behind consolation is love in the one who desires to console his friend, there is also another characteristic of consolation, another requirement: suffering in the one who is to be consoled. Cardinal Newman says we could never imagine it possible that we could worship God by sympathy and consolation. But this possibility has been realized for us in the Incarnation. Hence it is obvious that our consolation or sympathy is offered to Christ in His human nature and not to God or to Christ in His divine nature incapable as it is of suffering and so incapable also of being consoled.

The point is mentioned here not because of any doubt, but because of certain expressions which occur in Sacred Scrip-

(19) ST 1-2, 32, 5; cf. ad 3: «operationes aliorum... procedunt ex habitu illius, qui est unum tecum per amorem».

(20) Cf. ST 1-2, 38, 3; *In Job*, c. 2, lect. 2; *In Ep. ad Rom.*, c. 12, lect. 3; *9 Ethic.*, lect. 13.

ture; for example, St. Paul tells us: «And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God» (Eph. 4:30), which St. Thomas explains in these two ways: 1) The Holy Spirit is said to be saddened when a person in whom the Holy Spirit dwells is saddened. 2) The expression is a metaphor: just as God is said to be angry because by punishing He produces effects similar to those produced by an angry man, so the Holy Spirit is said to be saddened because He withdraws or departs from the sinner, an effect similar to that of an injured person withdrawing from the one who saddened him (21).

The same applies to other metaphors found in Scripture: God's anger or repentance, appeasing or placating God for sin (22). Such expressions indicate no change in God. They are metaphorical expressions used by the sacred authors to indicate a change that takes place in man, who by sin becomes worthy of hate and by repentance becomes worthy again of love (23). As St. Thomas also says, God's love for man is eternal and immutable, but at times man puts an obstacle to God's love (24).

These scriptural expressions, adapted to our human mentality and human weakness (25), indicate the profound truth that God is not and cannot be indifferent to sin, even though He is not intrinsically changed by sin. Hence we do not speak of giving consolation to God: 1) because He is eternal and unchangeable; 2) because there is no suffering in Him to be assuaged (26).

C. CONSOLATION TO CHRIST

But Christ, Son of God incarnate in our passible flesh, has a real human nature capable of suffering, and so is capable of being consoled. The fact of Christ's sufferings during His mortal, earthly life, especially during His passion and death, is perfectly clear from the Gospels. But how is it

(21) *In Ep. ad Eph.*, c. 4, lect. 10.

(22) CG 3:96; DV 23:2; cf. *In Joan.*, c. 6; *In Matt.*, c. 3.

(23) Cf. *In Ep. ad Eph.*, c. 4, lect. 10; CG 3:122; ST 3 Sup. 72, 3.

(24) ST 1-2, 113, 2; ST 3, 49, 4, ad 2; CG 3:159.

(25) Cf. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O. P., «È teologicamente essata l'espressione: Consolare il Cuore di Gesù?», VC 16 (1947) 28-38.

(26) Cf. the articles of Joseph Lécuyer, C. S. Sp., «Note sur une définition Thomiste de la satisfaction», DC 8 (1955) 21-30; «Réflexions sur la théologie du culte selon saint Thomas», RT 4 (1955) 339-362.

possible now to offer consolation to Christ, who reigns gloriously in heaven (27). For our Blessed Lord at times requests consolation and speaks of Himself as still suffering. Pius XI, for example, described Our Lord's appearance to St Margaret Mary Alacoque:

When Christ revealed Himself to St. Margaret Mary, He insisted on the immensity of His love, and at the same time sorrowfully grieved over the great number of horrible outrages heaped upon Him by the ingratitude of men... (28).

These difficulties may be reduced to two questions: 1) Is it possible for men now, at the present time, to console Christ for His past sufferings? 2) Does Christ in some real sense still continue to suffer even now?

1. Human Way of Speaking

The first explanation is that Christ in speaking of His present sufferings adapts Himself to a human way of speaking in order to be better understood. He expresses sublime truths in human language adapted to our weakness. He speaks of Himself as still suffering, although His sufferings are now finished and He reigns gloriously in heaven (29).

St. Augustine has said: «Give me a lover and he understands what I say». Psychologically speaking, for one who loves, time and space are not important, they do not exist. For him the only reality is that the one he loves suffers. The fact that now the sufferings are at an end, matters little. To him the suffering endured is the important thing, and he tries even afterwards to make up for it (30).

The Church uses this psychology in the liturgical cycle of feasts. If He so chooses, Christ, too, can thus adapt Himself to the mentality of His hearers. The theological basis is the reality of Christ's passion and death in the past, the ever-present reality of the beneficial effects of Christ's redemption which we share, and the ever-continuing reality of sin for

(27) Cf. Pius XI, MR, AAS 20 (1928) 173.

(28) *Ibid.*, 172-173. Cf. a similar description in Benedict XV, *Ecclesie consuetudo*, decretal letter on the canonization of St. Margaret Mary, AAS 12 (1920) 494.

(29) Cf. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O. P., «E teologicamente essaata l'espressione: Consolare il Cuore di Gesù?» VC 16 (1947) 28-38; Agostini, 284, note 12.

(30) Agostini, 284-285.

which Christ atoned by His suffering and death. Pius XI himself notes that the sins of every age are sufficient of themselves to bring about Christ's death anew, if that were possible (31). «They crucify again for themselves the Son of God and make him a mockery» (Heb. 6:6).

2. Christ's Foreknowledge

But there is another, a theologically better, explanation of the present actuality of Christ's sufferings and capacity for consolation; it is based on the theology of the Word Incarnate (32).

With God there is no past or future. All events are before Him in an eternal present. From the viewpoint of God, Christ's sufferings are always present, although from the viewpoint of this temporal world in which He suffered, His passion took place at a definite time and place.

Moreover, even as Man Christ possessed more than mere human knowledge (acquired experimental knowledge). He was also endowed with infused knowledge proper to the angels and with the beatific vision proper to the blessed in heaven, by which they see God in Himself and in God all other things. Hence Christ had immediate and universal knowledge — all men and all things were present to Him. Pius XII recalls this fact in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis* when he says:

Hardly was He conceived in the womb of the Mother of God, when He began to enjoy the beatific vision, and in that vision all the members of His mystical body were continually and unceasingly present and He embraced them with His redeeming love... In the crib, on the cross, in the unending glory of the Father, Christ has all the members of the Church present before Him and united to Him in a clearer and more loving way than a mother loves her little one clasped to her breast, than anyone knows and loves himself (33).

Hence, if the prevision of our sins, for which He was to offer satisfaction, caused sadness to our Savior in the Garden of Olives and throughout His passion, it is also true that our good acts were a source of consolation to Him then, as Pius XI tells us:

(31) MR, AAS 20 (1928) 173-174.

(32) Agostini, 288-290.

(33) AAS 35 (1943) 229, 230.

If, by His prevision of our future sins, the soul of Christ became sad even unto death, there can be no doubt that by His like prevision of our reparation He was in some way comforted when «there appeared an angel from heaven» (Lk. 22:43) to console that Heart of His bowed down with sorrow and anguish (34).

Christ's foreknowledge has an important bearing upon our mental prayer, for example, our Holy Hours. When we contemplate Christ during His Agony in the Garden or in other scenes of His sufferings, we do not merely indulge in an activity of the imagination, transporting ourselves in imagination to the Garden in order to try to make ourselves present to Christ during His Agony. There would be a note of unreality about this. Nor is it merely that we try to make Christ present to us now in imagination (although this element does enter in), for He is also really present by grace and in the Blessed Sacrament. But behind this activity of ours in contemplation is the reality of Christ's knowledge of us during His Agony: we were there with Christ in His knowledge and love of us. He them saw us in our present activity of uniting ourselves to Him in prayer and love.

3. Accidental Joy in Heaven

It is possible to go further. Not only did our good acts console Christ during His passion, but even now they are a source of joy to Him in heaven, an «accidental beatitude» in theological terminology, such as the blessed in heaven receive, in addition to the essential joy of the beatific vision, from the contemplation of other things besides God. Christ referred to this accidental joy of the blessed, when He said: «I say to you that, even so, there will be joy in heaven over one sinner

(34) MR, AAS 20 (1928) 174. Karl Rahner, S. J., «Einige Thesen zur Theologie der Herz-Jesu-Verehrung», in *Cor Salvatoris*, 194-195, questions whether our good acts were really a source of consolation to Christ, and not rather an added sorrow. His argument is summarized and answered by J. N. Zore, S. J., «Recentiorum questionum de cultu SS. Cordis Iesu conspectus», *Greg* 37 (1956) 111-112: «auctor... sententiam affert, Domino in sua immensa tristitia futura nostra bona opera exiguum attulisse solacium eaque propter suam inopiam et ambiguitatem ipsi forte non minus ac nostra peccata causam fuisse dolorum. An non talis extenuatio et restrictio valoris nostri meriti detrahere videtur de possibilitate, utilitate, necessitate «consolacionis», quam Dominus ipse a suis expectabat Apostolis... et instante a S. Margarita M. postulavit? An non sit eximium opus, cum homo (utique cum gratia Dei) Deo omnia dat quae ei dare potest? In possibiliate vere consolandi Dominum et reparandi nostras iniurias stant pietatis exercitia: Hora Sancta et Communio Reparatrix, quae "non modo Ecclesia probavit, sed etiam copiosis spiritualibus largitionibus locupletavit". Immo "consolatio" Christi nobis a Summo Pontifice Pio XI imponitur...».

who repents...» (Lk. 15:7). Christ in heaven can suffer no more; hence this accidental joy is only improperly called «consolation», which supposes suffering in the one who is consoled. But it is a joy to Him, for Christ in heaven is not insensible. In His human nature He can experience, in addition to the essential joy of the beatific vision, sentiments of joy which can be increased indefinitely by our good works of «consolation» and reparation (35).

4. Sufferings of the Mystical Christ

Even today Christ suffers «mystically» in His Church, in the members of His mystical body still on earth. «The expiatory passion of Christ is renewed and in a certain manner continued and fulfilled in His mystical body the Church» (36). Before giving a positive explanation of this truth, we will consider two explanations connected with the question of Christ's sufferings in His mystical body.

a) *«Spes Christi»*

Is it possible to speak of consolation as a partial fulfillment of Christ's «hope» for the salvation of men? The question is raised by an article in *Le Coeur* (37) in an effort to explain consolation in such a way as to give it greater appeal to young people. The author refers to articles of Père Charles in *Nouvelle revue théologique* (38) discussing an «almost forgotten theory» which would extend the object of hope, eternal happiness, to apply to all who are capable of it and not merely to one's own personal acquisition of eternal happiness. In this sense, then, Christ could have hope — during His mortal life and even now in heaven — in that He desires the salvation of all men still on earth (39).

It is not necessary to spend much time in refuting this theory. It will suffice to refer to St. Thomas who is quoted

(35) Agostini, 287-288; Zorè, 112; cf. ST 1, 62, 9, ad 3.

(36) Pius XI, MR, AAS 20 (1928) 174.

(37) André Dérumaux, «Crise ou évolution dans la dévotion des jeunes pour le Sacré-Cœur?» *Le Coeur*, ECarm, 296-326.

(38) Pierre Charles, S. J., «*Spes Christi*», NRT 61 (1934) 1009-1021; 64 (1937) 1057-1075; the series incomplete.

(39) Proposed by Thomas Muniessa, S. J., died 1696, professor of theology at the University of Barcelona, qualificator of the Inquisition in Spain, synodal examiner, and author of *Disputationes scholasticae de mysteriis Incarnationis et Eucharistiae*; cf. Dérumaux, 321, note; Charles, NRT 64 (1937) 1057, note 1.

in favor of the position. To the question whether one person can hope for eternal beatitude for another, St. Thomas answers in the negative. But in his explanation he introduces a distinction which opens the door to another possibility: by the bond of love one person can hope for another whatever he hopes for himself, including eternal life (40).

However, it is necessary to distinguish: 1) theological hope from desire and expectation (41); 2) proper acts of one virtue from similar acts commanded by the virtue of charity. Even Père Charles admits that hope for another, as the true and proper theological virtue of hope, is a conclusion St. Thomas himself did not draw (42). In fact, there are passages where St. Thomas expressly denies that one person can hope for the eternal beatitude of another (43) and that Christ had the virtue of hope (44).

St. Thomas proposes and answers the specific difficulty mentioned above: Christ's desire for the salvation of all men, for the increase and perfection of His mystical body. This does not refer to Christ's personal perfection, but to the participation of other men in the perfection of Christ (45). St. Thomas denies that the angels and the souls of the blessed in heaven have the theological virtue of hope (46). All of this agrees perfectly with the definition of Benedict XII on the beatific vision which the blessed enjoy even before the general judgment and which does away with acts of faith and hope as theological virtues in the proper sense (47).

Clearly, then, we cannot speak of a «spes Christi» in the sense of the theological virtue of hope. Christ now glorified in heaven desires the salvation of all men redeemed by His death on the cross, but this desire is not the theological virtue of hope.

b) «Suffering» of Christ in heaven

Many reported apparitions described Our Lady as weeping over the sins and sufferings of men. An article in *Maria-*

(40) ST 2-2, 17, 3; cf. *QO. Disp., De Spe.*

(41) ST 1-2, 40, 1; 3S 26, 2, 5, sol. 2.

(42) Charles, 1067, note 31.

(43) *QO. Disp., De Spe.*, a. 4.

(44) ST 3, 7, 4, and ad 1; 3S 26, 2, 5, sol. 1.

(45) ST 3, 7, 4, ad 3.

(46) 3S 26, 2, 5, sol. 2.

(47) ES 530.

num discusses the question as to whether or not our Blessed Lady in heaven «suffers» over the fate of people here on earth (48). A strong argument is seen in the words of Pius XII concerning the «Weeping Madonna» of Syracuse. Although the Holy See has made no statement as to the reality of the tears, the Holy Father is impressed by the account of the Sicilian bishops.

Without doubt, Mary is eternally happy in heaven and suffers neither sorrow nor sadness. But she is not insensible to the miseries of the human race; rather she ever fosters love and affection for mankind of whom she became the Mother, when sorrowing and weeping she stood beneath the cross of her crucified Son. Do men understand the hidden language of these tears? The tears of Mary! On Golgotha they were tears of compassion for her Jesus and of sadness for the sins of the world. Does she still weep for the fresh wounds inflicted on the mystical body of Jesus? Or does she weep for the great number of her children in whom error and guilt have extinguished the life of grace and who seriously offend the divine Majesty?... (49).

Basing his opinion on this testimony and on that of Benedict XII as well as on the testimony of the fathers and theologians that the blessed in heaven before the general judgment enjoy essential, but not consummate happiness, Volken concludes that Our Lady's «suffering» is not merely metaphorical, not merely «representative» (i. e., with reference to the sufferings she underwent during her life on earth, which are now present to us insofar as the work of redemption in which she co-operated by her sufferings has an eternal aspect, independent of time), but that Mary is really «suffering» now, not univocally but analogously — a hidden «suffering» connected with the mystical body of Christ. Because it is only analogously the same as the suffering we know on earth, it would perhaps be better to call it by some other name, such as «concern» «preoccupation», «solicitude» for the suffering members of Christ's mystical body still on earth (50):

Benedict XII had defined that the blessed before the general judgment possess the beatific vision with its consequent great joy (51). Yet Benedict himself could embrace

(48) Laurent Volken, M. S., «*Maria au Ciel souffre-t-elle pour son peuple sur la terre?*», Mar 17 (1955) 421-472.

(49) AAS 46 (1954) 660; cf. a similar message to the faithful of Ecuador concerning the Sorrowful Virgin of Quito, AAS 48 (1956) 292-293.

(50) Cf. ST 1, 79, 2 for various meanings of «suffering».

(51) ES 530.

the probable opinion that the joy of the blessed will receive a great increase after the last judgment (52).

The «concern» or «solicitude» of the blessed for their brethren still on earth is found also and especially in Christ and His Blessed Mother. The explanation is based upon the doctrine of St. Paul: «If one member suffers anything, all the members suffer with it» (1 Cor. 12:26). Christ, though He always enjoyed the beatific vision, suffered during His mortal life on earth, and even now «suffers» in heaven, as His words to Saul on the road to Damascus show (Acts 9:4) (53).

The «tears» of Our Lady and the question of «suffering» in the mystical Christ, discussed in the *Marianum* article, is connected with consolation, for consolation seeks to alleviate suffering. Christ in heaven «suffers», in an analogous sense of the word, in that He is concerned about the members of His mystical body still on earth, He desires the salvation of all men, He desires the coming of His Kingdom and the increase and perfection of His mystical body. The article helps us to give a positive explanation of the mystical suffering of Christ in His members still on earth.

c) «Consolation» to the Mystical Christ

The passion of Christ continues in His mystical body. Christ the head now glorious in heaven still suffers «mystically» in His members still on earth. Just as the human race died to sin when Christ in the name of sinful mankind died

(52) «...aliquibus dicentibus probabiliter et quod post generalem resurrectionem vel iudicium generale dei essentiam dicte anime perfectius, plenius, vicinius, clarius non solum extensive sed et intensive visure essent; et quod earum beatitudo essentialis post generalem iudicium magnum acceperet augmentum: quæ opinio visa fuit mici tunc verior et magis consona dictis Sanctorum et adhuc etiam, omni assertione temeraria circumscripta probabilior mici etiam videtur... Aliis autem visum fuit quod in essentia beatitudinis nullum augmentum fieret post generalem iudicium...

...Ex quibus conclusi, quod multa sunt, que beati nunc recte desiderant scire, que tamen nesciunt, ipsa tamen sciente in iudicio vel post generale iudicium, quia tunc tollitur omnis nescientia ab eis omnium eorum que secundum rectam rationem scire appetuntur ab angelis et hominibus beatis. Ponuntur etiam cause quare beatitudo sanctorum intensive secundum me et multos alios, vel extensive secundum alios multum augebitur post generale iudicium, quia eorum scientia erit perfectior et eorum amor intensior multo plus quam ante fuerit. Ostenditur etiam, quod tam dæmones quam homines impii molto plus cruciabantur post general iudicium quam ante, et quod cruciatus eorum ex multis augebitur» (Manuscript of the Vatican Library, lat. 4006: «De statu animalium ante generale iudicium», fol. 16, verso, a; fol. 17, recto, b; quoted from Volken, 441, note 38).

(53) Cf. Volken, 421; St. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps. 30* (PL 36:231).

on the cross (54), so now Christ suffers mystically in His members, not that there is physical pain in Christ now anymore than there was physical pain in us when Christ died on the cross. But Christ's passion is continued in His members, in the sense that just as once pain really tortured the physical body of Christ, so now pain is found afflicting the mystical body of Christ. Although Christ the head is no longer capable of experiencing pain, His members can and do suffer. We may, then, speak of our efforts to alleviate the sufferings of Christ's members as consolation to the mystical Christ and in a true sense as consolation to Christ, the head of the mystical body.

In St. Matthew's account of the last judgment Christ the King and Judge will say to the just: «I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink;... Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me» (Mt 25:35, 40). Every act of mercy done to a suffering or needy member of Christ, Christ considers as done to Himself. But such acts of mercy, of alleviation of sorrow or suffering, are a consolation given to the sufferer. Since Christ takes these acts as done to Himself, we are rightly said by our works of mercy and fraternal charity to offer consolation to Christ.

In St. Luke's account of St. Paul's conversion we read the oft-quoted words of Christ: «Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute me?... I am Jesus, whom thou art persecuting...» (Acts 9:4-5). If Christ Himself is persecuted when His members are persecuted, then Christ is consoled when we console and seek to alleviate His members, suffering persecution here on earth. This consolation may take the form of works of mercy; it will also include our prayers and good works offered for all those in various parts of the world who are still suffering persecution and thus continuing the passion of Christ, filling up in their flesh «what is lacking of the sufferings of Christ... for his body, which is the Church» (Col. 1:24).

Pius XI says Christ still suffering in His mystical body invites us as companions in His expiation (55). Although the

(54) «Since one died for all, therefore all died» (2 Cor 5:14). Cf. Cyril Vollert, S. J., «We Died with Christ», RfR 4 (1945) 337-348.

(55) MR, AAS 20 (1928) 174.

pope does not explain further, we may see at least implied in his words a further means of consoling Christ: not only our corporal works of mercy to His needy members, not only our prayers for His persecuted members, but our penance, our good works, our apostolic efforts for the spiritually ailing members or potential members of His mystical body — in other words, our apostolic ministry for the salvation of souls redeemed by the blood of Christ. This is but one aspect of our co-operation in the salvific work of Christ, but it is a most important aspect and gives a new motive and a new unity to our apostolic work. For our apostolic endeavors of preaching the word of God and administering the sacraments thus become not merely acts of fraternal charity, but a consolation to Christ Himself — the spiritually ailing members of Christ are healed through the saving merits of Christ's passion, and Christ the head is consoled. These endeavors are a partial fulfillment of Christ's desire for the salvation of all men for whom He died.

Our participation in Christ's redemption and our association with Christ in rendering His redemption efficacious for others is a consolation we offer to the mystical Christ.

5. Objections to Consolation

Objections are brought against Christocentric reparation of consolation because it is said to present Christ in an unfavorable light, as a disappointed lover seeking to be consoled in his dejection or as an effeminate person who longs to have others sharing his sadness with him. Such objections are based on a false idea of Christ's love for man and a false understanding of consolation.

Christ is not to be compared with a disconsolate human lover, rejected by the one he loves, who now bemoans his loss and seeks compensation from another. This is a false idea of Christ's love for men. In Christ we find divine and human love. To understand Christ's love better, we begin with the divine love.

God's love is not the same as man's love. When a man loves another, he wishes good to the one he loves, but he cannot produce goodness in the other. Rather he is attracted and drawn to the goodness, real or imaginary, that he finds already

existing in the other. But God's love is different. When God loves, He produces goodness and pours it into the creature He loves (56).

God's love is not a love of concupiscence or utility. God's love is the only love that is not solicited by previously existing goodness. Instead of being drawn by some external goodness to be acquired, God's love produces goodness and pours it forth into the creatures He loves. God can only give, He receives nothing from us. Our return of love confers no benefit or utility on Him (57).

This divine, uncreated love is found in Christ, for He is God. But it is not to this love or to Christ as God that consolation is offered. For consolation supposes suffering. Hence consolation is offered to the human love of Christ or to Christ as Man.

But Christ's human love is free from all imperfections. It is essentially the sign and the instrument of divine love (58). More than any other human love it shares in the perfection of the divine love. More than other human love, it loves men not in order to receive anything from them but to give to them ever more abundantly. At the Incarnation the Blessed Trinity breathed into Christ a perfect human love, like unto God's own redemptive love.

To this human love we offer consolation. As we saw earlier, God is always prepared to love men and to confer benefits upon them, but men put obstacles to this love by their sins. Sin is the obstacle to God's love, the rejection of God's love. Sin is refusal to receive the benefits of God's love. Sin is the rejection of Christ's love and Christ's redemption. For this rejection of Christ's love and redemption and for the suffering it caused, we offer to Christ a reparation of consolation.

The second objection, that the desire for consolation is proper to an effeminate person looking for others to share his sadness, was discussed by St. Thomas in his general treatment of consolation. He notes that in consolation there is a mixture of joy and sadness; for while the presence of a friend

(56) ST 1, 20, 2, and 23, 4; 1-2, 110, 1, and ad 1; cf. 3, 86; 2.

(57) ST 1, 44, 4, ad 1.

(58) Hartmann, 254.

in sorrow is consoling, it is also a sorrow to be the cause of sadness to others (59).

In the case of Christ, we know that His love for men is not a sentimental love, but the strong, self-sacrificing love that sent Him to the cross. Moreover, His love desires to pour out the benefits of His redemption upon men, who place the obstacles of sin in the way of His love. Hence His request for consolation is not a weak appeal for solace, but a call for a strong love in return for His sacrificing love, a strong love that will break with sin and remove the obstacles to receiving the fullness of His redeeming love.

Since Christ's motive is the glory of His Father, His call for reparation is not for any personal benefit or utility that may accrue to Him, much less for any sentimental or effeminate delight in seeing others share His sadness, but only that His Father be glorified in the salvation of men, who thus benefit when they answer His call. As God, He knows what is good for man, even in regard to what is the best approach to win the heart of man.

Moreover, as St. Thomas notes, a man allows his friends to be saddened only if the help they give greatly exceeds the sadness caused to them. Christ, on the contrary, supplies the abundant help of His grace to enable men to offer this consolation and thus repair their sins.

Finally, consolation or sympathy is not effeminate, but something profoundly human. By nature women are more sympathetic than men, but in itself sympathy is not something that belongs exclusively to only one sex; it is a human trait to be received and developed, and in this case to enter even into our service of God.

III. CO-OPERATION IN THE SALVIFIC WORK OF CHRIST

Sin has a double aspect: it is an injury to God who is offended; it is the greatest possible evil to man. Reparation also has this double aspect: it looks to God to whom reparation is offered; it looks to man who thus receives the benefits of

Christ's reparation. Thus far we have looked at Christo-centric reparation chiefly in its relation to Christ. Now we look at it in its relation to men, i. e., as co-operation with Christ in His salvific work. This, too, may be called Christo-centric reparation, in the sense of our co-operation with Christ in bringing His redemption to others.

Just as the historical Christ was born of Mary, suffered, died, was buried, rose again and ascended into heaven, so the mystical Christ, the Church, formed of the union of Christ and His members, was born on the cross, lives and suffers here on earth. In the first part of the work of redemption the Eternal Word chose as instrument a human nature hypostatically united to Himself. In the second part of the work of redemption, the application of the benefits of redemption to individual souls, Christ chose another instrument, not a physical body, but His mystical body, to continue and to perpetuate His saving mission in the world. The way of salvation will not be different for the Church, Christ's body, than it was for Christ the head in His suffering human nature. It is the way of the cross. «Did not Christ have to suffer these things before entering into His glory?» (Lk 24:26). «But if we are sons, we are heirs also: heirs indeed of God and joint heirs with Christ, provided, however, we suffer with him that we may also be glorified with him» (Rom 8:17).

The bond between Christ and His mystical members is more than just a moral solidarity. It is a life. This is not a mere external imitation of the life of the head. The Church is the mystical Christ; in the Church Christ mystically lives, prays and suffers (60). The Church relives, renews, completes the passion of Christ: «what is lacking of the suffering of Christ I fill up in my flesh for his body, which is the Church...» (Col 1:24).

As members of Christ we are associated with Christ in His salvific work of bringing the benefits of His reparation to others. By our prayers, good works, and sufferings, we become in a certain sense «co-redeemers» with Christ.

(60) Agostini, 291, note 5, calls this a «communicatio idiomatum» not between the two natures of Christ, but between the head and the members of the mystical body. He quotes Pascal's famous statement: «Christ is in agony till the end of the world».

Pius XII has repeatedly expressed this fact of our co-operation in the salvation of others, but especially in his dogmatic encyclical on the mystical body (61).

(61) Cf. AAS 35 (1943) 198-199, 200, 213, 236, 245-246.

CHAPTER FOUR

REPARATION IN DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

After studying theocentric and Christocentric reparation in general, there remains the study of reparation as practiced in devotion to the Sacred Heart. Devotion to the Sacred Heart means here the public cult approved by the Church, not private forms of the devotion, though otherwise laudable and approved. Various devotions have flourished during different periods of the Church's history, but it has been chiefly during the last century that devotion to the Sacred Heart has attained the prominence in the devotional life of the faithful that it has today. This has been under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the constant watchfulness and encouragement of the Church.

Our chief source for the public devotion to the Sacred Heart will be the papal pronouncements of the past hundred years. First, the principal papal documents on devotion to the Sacred Heart will be indicated, with special attention given to reparation. Documents referring to reparation, though not reparation to the Sacred Heart, will also be cited, because they help to clarify the idea of reparation. Then an effort will be made to synthesize the elements of reparation as found in devotion to the Sacred Heart.

I. PAPAL DOCUMENTS

A. PIUS IX

1. In 1856 Pius IX extended the feast of the Sacred Heart to the entire Church. The decree mentions Christ's reparation for sin, and urges the faithful to love the wounded Heart of Christ in return for His love, but there is no reference to reparation as we understand it (1).

(1) August 23, 1856; cf. Nicolaus Nilles, S. J., *De rationibus festorum Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu et Purissimi Cordis Marie*, ed. 5, 1:167.

2. In 1861 the same pontiff granted an indulgence for the «Communion of Reparation» which intends to propitiate God, to avert His punishments, and to make reparation for sin (2).

3. In 1875 Pius IX approved an Act of Consecration to the Sacred Heart. Though called an act of consecration, it really contains an act of reparation also, for the motive of the consecration is the desire to make reparation to the Sacred Heart (3).

4. The Apostleship of Prayer was first approved by Pius IX in 1844. Even the second set of statutes approved by Leo XIII in 1879 made no explicit mention of reparation, which appeared in the revised statutes of 1896.

B. LEO XIII

1. Three documents of Leo XIII, dealing with reparation in general, are: the proclamation of the Holy Year 1899 directed to a reform of morals and satisfaction for past sins (there is a Christological note to the reparation) (4); the encyclical *Tametsi futura* on Christ the Redeemer, which speaks of Christ's reparation for sin (5); and the encyclical *Miræ caritatis* on the Blessed Sacrament, which speaks of placating God and imploring His graces through the Mass (6).

2. Leo's best known work in honor of the Sacred Heart is his world consecration. The encyclical *Annum Sacrum* makes no mention of reparation (7). Nor is reparation mentioned in the act of consecration itself. But it does appear in the letter *De cultu SS. Cordi Iesu amplificando*, written by Cardinal Mazzella, prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, at the direction of the pope (8).

(2) August 9, 1861; cf. Nilles, 1:523-524.

(3) April 26, 1875; ASS 8:402-403; H. Marin, S. J., *Al Reino de Cristo por la devoción a su Sagrado Corazón*, 268-269, lists three acts of consecration and notes the character of reparation found in the acts of Pius IX and Pius XI and its complete absence in that of Leo XIII. The official titles are: Pius IX, *Atto di consecrazione al Sacro Cuore di Gesù*; Leo XIII, *Ad Sacratissimum Cor Iesu formula consecrationis recitanda*; Pius XI, *Precatio placularis ad Sacratissimum Cor Iesu*. The last is called an act of «reparations» in the vernacular versions published in AAS. Marin correctly notes that Leo does not mention reparation in his act of consecration while Pius IX gives it a prominent place.

(4) *Properante ad exitum*, May 11, 1899; ASS 31:642, 643.

(5) November 1, 1900; ASS 33:273-285.

(6) May 28, 1902; ASS 34:653.

(7) May 25, 1899; ASS 31:646-651.

(8) July 21, 1899; ASS 32:52, 53.

3. The confraternity called *Adoratio reparatrix gentium catholicarum* was approved and encouraged by Leo XIII on several occasions. Devotion to the Sacred Heart does not have a prominent place; the reparatory adoration is directed to the Blessed Sacrament (9).

4. One of the clearest statements of Leo XIII on reparation to the Sacred Heart occurs in his apostolic letter raising the feast of the Sacred Heart to a double of the first class, in which he states that the principal end of devotion to the Sacred Heart is reparation, «that through the Sacred Heart of Jesus God may be propitious to the human race» (10). The corresponding decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites lists among the motives of the pope's action his desire that the faithful offer praise and reparation to our Savior (11). Acts of praise and satisfaction are mentioned in the prayer of the Litany of the Sacred Heart, approved in 1898, but they are the acts of Christ in behalf of sinners (12).

5. Finally there is the third set of statutes of the Apostleship of Prayer (13), approved in 1896, which were to remain unchanged for over fifty years, until the recent revision of Pius XII in 1951. The first statute clearly states that the members offer the impetratory value of their good works; there is no mention of the satisfactory value. Theocentric reparation is found in the Communion of Reparation (n. 4), as also in the Holy Hour (n. 5).

C. ST. PIUS X

St. Pius X has given us no encyclical on devotion to the Sacred Heart, but we do find among the *acta* of his pontificate a number of indications of his attitude toward the devotion and toward reparation.

1. There are three very clear statements on reparation to the Sacred Heart. Pius X granted the request to add the ejaculation, *Cor Jesus Sacratissimum, miserere nobis*, to the

(9) ASS 15:449-450; 20:217; 31:501-506.

(10) *Benigno divinae providentiae*, June 28, 1889, *Leonis XIII Acta*, 9 (1890) 122-123: «Præcipuus enim huius cultus finis ille est, scilicet ut ingrati animi crimen et pietatis officiis expietur et Deus per Sanctissimum Cor Iesu humano generi placetur».

(11) ASS 21:694.

(12) ASS 31:192.

(13) ASS 29:750-753.

prayers recited after low Masses, to stimulate the faithful to acts of praise and propitiation (14). He indulged an ejaculation of consolation to the Sacred Heart (15). Writing to Bishop Leon Gauthey, he refused permission to crown the statue of the Sacred Heart, but approved the practice of reparation (16).

2. Among the prayers approved by Pius X, a *Preghiera a Gesù in Sacramento* speaks of personal repentance (17). An indulgence was requested for June devotions in honor of the Sacred Heart, because of the great efficacy of this devotion for the conversion of hardened sinners (18). An ejaculation begs the same grace (19). Although these prayers do not mention reparation, they petition the Sacred Heart for the conversion of sinners, which has always been one of the characteristic graces of this devotion (20) and is indirectly related to reparation.

3. Early in his pontificate Pius X indulged a prayer in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary Reparatrix (21); in 1913 he indulged exercises of reparation for sins of blasphemy against Our Lady (22).

4. A number of associations directed toward reparation were encouraged by Pius X: *Archisodalitas Missæ Reparatrixis* (23), *Consociatio Sacerdotum in honorem Sanctissimi Cordis Iesu* (24), *Consociatio a S. Corde Iesu pro piandis in purgatorio igne detentis* (25), *Associatio Reparationis Sacerdotalis* (26). Finally, there is *Œuvre de la Divine Misericorde*,

(14) ASS 36:750-751.

(15) ASS 37:371-372.

(16) Epistola, July 9, 1908; ASS 41:621.

(17) ASS 39:375-376.

(18) ASS 39:434-435.

(19) ASS 39:559-560.

(20) Cf. José Calveras, S. J., *Los Elementos de la Devoción al Corazón de Jesús. Su contenido y práctica en los Ejercicios de San Ignacio*, nn. 120-123.

(21) ASS 37:267-268.

(22) AAS 4 (1912) 623.

(23) ASS 39:449-450, 450-452.

(24) AAS 2 (1910) 318-320.

(25) AAS 5 (1913) 26-29.

(26) AAS 2 (1910) 474-475; 475-476. Cf. Pius X's exhortation to the clergy, *Hærent animo*, August 4, 1908 (ASS 41:576-577), where the pope praised those priests who offer themselves as victims to God. The practice of offering oneself as a victim for the sins of others was to climax in emphasis and extension to all the faithful in Pius XII's encyclical *Mediator Dei*.

whose members offer their works of fraternal charity to obtain pardon and mercy for their personal sins (27).

D. BENEDICT XV

1. Benedict XV is best known for his promotion of family consecration to the Sacred Heart. But we also find some mention of reparation. He conferred privileges on the *Sodalitas Sacratissimi Cordis pro piandis animabus in purgatorio igne detentis* (28). He also approved an association *Sanctæ Unionis Eucharisticae reparatricis*, but the Sacred Heart is not mentioned (29).

2. Benedict XV canonized St. Margaret Mary and St. Gabriel of the Sorrowful Virgin in 1920. In the homily he joins devotion to the Sacred Heart and to our Sorrowful Mother and speaks of reparation (30). But it is chiefly in the decretal letter *Ecclesiae consuetudo* that Benedict speaks of reparation in the life of St. Margaret Mary (31).

E. PIUS XI

1. Pius XI is the pope of reparation, but we shall be brief here, because his two great encyclicals on reparation will serve as the basis of our synthesis. *Miserentissimus Redemptor* (32) presents the fullest explanation of reparation. *Caritate Christi compulsi* (33), written four years later, is an exhortation to put reparation into practice as the extraordinary remedy for the extraordinary evils of the Depression. Earlier, in establishing the feast of Christ the King, Pius XI expressed the hope that the annual celebration of the feast would be a partial reparation for the evil of laicism (34).

2. In a *motu proprio* in 1932 Pius XI assigned a church in Rome to the faithful of the Slavic rite and indicated the functions to be held there: devotions on Fridays, and more

(27) ASS 40:372-373.

(28) AAS 9 (1917) 533.

(29) AAS 14 (1922) 150.

(30) AAS 12 (1920) 223-225.

(31) AAS 12 (1920) 486-513, esp. 492, 494-496, 506.

(32) May 8, 1928; AAS 20 (1928) 165-179; cf. AAS 21 (1929) 601-606.

(33) May 3, 1932; AAS 24 (1932) 177-194. Cf. a similar appeal for prayer and penance against atheistic communism in the encyclical *Divini Redemptoris*, March 19, 1937; AAS 29 (1937) 96; cf. also AAS 24 (1932) 231.

(34) QP, December 11, 1925; AAS 17 (1925) 606.

solemnly on First Fridays, in honor of «Dulcissimus Jesus», the Oriental equivalent of devotion to the Sacred Heart; prayers for Russia; a special section of the Apostleship of Prayer to offer reparation for communism (35).

3. The Holy Year of 1933 was a call to purification and atonement, especially for personal sin (36), but vicarious reparation is included. To open the Jubilee Year Pius XI ordered a special Holy Hour in St. Peter's and urged the same throughout the world (37). This Holy Hour is to be spent in union with the Sacred Heart, but the word «consolation» does not appear in the letter: rather it is the expiation of sins and the propitiation of God on behalf of sinners that is stressed. In the decree granting an indulgence for this Holy Hour there is no mention of the Sacred Heart, but only of the passion and death of Our Lord and the Blessed Sacrament as the memorial of His death (38). On the occasion of this Holy Hour in St. Peter's, Cardinal Pacelli, the future Pius XII, in the presence of Pius XI, preached on the Sacred Heart and the Holy Hour as taught by Christ Himself to St. Margaret Mary (39).

F. PIUS XII

Pius XII more than any previous pope has made his discourses to the numerous and varied groups of pilgrims from all over the world the ordinary vehicle of his teaching. His thoughts on devotion to the Sacred Heart and his teaching on reparation occur so frequently that we can only give the more important instances.

1. The pontificate of Pius XII began in the year of the fortieth anniversary of Leo XIII's world consecration to the Sacred Heart. Pius XII recalls this event and consecrates his pontificate to the Sacred Heart of Christ the King in his

(35) AAS 24 (1932) 353-354.

(36) Cf. Pius XI's allocution in the sacred consistory of March 13, 1933; AAS 25 (1933) 105-118, esp. 118.

(37) *Chirographus* to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, March 2, 1933; AAS 25 (1933) 73-75.

(38) AAS 25 (1933) 171-172.

(39) Eugenio Cardinale Pacelli, *Discorsi e Penegirici* (1931-1938), ed. 2, 159-166.

first encyclical *Summi Pontificatus*. Here is his first mention of reparation (40).

Up to the present, the most important document of the reigning pontiff in favor of devotion to the Sacred Heart is his encyclical *Haurietis aquas*. Acts of love and satisfaction are characteristic of the devotion; redemption is the mystery of divine love by which Christ satisfied for the sins of mankind (41).

2. In 1943 Pius XII wrote his encyclical *Mystici Corporis* on the union of the members of the mystical body with Christ the head, the foundation of our reparation. We have already seen this encyclical in connection with our co-operation in the salvific work of Christ, a subject also referred to in a talk in 1940 (42). In a recent approval of an association in honor of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Pius XII spoke of repairing injuries inflicted on the mystical body (43).

3. The teaching of Pius XII on the role of the faithful as victim and offerer in the Mass is detailed in the encyclical *Mediator Dei*, as we have already seen. The same teaching is often repeated. In a *motu proprio* in 1940 Pius XII had ordered Masses and public prayers to appease the divine justice in the face of the present evils (44). The Sacred Congregation of the Council urged that the faithful be instructed in these truths: the impetratory and satisfactory value of the Mass, and the Communion of Saints (45). The place of the Mass in the life of a priest and his corresponding obligation to the life of a victim in a higher degree than the ordinary faithful is explained in the apostolic exhortation *Menti Nostræ* (46).

4. Pius XII's 1946 allocution to the cardinals and his call for a crusade of reparation to the Sacred Heart merits a special mention:

(40) October 20, 1939; AAS 31 (1939) 417, 540.

(41) May 15, 1956; AAS 48 (1956) 309-353; cf. 312, 314, 340, 342, 347, 353; 321-322.

(42) DR 2 (1940-41) 46. On the communion of saints, cf. also DR 2 (1940-41) 285-302; AAS 34 (1942) 142-144.

(43) AAS 46 (1954) 363-364: «et iniurias expient Corpori Christi Mysticis illatas».

(44) *Norunt profecto*, October 27, 1940; AAS 32 (1940) 386.

(45) July 14, 1941; AAS 33 (1941) 390-391; cf. Pius XII's 1949 exhortation to the Lenten preachers, AAS 46 (1949) 182-187.

(46) September 23, 1950; AAS 42 (1950) 657-702, esp. 666-669.

. . . Disarm the punitive justice of the Lord by a worldwide crusade of expiation. To the army of those who blaspheme God's name and transgress His law oppose a world league of all those who give Him due honor and offer His offended majesty the tribute of homage, sacrifice and reparation which so many others deny Him.

Therefore, it is Our ardent desire and Our express intention that the month which begins today and will close this year with the solemn festival of the Sacred Heart of Jesus may in its entirety be a devout and fervent preparation for that feast, especially by the practice of that great work of expiation and reparation through acts of piety, charity and penance (47).

5. Like his predecessors since 1844 Pius XII has on numerous occasions praised and encouraged the Apostleship of Prayer. For the centennial year alone he favored the Apostleship of Prayer with an apostolic letter to the Director General (48) and four radio messages (49). In 1951 he approved the new statutes which place a greater emphasis on reparation, on the Mass, and on living the life of a victim. It is a practical application of Pius' teaching in *Mystici Corporis* and *Mediator Dei*. To be noted is the fact that the impreatory and satisfactory value of good works are offered; reparation is highlighted (50).

6. There are two beautiful passages on reparation to the Sacred Heart, the first in a talk to newly-weds in 1940 (51), and the second in a radio message to an Eucharistic Congress of Ecuador in 1949 (52). To these talks may be added the homily preached at the canonization of St. Mary Ann of Jesus of Paredes in which the pope emphasized the saint's vicarious reparation (53).

7. There is a long series of appeals for prayer and penance, especially during the war and during the Jubilee of 1950, intended to appease the justice of God and obtain His blessings. Repeatedly during May the Holy Father has called for

(47) June 1, 1946; AAS 38 (1946) 259-260. Cf. the previous year's allocution on nazism in Germany, AAS 37 (1945) 165.

(48) *Cum proxime*, June 16, 1944; AAS 36 (1944) 238-243.

(49) To France, June 16, 1945; AAS 37 (1945) 189-192. To Colombia, September 30; 262-264. To Argentina, October 28; 318-321. To Spain, November 18; 321-324.

(50) *Manuale*, 14, 15, nn. 3b, 4.

(51) DR 2 (1940-41) 157.

(52) AAS 41 (1949) 329, 330-331.

(53) AAS 42 (1950) 611-612.

prayer to Our Lady for peace. The note of propitiation to be obtained through her intercession is frequently there (54). In the Christmas message of 1949, Pius XII opened the Holy Year, the year of the great return and the great pardon, a special time for personal reformation and atonement, but not exclusively so; vicarious reparation is also urged (55). Later, in 1954, Pius XII approved a prayer in reparation for blasphemy (56).

8. Finally, there are the discourses Pius XII gave to groups of sufferers, both the innocent and the guilty, such as imprisoned criminals (57). The talks to the Italian Catholic Jurists, especially the sections on the religious aspects of punishment, are a wonderful compendium of the Church's teaching on crime and punishment (58).

II. SYNTHESIS

Much has been written about the object of devotion to the Sacred Heart. Forceful arguments for the inclusion of the divine love can be drawn from *Miserentissimus Redemptor* (59). But even clearer statements are now to be had in the recent encyclical *Haurietis aquas*: the Sacred Heart is a symbol of Christ's triple love — divine love, human spiritual love, and sensible love (60). In the mind of the Church both the

(54) Cf., v. g., AAS 31 (1939) 155; 32 (1940) 144; 36 (1944) 145, 280.

(55) December 23, 1949; AAS 42 (1950) 130. Cf. also the apostolic constitution *Iubilaeum maximum*, May 26, 1949, AAS 41 (1949) 257-261; and the three encyclicals on the same subject: *Anni Sacri*, March 12, 1950, AAS 42 (1950) 217-222; *Summi mæroris*, July 19, 1950, 513-517; *Mirabile illud*, December 6, 1950, 797-800. Cf. also the discourse on Passion Sunday, March 26, 1950, DR 12 (1950-51) 17; cf. a similar appeal in AAS 41 (1949) 58-61, and the prayer for the Holy Year, 187-188.

(56) AAS 46 (1954) 501.

(57) Cf., v. g., DR 13 (1951-52) 441-447; DR 15 (1953-54) 243-246, 435-437.

(58) AAS 47 (1955) 60-71, 72-85; DR 16 (1954-55) 275-289, 349-365; cf. discourse to the VI International Congress on Penal Law, AAS 45 (1953) 730-744; DR 15 (1953-54) 335-353.

(59) Cf. Julien Jacques, S. C. J., «Culte et théologie du Sacré Coeur», AT 8 (1947) 274-298; P. Philippe de la Trinité, «Du Coeur du Christ à l'Esprit d'Amour», *Le Coeur*, ECarm 379-389.

(60) AAS 48 (1956) 329, 336: «Una cum humano ac divino pulsatur amore adorandum Iesu Christi Cor... Cor Christi redundet divino humanoque amore...; 676 (Allocution to the Apostleship of Prayer Congress, Rome, shortly after HA): (Cultus SS. Cordis) «aliud non est ac devotio studiosissima erga amorem divino-humanum Iesu secundum totam suam amplitudinem, ab amore increato et infinito usque ad palpitaciones cordis sui humani creati...».

divine and the human love of Christ are symbolized in His Heart. Thus it is easier to see how theocentric and Christocentric reparation are found united in devotion to the Sacred Heart. The encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* will serve as the basis of this synthesis.

A. THEOCENTRIC REPARATION

No one doubts that theocentric reparation has a place in devotion to the Sacred Heart. The word reparation or satisfaction or expiation immediately recalls the thought of sin as an offense to God. This «duty» of reparation is clearly indicated by Pius XI in *Miserentissimus Redemptor* (61). motives urge us to reparation: justice and love. The motive of justice in theocentric reparation is clear, for in reparation we satisfy the offended justice of God; but the motive of love is there, too, since charity holds the first place in the spiritual life, dominating and informing the other virtues (62).

The obligation of expiation has burdened the entire human race ever since Adam's sin and has induced men to try to appease God by public sacrifice. But human effort did not suffice; only the sacrifice of the God-Man offered adequate satisfaction for the sins of mankind. To this one sacrifice, priests and faithful alike must unite the immolation of themselves «as a sacrifice, living, holy, pleasing to God» (Rom. 12:1), in order to receive the saving benefits of Christ's death. The more perfectly our sacrifice is united to Christ's sacrifice, the greater will be the fruits of propitiation and expiation for ourselves and for others, due to the

(61) AAS 20 (1928) 169.

(62) Love, says Pius XI, motivates the consolation offered to the suffering Christ. Love also motivates the satisfaction of divine justice, for the work of redemption is eminently a mystery of love, as Pius XII clearly states in HA, AAS 48 (1956) 321: «Divinae Redemptionis Mysterium primaria ac naturali ratione mysterium amoris est: hoc est iusti amoris Christi erga cœlestem Patrem, cui sacrificium Crucis, amanti obædientique animo oblatum, uberrimam infinitamque satisfactionem defert ob culpas humani generis debitam: "Christus, ex caritate et obædientia patiendo, maius aliquid Deo exhibuit quam exigere recompensatio totius offensæ humani generis"» (ST 3, 48, 2). «It is the special merit of Hartmann's *Le Sens Plénier de la Réparation du Péché* to bring out the element of love in satisfaction for sin. Parente summarizes St. Thomas' teaching on Christ's vicarious satisfaction in these words: «Secondo S. Tommaso le elementi concorrono a costituirla: l'amore, la giustizia, il dolore; il primo è l'elemento formale, il più importante; il secondi è la ragione direttiva, il terzo è l'elemento materiale» (DTD, 3f4).

communion of saints and the union of all the faithful with Christ (63).

Theocentric reparation — and exclusively such — is also the theme of Pius XI's *Caritate Christi compulsi*, which is an exhortation to prayer and penance as a solution to the worldwide economic distress, brought on as punishment for the sins of men.

It is clearly sin as an offense against God that is to be repaired (64). The reparation which the pope urges is both personal and vicarious (65). This theocentric reparation is offered to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, i. e., ultimately to Christ as God, immediately and directly to His Sacred Heart (66). Thus Pius XI's Act of Reparation attached to *Miserentissimus Redemptor* had been addressed to Christ as God (67). But this form, used in these two encyclicals, is not the only one; earlier Leo XIII had spoken of the Sacred Heart as mediator and propitiation on behalf of the human race (68).

In comparing the two encyclicals, there does not seem to be much difference in the meaning of the different words used by Pius XI for reparation (69). Certainly the meaning, even when the word *satisfaction* is used, cannot be restricted to atonement for temporal punishment, which can only be offered for the just. Evidently both Pius XI in these encyclicals and Pius XII in his many references to vicarious reparation intend to include all men: just, sinners, infidels. This is especially clear when they speak of the results expected from reparation, and from the fact that their call for repara-

(63) AAS 20:170-171.

(64) AAS 24 (1932) 183, 188, 189.

(65) *Ibid.*, 183, 184, 190.

(66) *Ibid.*, 192.

(67) AAS 20: 179.

(68) *Leonis XIII Acta*, 9 (1890) 122-123.

(69) Hartmann, 219, says there is a nuance of difference in the three words: *satisfaction* intends by the offering of compensatory honor to remove the outrage given to God by sin; *expiation* accents the painful element of penance and refers to the restoration of the order violated by sin; *reparation* tries to assuage wounded love by a testimony of love in return, which takes the form of compassion and consolation to Christ. We can grant this as far as the words are concerned, but it is hard to see how this can be substantiated from the encyclicals themselves, since at times the words are used as synonyms, v. g., MR, AAS 20: 169: «bonae satisfactionis... seu reparationis»; 172: «expiationis... seu reparationis spiritus»; 174: «huius expiationis seu reparationis necessitas»; 177: «huius expiationis seu piae reparationis morem».

tion includes public sins and the sins of those who personally will pay no heed to the words of the pope.

Reparation offered by the just for sinners and infidels is not atonement for temporal punishment, for the sins have not yet been forgiven and cannot be forgiven without personal co-operation and repentance. But such reparation is a propitiation of the divine justice, offered by the just on behalf of sinners. Propitiation is motivated by the desire to recompense the offense and injury offered to God by sin. It inclines God to mercy. Of itself, it requires the co-operation of the sinner himself to be effective of actual conversion. But it secures for the sinner graces from God which, if used, enable the sinner himself to make this return to God's friendship and personally to offer reparation for his sins by his individual union with the reparation of Christ. In this there is an analogy with Christ's vicarious reparation. Christ is a «propitiation for our sins, not for ours only but for those of the whole world» (1 Jn. 2: 2). Christ's sacrifice of Himself appeased the justice of God on behalf of all men and inclined God to mercy. But to be effective of actual redemption, individual men must personally and willingly co-operate by accepting the benefits of Christ's sacrifice.

Propitiation and expiation are closely related in the sense that God is truly appeased only when complete expiation has been made for sin. But in the language of Sacred Scripture God is also appeased by the intercession of the just on behalf of sinners. In this case God is appeased — we might say, partially appeased — in that He grants to sinners graces He might otherwise have denied, or He averts public calamities He might otherwise have inflicted. But He is fully appeased only when the sinner himself responds to grace and expiates his sins. It is to this propitiation that the popes refer when urging the faithful to expiate the sins of the world.

Expiation and impetration are also closely related. Very frequently the two ideas are joined in the same appeal of the popes, for the same good work may be meritorious, satisfactory, propitiatory and impetratory. We know that penitential works are more powerful than prayer alone (cf. Mk. 18:20). Penitential works offered as compensation and propitiation on behalf of sinners also have an impetratory aspect to petition graces for sinners. Reparation as described by the

popes seems to include propitiation, expiation and impetration (70).

This is confirmed by the Act of Reparation of Pius XI. First, we express our desire to make reparation. Secondly, mindful of our own sinfulness we first implore mercy for ourselves, and then state our willingness to atone by voluntary expiation for our own sins and for the sins of others. Finally, we state *how* we will make this reparation: by offering the satisfaction of Christ Himself, offered once on the cross and renewed daily in the Mass, and with it the satisfactions of Our Lady, the saints, and the faithful, promising to observe God's law in the future and, as far as possible, to prevent others from violating it. Since we offer the satisfaction of Christ Himself in the Mass, we may apply here all that has been said about the way Christ's satisfaction is applied to individual souls and the way the fruits of the Mass are applied, i. e., impetration, propitiation, satisfaction.

This, in brief, is theocentric reparation in devotion to the Sacred Heart. All devotion of its very nature terminates ultimately in God and in this sense is theocentric. Reparation, moreover, as an act of devotion tends to repair the offense and injury given to God by sin.

All devotion leads to imitation. At the beginning of *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, Pius XI praised devotion to the Sacred Heart because it so effectively leads men to the knowledge, love and imitation of Christ (71). When we make reparation we are imitating Christ precisely in His mission of offering reparation to His Father for the sins of men. Moreover, Christ is not only our model of reparation. He is also our mediator. His human nature, including His Sacred Heart, is the instrument of His divinity in offering reparation to His Father (72).

(70) Cf. the explanation and references given in Chapter Two (IV. A. 2. *Fruits of the Mass*): Thus the Mass directly and indirectly confers these helps by which a man is led to penance and the remission of his sins: indirectly, in virtue of its propitiatory value which appeases God's anger and thus allows Him to bestow these helps; and directly, in virtue of its imprecatory value in that it immediately moves God to bestow these helps».

(71) AAS 20 (1928) 167: «totius religionis summa atque adeo perfectioris vitae norma... quippe quae et ad Christum Dominum penitus cognoscendum mentes conducat expeditius et ad eundem vehementius diligendum pressiusque imitandum animes inflectat efficacius».

(72) *Leonis XIII Acta*, 9 (1890) 122-123; cf. Agostini, 298-299; Galtier, DIR, n. 303; and commentaries on MR.

B. CHRISTOCENTRIC REPARATION

The characteristic note of devotion to the Sacred Heart is reparation, and specifically Christocentric reparation, reparation to the Sacred Heart. This reparation of consolation, motivated by love for Christ in His sufferings, is clearly taught by Pius XI in *Miserentissimus Redemptor* (73).

After describing theocentric reparation, Pius XI considers this reparation of consolation more in detail, beginning with a description of Our Lord's apparition to St. Margaret Mary and His call for a return of love especially through the practice of the Communion of Reparation and the Holy Hour (74).

The pontiff proceeds to answer the ever-recurring objection: But how can Christ, now reigning gloriously in heaven and free from all suffering, be consoled by our acts of reparation?

Christian piety has always loved to meditate upon the sufferings Christ endured for us. Such meditation becomes even more penetrating if one realizes that the sins of men of all times brought on these sufferings and death, and that these same sins of themselves are such as to bring about even now the same sufferings and death of Christ, «since they crucify again for themselves the Son of God and make him a mockery» (Heb. 6:6). Now, since it is true that the soul of Christ was saddened during His passion at the prevision of our future sins for which He was then suffering, it is also true that He was comforted by the prevision of our future reparation (75). Later in the encyclical the pope praises the religious orders of men and women who day and night have as their ideal to fill the role of the consoling angel, as far as this is possible (76). This aspect of our consolation offered to Christ during His Agony in the Garden and foreseen by Him then, is an answer to the error of those who would ignore the historical Christ to concentrate only on the glorious Christ, an error against which Pius XII warned in *Mediator Dei* (77).

(73) AAS 20:169.

(74) *Ibid.*, 172-173; cf. Benedict. XV, AAS 12 (1920) 494.

(75) AAS 20:174.

(76) *Ibid.*, 176-177.

(77) AAS 39 (1947) 579-580; cf. Hartmann, 229.

But not only in the past, during His sufferings on earth, did our reparation console Christ; even now in a wonderful, but no less real, way we can and ought to console the Heart of Christ, continually wounded by the sins of ungrateful men (78). Although Pius XI does not expressly call this consolation an accidental joy given to Christ now in heaven, such an explanation seems implied by his words. This is confirmed toward the end of the encyclical, when he says the zeal of the just for reparation to the Sacred Heart and for the salvation of souls is a joy to the Sacred Heart who is always gladdened «over one sinner who repents» (Lk. 15:7). The joy of the angels in heaven at the conversion of a sinner, as St. Thomas explains, is an accidental joy (79).

Pius XI adds: the sufferings of Christ continue in the mystical body. Christ suffers mystically in His members, as the words He spoke to Saul testify: «I am Jesus, whom thou art persecuting» (Acts. 9:5). As members of Christ we are called to suffer with Christ the head as associates in His work of expiation for sin (80).

Since Christ suffers mystically in His members, our effort to alleviate His suffering members is a consolation to Christ Himself. This we do by all our acts of fraternal charity, of spiritual and corporal works of mercy, and especially by our co-operation in Christ's salvific work. From the viewpoint of Christ, our effort to save souls is a partial fulfillment of His desire for the salvation of all men — an offering, a consolation, a reparation to the Sacred Heart.

This exposition of Christocentric reparation in *Miserentissimus Redemptor* is brief, because these points have been explained more fully in the chapter on Christocentric reparation.

C. REPARATION IN RELATION TO MAN

Our study began with an analysis of sin as an evil to God who is offended and as an evil for man who is justly punished for sin; in the present supernatural economy sin is also an evil for Christ whose redemption is rejected by sin.

(78) AAS 20:174.

(79) *Ibid.*, 178; ST 1, 62, 9, ad 3.

(80) AAS 20:174.

Thus far in the present chapter we have seen reparation in relation to Christ. It now remains to add a few words about reparation in relation to man.

The papal documents cited earlier in this chapter enumerate the benefits that accrue to men from the practice of reparation. Just as sin is an evil for God, for Christ and for man, so is reparation a good for God, for Christ and for man. But from the viewpoint of benefit or utility, it is only man who receives, since nothing man does can confer any benefit or utility on God.

«Gloria... Dei vivens homo», St. Irenaeus said long ago (81). God is glorified by a living man, a man living the life of God's grace. These words remind us that God's glory is not isolated from the supernatural good of man. God is glorified by the ever more, perfect assimilation of man to Himself, in whose likeness man was created. Reparation seeks to remove the obstacle to this assimilation in ourselves and in others.

It is understandable, then, that the popes should speak of individual and collective blessings that come to the human race through the practice of reparation which removes the obstacles of sin. God is always prepared to love men and bestow blessings upon them; but men place obstacles to his love by their sins.

Love of God urges us on to love of our neighbor. Love of Christ urges us on to share more fully the graces of Christ and to spend ourselves in extending the salutary effects of His redemption to other men redeemed by His blood. Our zeal for the glory of God and for the salvation of souls are joined in our apostolic works, which include reparation, just as love of God His Father and love of men His brethren were joined in the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Devotion to the Sacred Heart has always been a most effective means for converting sinners from a life of sin to a life of reparation (82).

(81) *Adv. Hær.*, 4, 19 (PG 7:1037): «Gloria enim Dei vivens homo: vita autem hominis visio Dei».

(82) Pius XII, March 27, 1940, DR 2 (1940-41) 47: «Gloria di Dio, salvezza delle anime, propagazione del culto del S. Cuore! Certamente non vi è che un fine per voi, come per tutti e per tutto il mondo: la gloria di Dio. Ma voi glorificherete Dio salvando le anime, e salverete le anime propagando il culto del S. Cuore...».

CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this study we set out to investigate the theological meaning of reparation, especially of vicarious reparation in the sense of reparation or expiation made by one man for the sins of others. We now see more clearly how vast is the theological content of that word, how many truths of faith are linked with it, and how the full explanation of it touches so many branches of theology. For the sake of order and clarity we may summarize our conclusions under various headings.

1. The word *reparation* seems best suited to express this composite of truths. Better than ransom, expiation or satisfaction, it approximates more closely the full content of redemption, for it includes expiation for sin, satisfaction to the offended justice of God, appeasement of the anger of God, and restoration of sinful man to the friendship of God.

2. Reparation is closely linked with the virtue of penance, whose formal object is *jus divinum reparandum*. Although penance in the strict sense, and contrition as its primary act, is restricted to one's own sins, in a wider sense penance can also refer to the sins of others and includes everything a man can do toward the reparation of these sins. Thus a man can detest every injury given to God by sin — his own and the sins of others, even the disobedience of Adam — and desire to repair such injury, to some extent at least. This is the way Christ detested all sins and actually did repair them, although Christ did not have the virtue of penance in the strict sense, nor can He be called a penitent. In addition to this detestation of all sin, a man can offer at least some compensation even for the sins of others. He can offer internal acts of virtue (of love of God, of the virtue of penance, or of the particular virtues which are sinned against) with the intention of giving honor and glory to God in compensation for the injury of sin. He can offer external acts of mortification and penance for the same intention. Besides giving honor and glory to God which is at least some compensation for the injury and offense of sin these acts of virtue are efficacious in petitioning for sinners the graces of conversion that will enable them to make personal reparation for their sins.

3. An act of reparation may be considered as an act of

different virtues. As coming under the special virtue of penance, a potential part of justice, it is related to God's justice. It also refers to the justice of God if it is considered as an act of cult or worship, i. e., as coming under the virtue of religion, another potential part of justice. Reparation may also be an act commanded by love of God. Justice and charity are not mutually exclusive, for justice, like the other virtues, comes under the domination of charity. Even to begin to satisfy God's justice offended by sin, contrition is required; if this contrition is perfected by charity, i. e., based on the love of God above all else, it congruously merits the immediate forgiveness of sin and the infusion of sanctifying grace.

4. The basis of all reparation for sin is the vicarious reparation of Christ for the sins of the whole world. In the order of objective redemption Christ superabundantly satisfied for the guilt and punishment of all sins. In the order of subjective redemption the merits and satisfactions of Christ are applied to individuals by their vital contact with the sacrifice of Christ on the cross through Mass and the sacraments. This initial application of the redemption of Christ takes place in baptism which completely removes the guilt and all punishment due to all sins, original and personal. Subsequent applications through the sacrament of penance do not always completely remove temporal punishment, which must then be atoned for by penitential works here or by the sufferings of purgatory in the next life.

5. Reparation for the sins of other just men includes atonement for temporal punishment due to their forgiven sins. Reparation for the sins of infidels and sinners is propitiation of the just anger of God on their behalf. Looking to God, it consists of internal and external acts of virtue offered in compensation for the injury of sin, acts which appease the anger of God and allow Him to grant to sinners graces He might otherwise have denied them because of their sins. Looking to men, it secures for them these special graces which they need for repentance. Indirectly, reparation includes everything a man can do toward the reparation of the sins of others, i. e., in addition to good example, impetration and congruous merit by which a man wins for others the grace of repentance and conversion to a life of personal reparation.

6. In addition to the theological aspect of sin and reparation, there is also a Christological aspect, for in the present economy sin also involves a rejection of Christ, and all reparation is inseparably linked to Christ's reparation on the cross. The same acts of reparation that give honor and glory to God in compensation for the offense of sin, also glorify Christ our Redeemer and our mediator with the Father. In addition, we can give to Christ as Man something we could not otherwise give to the unchangeable and impassible God: our sympathy and consolation in the sufferings He underwent in His human nature for the reparation of our sins.

7. Both types of reparation are found in devotion to the Sacred Heart. In this devotion they are united in a marvelous synthesis due to the special object of devotion to the Sacred Heart. Following the teaching of Pius XI and Pius XII we may express the material object of devotion to the Sacred Heart in this way: the physical Heart of Christ as the symbol of Christ's multiple love or of Christ's love in its full extension. Thus we have two elements: the physical heart as the symbol of love and the love as symbolized by the heart. This love includes uncreated love and created love, Christ's love for His Father and Christ's redemptive love for men. This love, moreover, is worthy of a return of love; worthy also of reparation and consolation in compensation for the injuries offered to His love by the sins of men. Finally, since all worship is directed ultimately to a person, devotion to the Sacred Heart is worship directed to the Person of Christ under the symbolism of His Heart.

8. The Sacred Heart is the symbol, first of all, of uncreated love, for in Christ the divine and human natures are hypostatically united in the Person of the Word. To this uncreated love, according to *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, is due reparation for sin as an offense and injury to God. This is theocentric reparation. In the Act of Reparation of Pius XI we expressly offer to Christ as God the satisfaction He once offered to His Father on behalf of sinful men. Sometimes, however, theocentric reparation in devotion to the Sacred Heart is directed to God the Father who is appeased through the Sacred Heart of His Son.

9. The Sacred Heart is also the symbol of Christ's human love for His Father and for men. Love of His Father is

primary in Christ's love, but it is His redemptive for men that is emphasized in Christocentric reparation, for it is this aspect of His love that is rejected and offended by men. Our reparation to the suffering love of Christ, our consolation, is real to Him in three ways. In the Garden of Olives the prevision of our sins was a cause of suffering to Christ; so, too, the prevision of our consolation was a source of comfort to Him in His sufferings. Now glorified in heaven Christ receives an accidental joy from our consolation; this is a real source of joy, but it is only improperly called consolation, since Christ no longer suffers and strict consolation implies suffering. Finally, Christ suffers mystically even today in His mystical body; our reparation in the form of apostolic prayer, work and suffering for the salvation of souls and the alleviation of His mystical members is a consolation offered to Christ Himself, for head and members form but one mystical person.

10. Study of the papal pronouncements on reparation to the Sacred Heart enables us to determine the full theological content of reparation. The popes repeatedly recall the manifold benefits they expect for sinful men, individually and collectively. Such statements do not allow us to restrict reparation to atonement for temporal punishment due to forgiven sin. Rather they force us to include much more: propitiation of God's anger, offered by the just on behalf of sinners; merit and impetration of the graces in good works for the just; impetration of temporal and social benefits, such as peace and harmony among men and nations, the averting of wars and public calamities.

11. Finally, devotion to the Sacred Heart, as Pius XI tells us, calls us to knowledge, love and imitation of Christ, especially of His love symbolized in His Heart. It was Christ's love for His Father and His offended majesty that inspired Him to offer superabundant satisfaction for the injury and offense of sin. It was Christ's redemptive love for men that inspired Him to undertake the arduous task of restoring fallen man by His sufferings and death. Great as this human love of Christ is, it is but the reflection and imitation of that uncreated love by which God «has first loved us and sent his Son a propitiation for our sins» (1 Jn. 4:10). In the Sacred Heart of Jesus these two loves are united,

for at the Incarnation God, «who wishes all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth» (1 Tim 2:4), breathed into Christ the same redemptive love and soul-saving intentions that were His. Redeemed by Christ and united to Him by grace and love we share that same charity of God which «is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us» (Rom. 5:5). But we can grow in charity, we can make our love ever more closely assimilated to Christ's love — to His uncreated love, to His human love of His Father and of men. For Christ breathes into us the same redemptive love and soul-saving intentions that are His. That love manifests itself in our practice of reparation for our sins and for the sins of others. United to Christ in helping to apply His redemption to others, we imitate His very love by becoming in a certain sense «co-redemers» with Him. With our hearts thus united to the Sacred Heart of Jesus we try to take on more and more the virtues of His Sacred Heart, especially His love of His Father and His redemptive love of men.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum, Collectio Lacensis*, 7 vol., Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1870-1890.
- Leonis XIII Acta*, 23 vol., Romæ, 1881-1905.
- Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, 41 vol., Romæ, 1872-1908.
- Acta Apostoliceæ Sedis*, 48 vol., Romæ, 1909-1956.
- Pio XII, *Discorsi e Radiomessagi*, 17 vol., Milano, 1939-1956.
- Eugenio Cardinale Pacelli, *Discorsi e Panegirici* (1931-1938), ed. 2., Vaticana, 1956.
- Migne, J. P., *Patrologiaæ cursus completus*, series græca, 161 vol., Parisiis, 1857-1866.
- Migne, J. P., *Patrologiaæ cursus completus*, series latina, 221 vol., Parisiis, 1844-1855.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas, *Opera Omnia jussu impensaque Leonis XIII P. M.*, edita, 16 vol. to date, Romæ, 1882-1948.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas, *Summa Theologieæ*, cum textu ex recensione Leonina (Marietti), 4 vol., Taurini, Romæ, 1948.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas, *Scriptum super Libros Sententiarum*, vol. 1-2, ed. R. P. Mandonnet, O. P., Parisiis, 1929; vol. 3-4, ed. Maria Fabianus Moos, O. P., Parisiis, 1933, 1937.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas, *Opera Omnia*, 25 vol., Parma, 1852-1873.
- Suarez, Franciscus, S. J. *Opera Omnia*, ed. nova a Carolo Berton, 26 vol., Parisiis, 1861-1866.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Only a few of the more important articles from theological dictionaries and encyclopedias are listed; for other articles, see the following words: Sacred Heart, communion of saints, contrition, expiation, indulgences, mystical body, penance, propitiation, purgatory, redemption, reparation, satisfaction, sin.

I. SIN AND REPARATION IN GENERAL

A. BOOKS

- Bernard, R., O. P., *Le Péché*, 2 vol. (Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Somme Théologique*, 1-2, 71-89), Paris, Tournai, Rome, 1930, 1931.
- Billot, Ludovicus, S. J., *De personali et originali peccato*, ed. 6, Prati, 1931.
- Capelle, Louis, S. J., *Les Ames Généreuses*, ed. 4, Paris, 1924.
- Galtier, Paulus, S. J., *De Incarnatione ac Redemptione*, ed. nova, Paris, 1947.
- Galtier, Paulus, S. J., *De Pænitentia, Tractatus Dogmatico-Historicus*, ed. novissima, Romæ, 1957.
- Galtier, P., S. J., *Les deux Adam*, Paris, 1947.
- González Rivas, Severinus, S. J., *De Pænitentia*, STS, ed. 3, Matri, 1956, 4:395-539.
- Hugueny, E., O. P., *La Pénitence*, 2 vol. (Saint Thomas d'Aquin, *Somme Théologique*, 3, 84-90; Sup., 1-20), Paris, Tournai, Rome, 1930, 1931.
- Lercher, Ludovicus, S. J., *Institutiones Theologie Dogmaticæ*, vol. 1, 2, 3, 4/1, ed. 4, Barcelona, 1945; vol. 4/2 pars prior et pars altera, ed. 3, Eniponte, 1948, 1949.
- Lyonnard, Juan, S. J., *El Apostolado del Sufrimiento o Las Víctimas Voluntarias*, Madrid, 1887.
- Médébielle, Alexis, S. C. J., *L'expiation dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*, 2 vol., Romæ, 1924.
- Mersch, Emile, S. J., *Le corps mystique du Christ*, ed. 2, 1936; *The Whole Christ*, tr. John R. Kelly, S. J., Milwaukee, 1938.
- Mersch, Emile, S. J., *Morale et corps mystique*, Paris, 1937; *Morality and the Mystical Body*, tr. Daniel F. Ryan, S. J., N. Y., 1939.
- Mersch, Emile, S. J., *La théologie du corps mystique*, ed. 2, 1946; *The Theology of the Mystical Body*, tr. Cyril Vollert, S. J., St. Lonis, 1951.
- Moraldi, Luigi, I. M. C., *Espiazione sacrificale e riti espiatori nell'ambiente biblico e nell'antico testamento*, Romæ, 1956.
- Prat, Ferdinand, S. J., *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, ed. 38, 2 vol., Paris, 1949.

- Rivièvre, J., *Le dogme de la Rédemption, Essai d'étude historique*, Paris, 1905; *The Doctrine of the Atonement, A Historical Essay*, tr. Luigi Cappadelta, 2 vol., London, 1909.
- Rivièvre, J., *Le dogme de la Rédemption, Etude théologique*, ed. 3, Paris, 1931.
- Sagüés, Josephus, F., S. J., *De peccatis*, STS, ed. 2, Matriti, 1955, 2:857-1010.
- Solano, Jesus, S. J. *De Verbo Incarnato*, STS, ed. 3, Matriti, 1956, 3:9-329.
- Spitzig, J., *Sacramental Penance in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Washington, D. C., 1947.
- Vaughan, Augustinus, *The Nature and Necessity of Satisfaction according to the Mind of St. Thomas Aquinas* (PUG thesis n. 2179), Romæ, 1953.
- Zapelen, Timotheus, S. J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, Pars altera: *Apologetico Dogmatica*, ed. 2, Romæ, 1954.

B. ARTICLES

- Broglie, Guy de, S. J., «Malice intrinsèque du péché et péchés heureux par leurs conséquences», *RechSR* 24 (1934) 302-343, 578-605; 25 (1935) 5-44; «Malice intrinsèque du péché: esquisse d'une théorie des valeurs morales», *RechSR* 26 (1936) 46-79, 297-333; 27 (1937) 275-307.
- Coressel, Leo A., S. J., «Merit for Others», *RfR* 5 (1946) 161-169.
- De Letter, P., S. J., «You Shall Receive», *CC* 6 (1956) 388-397.
- De Letter, P., S. J., «Offence against God», *IER* 87 (1957) 329-342.
- Deneffe, August, S. J., «Das Wort *satisfactio*», *ZKT* 43 (1919) 158-175.
- «Du mérite et de la réparation», *AJP* 6 (1863) 2226-2243.
- Fenech, Alanus M., O. P., «Notio Thomistica Satisfactionis Vicariæ Jesu Christi Mediatoris», *MT* 6 (1953) 65-78; 7 (1954) 20-43.
- Filograssi, Giuseppe, S. J., «Agonia di Gesù Cristo», *EC* 1:497-499.
- Galtier, P., S. J., «Pénitence», *DAFC* 3:1755-1865.
- Galtier, P., S. J., «Satisfaction», *DTC* 14:1129-1210.
- Galtier, Paolo, S. J., «Soddisfazione Sacramentale», *EC* 11: 887-889.

- Garrigou-Lagrange, R., O. P., «Le devoir de réparation», VS 68 (1943) 505-515.
- Grech, P. Prosper, «Theoriæ ad explicandam redemptionem apud Protestantes recentiores in Anglia cum doctrina catholica comparatæ», DC 8 (1955) 77-113.
- Herbst, C. A., S. J., «Conformity with Christ in His Suffering», RfR 9 (1950) 119-124.
- Hocedez, E., S. J., «Notre solidarité en Jesus Christ et en Adam», Greg 13 (1932) 373-403.
- Hoffmann, Adolf, O. P., «Christus et Ecclesia est una persona mystica», Ang 19 (1942) 213-219.
- Hugon, Edouard, O. P., «La doctrine catholique de la satisfaction et la vie spirituelle», VS 14 (1926) 113-121, 225-233, 378-386.
- Journet, Mgr. Charles, «Le péché comme faute et comme offense», *Trouble et Lumière*, ECarm, Bruges, 1949, 21-29; «Sin as Fault and as Offence», *Conflict and Light*, London, N. Y., 1952, 3-13.
- Journet, Mgr. Charles, «Le peine temporelle du péché», RT 32 (1927) 20-39; 89-103.
- Krautwig, Notker, O. F. M., «Bewältigt der moderne Mensch die Sünde?» GL 26 (1953) 20-32.
- Lécuyer, Joseph, C. S. Sp., «La Causalité efficiente des mystères du Christ selon saint Thomas», DC 6 (1953) 91-120.
- Lécuyer, Joseph, C. S. Sp., «Note sur une définition Thomiste de la satisfaction», DC 8 (1955) 21-30.
- Lécuyer, Joseph, C. S. Sp., «Reflexions sur la théologie du culte selon saint Thomas», RT 4 (1955) 339-362.
- Ledrus, Michele, «Riparazione», EC 10:951-952.
- Lyonnet, Stanislaus, S. J., «De "Justitia Dei" in Epistola ad Romanos», VD 25 (1947) 23-34, 118-121, 129-144, 193-203, 257-263.
- Lyonnet, Stanislaus, S. J., *Quæstiones in Epistolam ad Romanos* (ad usum privatum auditorum), Romæ, prima series, 1955; secunda series, 1956.
- Lyonnet, S. J., *Theologia Biblica Novi Testamenti*, 1: *De Peccato et Redemptione* (ad usum privatum auditorum), Romæ, 1956.
- Médébielle, A., S. C. J., «Expiation», SDB 13:1-262.
- Mersch, Emile, S. J., «Prière de chretiens, Prière de membres», NRT 58 (1931) 97-113.

- Michel, Albert, «La Communion des Saints», DC 9 (1956) 1-130.
- Muscat, I., C. M., «De virtute satisfactoria operum bonorum in ordine ad alios», DTP 14 (1937) 225-254, 329-349.
- Philippe de la Trinité, O. C. D., «Dieu de la colère ou Dieu d'amour?» *Amour et Violence*, ECarm, Bruges, 1946; «God of Wrath or God of Love?» *Love and Violence*, N. Y., 1954, 122-202.
- Plus, Raoul, «Voeux», DAFC 4:1924-1943, esp. 1926-1928.
- Potterie, I. de la, «Le péché c'est l'iniquité» (1 Jn. 3:4), NRT 88 (1956) 785-797.
- Richard, L., «Péché et rédemption», RA 50 (1930) 385-408.
- Richard, Louis, S. S., «La Rédemption, mystère d'amour», RechSR 13 (1923) 193-217, 397-418.
- Richard, L., S. S., «Sens théologique du mot satisfaction», RevSR 7 (1927) 87-93.
- Rivière, J., «Rédemption», DTC 13:1912-2004.
- Rivière, J., «Satisfactio Vicaria», RevSR 26 (1952) 221-257.
- Roberts, Dom John, «The Injustice of Sin», DRev 71 (1953) 233-242.
- Roche, E., S. J., «L'homme de la rédemption», NRT 70 (1948) 1023-1036.
- Roche, E., S. J., «Notre condition de pécheurs», NRT 72 (1950) 690-703.
- Roche, E., S. J., «Pénitence et conversion dans l'Evangile et la vie chrétienne», NRT 79 (1957) 113-134.
- Rondet, H., S. J., «Aux origines de la théologie du péché», NRT 79 (1957) 16-32.
- Rondet, Henri, S. J., «Bemerkungen zu einer Theologie der Sünde», GL 28 (1955) 28-44, 106-116, 194-208.
- Solano, Jesús, S. J., «Actualidades cristológico-soteriológicas», EE 24 (1950) 43-69.
- Solano, Jesús, S. J., «El sentido de la muerte redentora de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo y algunas corrientes modernas», EE 20 (1946) 399-414.
- Vollert, Cyril, S. J., «We Died with Christ», RfR 4 (1945) 337-348.

II. REPARATION IN DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

A. BOOKS

- Agostini, Enrico, S. C. J., *Il Cuore di Gesù*, Bologna, 1950.
- Bainvel, J.-V., S. J., *La Dévotion au Sacré-Coeur de Jésus, doctrine-histoire*, ed. 5, Paris, 1921; *Devotion to the Sacred Heart*, tr. E. Leahy, London, 1924.
- Caldarola, Francesco, *Il carattere espiatorio della Devozione al Sacro Cuore di Gesù* (pars dissertationis ad lauream in facultate sacræ theologiæ apud Pontificium Athenæum «Angelicum» de Urbe), Romæ, 1947.
- Calveras, José, S. J., *Los Elementos de la Devoción al Corazón de Jesús*, su contenido y práctica en los Ejercicios de San Ignacio, Barcelona, 1955.
- Calveras, José, S. J., *La hora santa de Santa Margarita María de Alacoque*, Barcelona, 1945.
- Charmot, François, S. J., *Le Coeur sacerdotal du Christ à l'Agonie, 12 Heures Saintes*, Toulouse, 1955.
- Franciosi, R. P. Xavier de, S. J., *La dévotion au Sacré-Coeur de Jesus et au Saint-Coeur de Marie*, ed. 8, Nancy, 1885.
- Gabriele, Denis, S. C. J., *Spiritualità Riparatrice*, versione dal francese e prima edizione di Andrea Tessarolo, S. C. J., Pescara, 1955.
- Galtier, Paul, S. J., *Le Sacré-Coeur, Textes Pontificalux* (Cathédra Petri), Paris, 1936.
- Hamon, Auguste, S. J., *Histoire de la dévotion au Sacré-Coeur*, 5 vol., Paris, 1923-1939.
- Leeming, Bernard, *Adnotationes de Verbo Incarnato* (ad usum privatum auditorum), Romæ, 1936; *The Word Incarnate*, Part II, 92-101 (mimeographed notes).
- Lyonnard, Juan, S. J., *Los Sufrimientos continuos del Corazón Agonizante de Jesús y del Corazón Compasivo de María*, París.
- Manuale Theologica-Pastorale Apostolatus Orationis*, Romæ, 1955.
- Marín, P. H., S. J., *Al Reino de Cristo por la devoción a su Sagrado Corazón*, Barcelona, 1950.
- Nilles, Nicolaus, S. J., *De rationibus festorum Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu et Purissimi Cordis Mariae*, ed. 5, Œniponte, 1885.

- Plus, Raoul, S. J. *L'Idee Réparatrice*, Paris, 1919, *The Ideal of Reparation*, tr. Madame Cecilia, London, 1926.
- Plus, Raoul, S. J., *La Réparation, histoire, doctrine, pratique*, Toulouse, 1929; *Reparation, its History, Doctrine and Practice*, N. Y. 1931.
- Rahner, Karl, S. J., *Heilige Stunde und Passionsandacht*, Freiburg i. Br., 1955.
- Schwendimann, Dr. Friedrich, *Herz-Jesu-Verehrung und Seelsorge*, Luzern, 1942.
- Solano, Jesús, S. J., *La Devoción al Sagrado Corazón de Jesús según las Encíclicas Pontificias*, Bilbao, 1950.
- Stanislas, R. P., S. C. J., *Vie d'amour et de réparation*, Essai de synthèse pratique de notre spiritualité, traduit en français par le R. P. Marie-Ange, S. C. J., 1955.
- Vailati, Valentino, *Il Cuore di Gesù Cristo*, Alba, 1946.
- Vermeersch, Arthur, S. J., *Pratique et doctrine de la dévotion au Sacré-Coeur*, ed. 7, 2 vol., Tournai, Paris, 1930.
- Virgo Immaculata*, Acta Congressus Mariologici-Mariani Romæ anno 1954 celebrati, 8/2: De Maria Immaculata et Reparatione ad mentem ecclesiæ et in spiritu Congregationis Sacerdotum a Saero Corde Jesu, Romæ, 1955; some of the articles treat briefly of reparation to the Sacred Heart, one does so at greater length (cf. Sánchez-Cremades below).
- Zeij, P. Jacob, S. J., *Gemeinschaftliche Sühne*, Soarbrücken, 1933.

B. ARTICLES

- Bainvel, J. V., S. J., «Cœur Sacré de Jésus», DTC 3:271-351.
- Bainvel, Jean, S. J., «Heart of Jesus, Devotion to the», CE 7:163-167.
- Böhmer, Rudolf, «*Victima Christi*, Zur Begründung und Verwirklichung des Sühnegedankens», GL 22 (1949) 191-203.
- Bover, José M., S. J., «Problemas fundamentales de la devoción al Corazón Inmaculado de María», RET 4 (1944) 93-125.
- Charles, Pierre, S. J., «Spes Christi», NRT 61 (1934) 1009-1021; 64 (1937) 1057-1075.
- Daniel a Conchas, O. F. M. Cap., «Redemptio acquisitonis», VD 30 (1952) 14-29, 81-91, 154-169.
- Démann, P., «L'Idee de la Réparation», VS 86 (1952) 601-609.

- Derumaux, André, «Crise ou évolution dans le dévotion des jeunes pour le Sacré-Coeur, Le Coeur ECarm, 1950, 296-326.
- Donnelly, Malachi, S. J., «Reparation in the Devotion to the Sacred Heart», RfR 1 (1942) 167-169.
- Feld, William Fred., S. J., «Sacred Heart and Reparation», AER 92 (1935) 602-610.
- Fonck, Leop., S. J., «Passio SS. Cordis in horto Gethsemani», VD 8 (1928) 161-170, 193-204.
- Galtier, Paul, S. J., «La pénitence et l'apostolat», RAM 2 (1921) 373-384.
- Garrigou-Lagrange, Reg., O. P., «L'Amour rédempteur du Christ», VS 36 (1933) 5-15.
- Garrigou-Lagrange, Reg., O. P., «E teologicamente esatta l'espressione: Consolare il Cuore di Gesù?» VC 16 (1947) 28-38.
- Garrigou-Lagrange, R., O. P., «L'Oblation toujours vivante au Coeur du Christ», VS 57 (1938) 247-257.
- Guibert, J., S. J., «Adoration réparatrice», RPA 12 (1911) 515-523.
- Guibert, J. de, S. J., «Les âmes victimes», RAM 6 (1925) 425-427.
- Gutzwiller, Richard, S. J., «Widestände» in Josef Stierli, *Cor Salvatoris, Wege zur Herz-Jesu-Verehrung*, Freiburg im Br., 1954, 1-18.
- Hamon, Auguste, S. J., «Coeur (Sacré)», DS 2:1023-1046.
- Héris, Ch. V., O. P., «Les fondements doctrinaux de la dévotion au Sacré-Coeur», VS 86 (1952) 577-588.
- Hugon, Edouard, O. P., «La doctrine spirituelle de la recente Encyclique *Miserentissimus Redemptor* touchant la réparation que le monde entier doit rendre au Sacré-Coeur», VS 18 (1928) 405-415.
- Hugon, Edouard, O. P., «Les fondements théologiques de la dévotion au Sacré-Coeur», VS 2 (1920) 177-186.
- Jacques, Julien, S. C. J., «Culte et théologie au Sacré-Coeur», AT 8 (1947) 274-298.
- La Begassière, R. du Bouays de, S. J., «Coeur de Jésus (Culte du)», DAFC 1:566-587.
- LeBlond, J.-M., S. J., «Le culte du Sacré Coeur et la psychologie moderne», MCJ, fevrier 1957, 71-77.
- «Loigny et le Coeur de Jésus Pénitent», NRT 25 (1893) 496-507.

- Monier-Vinard, H., S. J., «Vie chrétienne et vie parfaite, origine et développement», RAM 22 (1946) 97-116; «II. Vie réparatrice», 229-252.
- Nicolau, Miguel, S. J., «La devoción al Corazón de Jesús a la luz de la Teología espiritual», Man 26 (1954) 115-146.
- Peralta, P. Vicente de, O. F. M. Cap., «El Culto del Corazón de Jesús», EF 13 (1914) 324-335; 14 (1915) 1-21, 161-177, 412-430; 15 (1916) 176-192, 401-424.
- Philippe de la Trinité, O. C. D., «Du Coeur du Christ a l'Esprit d'Amour», *Le Coeur*, ECarm, 1950, 379-389.
- Pickery, N., S. J., «L'Encyclique *Miserentissimus Redemptor*», NRT 55 (1928) 561-570.
- Pujol, Luis, C. M. F., «La Reparación cristiana», VR 2 (1945) 262-269; 3 (1946) 348-354; 4 (1947) 90-99.
- Rahner, Karl, S. J., «Einige Thesen zur Theologie der Herz-Jesu-Verehrung» in Josef Stierli, *Cor Salvatoris, Wege zur Herz-Jesu-Verehrung*, Freiburg im Br., 1954, 166-199; reprinted with slight changes in Karl Rahner, *Schriften zur Theologie*, Einsiedeln, Zürich, Köln, 1956, 3:391-415.
- Recker, Wilhelm, S. C. J., «Die theologischen Grundlagen der Sühneübung», ZAM 6 (1931) 334-343.
- Rivera, P. Alfonso, C. M. F., «La Reparación en la Devoción al Inmaculado Corazón de María», *Alma Socia Christi*, Acta Congressus Mariologici-Mariani Romæ anno sancto MCML celebrati, 6/2: De Corde Immaculato B. V. Mariæ, Romæ, 1952, 157-170.
- Sánchez-Cremades, J. Josephus, S. C. J., «De necessitudine inter reparationem in cultu SS. Cordis Jesu et reparationem mariatum», *Virgo Immaculata*, 8/2: 52-105.
- Schmidt, Josef, S. J., «Die dem gottlichen Herzen geschuldete Sühneleistung», ZAM 5 (1930) 349-360.
- Sparks, Timoteo M., O. P., «Riparazione al Cuore Immacolato di Maria», Roma, 1955; reprint and revision of «Repara-

- tion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary» in *From an Abundant Spring*, N. Y., 1952, 39-56.
- Volken, Laurent, M. S., «Maria au Ciel souffre-t-elle pour son peuple sur la terre?» Mar 17 (1955) 421-472.
- Wulf, Friedrich, S. J., «Das stellvertretende Leiden als Anruf Gottes an unsere Zeit», GL 21 (1948) 321-331.
- Zorè, J. N., S. J., «Recentiorum quæstionum de cultu SS. Cordis Iesu conspectus (Utrum crisis an evolutio cultus prævideatur)», Greg 37 (1956) 104-120.



SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	<i>Acta Apostolicæ Sedis</i>
AER	<i>American Ecclesiastical Review</i>
AJP	<i>Analecta Juris Pontificii</i>
Ang	<i>Angelicum</i>
AS	<i>Leo XIII, Annum Sacrum</i>
ASS	<i>Acta Sanctæ Sedis</i>
AT	<i>L'Année théologique</i>
CC	<i>Cross and Crown</i>
CCC	<i>Pius XI, Caritate Christi compulsi</i>
CE	Charles G. Herbermann et al., <i>The Catholic Encyclopedia</i>
CG	<i>St. Thomas, Summa contra Gentiles</i>
CivC	<i>La Civiltà Cattolica</i>
CIC	<i>Codex Iuris Canonici</i>
CL	<i>Collectio Lacensis, Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum</i>
DAFC	A. d'Alès, <i>Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique</i>
DB	F. Vigouroux, S. S., <i>Dictionnaire de la Bible</i>
DC	<i>Doctor Communis</i>
DIR	P. Galtier, S. J., <i>De Incarnatione ac Redemptione</i>
DP	<i>De Pænitentia</i> , v. g., Suarez, Galtier, etc.
DR	Pius XII, <i>Discorsi e Radiomessaggi</i>
DRev	<i>The Downside Review</i>
DS	M. Viller, F. Cavallera, J. de Guibert, S. J., <i>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité</i>
DTC	A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, E. Amann, <i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i>
DTD	P. Parente, A. Piolanti, S. Garofalo, <i>Dizionario di Teologia Dommatica</i>
DTP	<i>Divus Thomas</i> (Piacenza)
DV	St. Thomas, <i>De Veritate</i>
EC	<i>Enciclopedia Cattolica</i> , Vaticano
ECarm	<i>Les Études Carmélitaines</i>
EE	<i>Estudios Eclesiásticos</i>
EF	<i>Estudios Franciscanos</i>
ES	Denzinger-Rahner, <i>Enchiridion Symbolorum</i> , ed. 30, 1954
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologixæ Lovanienses</i>
GL	<i>Geist und Leben</i>

Greg	<i>Gregorianum</i>
HA	Pius XII, <i>Haurietis aquas</i>
HG	Pius XII, <i>Humani generis</i>
IER	<i>Irish Ecclesiastical Record</i>
Man	<i>Manresa</i>
Manuale	<i>Manuale Theologico-Pastorale Apostolatus Orationis</i>
Mar	<i>Marianum</i>
MC	Pius XII, <i>Mystici Corporis</i>
MD	Pius XII, <i>Mediator Dei</i>
MCJ	<i>Messager du Coeur de Jésus</i>
MR	Pius XI, <i>Miserentissimus Redemptor</i>
MT	<i>Melita Theologica</i>
NRT	<i>Nouvelle revue théologique</i>
PG	J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologia cursus completus</i> , series græca.
PL	J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologia cursus completus</i> , series latina.
PUG	Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana
QP	Pius XI, <i>Quas primas</i>
RA	<i>Revue apologétique</i>
RAM	<i>Revue d'ascétique et mystique</i>
RET	<i>Revista Española de Teología</i>
RechSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
RevSR	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
RfR	<i>Review for Religious</i>
RPA	<i>Revue pratique d'apologétique</i>
RT	<i>Revue Thomiste</i>
1S, 2S,	St. Thomas, <i>Commentarium in 4 Sent.</i>
3S, 4S	
SAO	<i>Statuta Apostolatus Orationis</i>
SDB	Louis Pirot, <i>Supplément au dictionnaire de la Bible</i>
SP	Pius XII, <i>Summi Pontificatus</i>
ST	St. Thomas, <i>Summa theologica</i>
STS	Patres S. J. in Hispania Professores, <i>Sacræ Theologiæ Summa</i> , 4 vol.
TF	Leo XIII, <i>Tametsi futura</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
VC	<i>Vita Cristiana</i>
VD	<i>Verbum Domini</i>
VR	<i>Vida Religiosa</i>
VS	<i>La Vie Spirituelle</i>
ZAM	<i>Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik</i>
ZKT	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>

DE VALORE ARGUMENTI PATRISTICI IN THEORIA PRÆCEPTI NON RIGOROSI CIRCA MORTEM CHRISTI

FERDINANDUS VELASQUEZ, S. J.

SECTIO PRIMA

INTRODUCTIO

1 — Libertas Christi. Libertatem, sive immunitatem a determinatione tum extrinseea (a coactione), tum intrinseea (a necessitate), nemo inter catholicos potest negare Christum habuisse. Hanc enim libertatem ostendunt Evangelia cum actus liberæ electionis Christi narrant (1), Patres unanimiter profitentur (2), Ecclesia declarat cum libertatem a necessitate statuit contra Jansenium esse ad merendum necessariam, simulque Christum meruisse definit (3), et tandem ratio theologiae clarissime demonstrat, cum ad integratatem naturæ humanæ Christi, liberam voluntatem requiri defendit.

Manifestum est, hanc Christi libertatem amplecti tum potestatem ponendi vel omittendi actum (libertatem contradictionis), tum etiam potestatem hunc pro illo actu eligendi (libertatem specificationis), sed non necessario includere potestatem eligendi inter bonum et malum morale (libertatem contrarietatis), quæ potestas potius ad limitationem libertatis quam ad ejus perfectionem pertinet, nam bonum est objectum proprium voluntatis.

2 — Libertas Christi in morte obeunda. Hæc libertas humanae libertatis Christi clarius apparet in fontibus Revelationis cum de subeunda morte agitur. Illam prænuntiavit Isaias in vaticinio messianico circa Servum Yahweh; confidendum est tamen, textum originalem non tantam vim habere ut habet versio Vulgata: verba, enim, «oblatus est quia ipse voluit» leguntur in originali «vexatus est et submisit se» in quibus verbis tamen, non deest indicatio submissionis ex

(1) Cf. Matt. 8:3 et 27:34; Jo. 7:1.

(2) Cf. RJ. 830, 1324, 1654.

(3) DB. 1094; 790 et 795.

proprio motu (4). Idem insinuatur per conditionalem propositionem in versu decimo ejusdem capituli: «Si posuerit pro peccato animam suam videbit semen longævum».

Christus hanc libertatem in acceptanda sua morte aperte statuit cum dicit: «Propterea me diligit Pater, quia ego pono animam meam, ut iterum sumam eam. Nemo tollit eam a me; sed ego pono eam a meipso, et potestatem habeo ponendi eam, et potestatem habeo iterum sumendi eam» (5).

Sanctus Paulus in Epistola ad Habræos eamdem doctrinam docet: «Aspicientes in auctorem fidei et consummatorem, Jesum, qui proposito sibi gaudio sustinuit crucem, confusione contempta» (6). Libertatem Christi in morte ejus ostendit Apostolus, sive ejus verba «proposito sibi gaudio» referantur ad glorificationem Christi per Resurrectionem, quia sustinuit cum merito crucem et proinde cum libertate, sive directe indicent Christum elegisse crucem pro «proposito sibi gaudio».

Quæ in documentis Ecclesiæ continentur circa libertatem Christi, applicantur præsertim ad libertatem in morte. Concilium namque Tridentinum cum loquitur de justitia quam Christus pro nobis meruit (7), refertur ad meritum mortis et passionis ejus (8), et dicit aperte: «Sua sanctissima passione in ligno crucis nobis justificationem meruit» (9). Scimus etiam ad meritum Christi, ut ad aliud quodcumque meritum, libertatem, non solum a coactione sed etiam a necessitate requiri, ut appareat ex propositione Jansenii ab Innocentio X damnata ut hæretica: «At merendum et demerendum in statu naturæ lapsæ non requiritur in homine libertas a necessitate, sed sufficit libertas a coactione» (10). Jansenius ultiro concedebat necessitatem libertatis ad meritum in statu naturæ puræ, sed eam negabat in statu naturæ lapsæ; unde bene notat Franzelin: «Juxta verum sensum hujus condemnationis continetur velut a fortiori affirmatio ejusdem libertatis requisitæ ad merendum et demerendum pro statu naturæ integræ» (11), ut in casu circa Christi libertatem.

(4) Isa. 53:7-12.

(5) Jo. 10:17-18.

(6) Heb. 12:2.

(7) DB. 820.

(8) DB. 795.

(9) DB. 799.

(10) DB. 1094.

(11) Franzelin, *De Verbo Incarnato*, p. 439.

Multæ denique rationes theologicæ pro libertate mortis Christi possent afferri, sed sufficiat præcipuam in mentem revocare: Opus Redemptionis operatum est per Christi mortem et passionem; sublata autem libertate agentis, illud mirabilissimum opus jam non pertineret ad ordinem moralem sed ad ordinem physicum, et proinde incapax esset Deum justissimum et sanctissimum placare. Nullo igitur pacto dubitare possumus Christum intrinsece liberum fuisse in acceptatione sue mortis.

3 — Compositio istius libertatis cum visione beatifica et impeccabilitate sub præcepto moriendi. Aliud autem factum quod Scriptura videtur asserere est Christum accepisse a Patre mandatum moriendi et Christum obediisse usque ad mortem: «Calicem quem dedit mihi Pater, non bibam illum?»; (12); «Hoc mandatum a Patre meo» (13); «Humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis» (14).

Nunc autem, supposito hoc mandato, magna difficultas contra libertatem mortis Christi surgit, et quidem ex duplice capite; primo, ex intrinseca ejus impeccabilitate, orta, ut communiter admittitur contra Scotistas, ex ipsa unione Hypostatica, et secundo ex visione beatifica qua Christus gavisus est in terra. Nam queritur, potuitne Christus huic præcepto non obtemperare? Si potuit, ergo potuit inobedire Patri suo et actum est de impeccabilitate et visione beatifica; sed si non potuit, necessitatibus ad mortem.

Hanc difficultatem Cardinalis De Lugo non dubitat fateri: «merito reputari unam ex gravissimis Theologiæ» (15). et Cardinalis Franzelin vehementer increpat eos theologos qui negant difficultatem problematis: «Patet ex dictis, recentiores quosdam theologos (vide Henricum Klee), dum rident veterum hæsitationes et ingentes conatus ad rem, ut ipsis videatur, tam facilem explicandam, aut non intellexisse, quæ libertas requiratur ut conditio meriti, aut non considerasse quæ sit Christi hominis impeccantia» (16). Nec defuerunt aliqui

(12) Jo. 18:11.

(13) Jo. 10:18.

(14) Philip. 2:8.

(15) Lugo, Disp. 26, sect. 6.

(16) Franzelin, op. cit., p. 442.

theologi qui adeo magnam aestimaverunt difficultatem conciliandi libertatem Christi cum ejus visione beatifica, supposito praecepto, ut hanc visionem a Christo in terra degente denerarent (Gunter, Schell), aut saltem eam minuerent (Cano, Salmeron).

4 — Diversitas solutionum. Et re quidem vera, magnus solutionum numerus a veteribus et modernis theologis ex cogitatarum, testatur momentum hujus difficultatis. Franciscus Amicus undecim enumerat modos solutionis diversos, et in postremo modo adhuc septem «vias diversas» (17); post ejus tempus nonnulli alii modi sunt propositi.

Non omnes tentatas solutiones hie singillatim recollere possumus, sed oportet ad plenam intelligentiam status nostræ questionis, proprietates vel peculiaritates diversarum solutionum per classes distribuere, antequam de aliquibus in specie agamus.

Consideratis elementis problematis, aliqui auctores solutionem querunt ex parte Christi libertatis, eam componendo cum vero præcepto, dum alii econtra, solutionem invenire cogitant ex parte præcepti, ejus vim vel obligationem aliquo modo invalidando vel minuendo.

Si natura solutionis spectetur, sunt qui requirunt specialem solutionem pro hac difficultate, dum alii affirmant eam solvendam esse secundum principia generalia pro conciliatione libertatis humanæ cum actione divina.

Speciatim denique scholis circa compositionem libertatis cum gratia divina, inter eos qui in prima divisione querant solutionem ex parte libertatis, sunt qui quæstionem solvere cupiunt juxta principia molinisticæ scholæ, dum alii sequuntur principia scholæ banneziæ.

Nunc autem, si considerando solum elementa problematis, ad primam divisionem attendimus, in tres scholas omnes theorias dispertere possumus, ex quibus prima admittit præceptum rigorosum, id est, obligans sub reatu morali, secunda tale præceptum admittit solum quoad mortis Christi circumsistantias, tertia autem negat præceptum rigorosum mortis Christi. Præcipue theoriae uniuscujusque scholæ in sequenti paragrapho considerabuntur.

(17) Franciscus Amicus, S. J. *De Incarnatione*, disp. 25, sec. 3.

5 — *Præcipua theorie uniuscujusque schola.* A - Schola præcepti rigorosi: Omnes assecræ istius scholæ admittunt ut inconcessum Christum accepisse a suo Patre præceptum rigorosum moriendi, tale nimirum ut obligationem strictam imponebat. Diversæ theorie hujus scholæ diversimode libertatem Christi sub hoc præcepto explicant:

a) Prima theoria vult conciliare libertatem Christi cum ejus impeccabilitate, per gratias efficaces Christo concessas. Sie Sanctus Bonaventura: «In Christo autem fuit liberum arbitrium determinatum ad unum, non per necessitatem naturæ, sed per confirmationem gratiæ» (18). Multi theologi posteriores hanc sententiam amplectuntur et diversimode eam evolvunt. Sic Molina (19), Suarez (20), et Lessius qui hoc modo eam resumit: «Deus proponens animæ Christi hoc præceptum, ita excitabat ejus intellectum et afficiebat voluntatem per gratiam prævenientem, sicut noverat eum libere consenserum» (21). Deus, scilicet, ope scientiæ mediæ, cognoscebat illa auxilia gratiæ quibus Christus libere sed infallibiliter obtemperatus erat præcepto, et talia auxilia ei determinavit. Ut ex his apparet, pro eis qui hanc sententiam amplectuntur, non majorem parit difficultatem hoc problema, respectu impeccabilitatis Christi, quam problema libertatis in confirmatis in gratia. Quod vero attinet ad compositionem libertatis Christi cum visione beatifica, isti auctores radicem solutionis inveniunt in eo quod nulla voluntas necessario et invincibiliter movetur a bono cognito, nisi illud ei exhibeat ut undequaque et sub omni respectu bonum; jam vero præceptum moriendi, non obstante statu beatifico Christi, ei exhibeat sub aliqua ratione malum, nam ipse erat simul viator.

b) Thomistæ, vel fortasse melius vocentur banneziani, strictum præceptum admittunt, sed rem totam solvere conantur simili modo ac solvere intendunt concordiam humanæ libertatis cum auxiliis gratiæ efficacis. Ad rem el. Pater Hugon: «Præceptum est rigorosum et absolutum... Poterat Christus componere potentiam non moriendi cum præcepto moriendi, licet non posset componere de facto non mortem cum præcepto, sicut præmotus ad standum habet sub ipsa præmotione

(18) S. Bonaventura, In 3, d. 18, a. 192, ad 1.

(19) Molina, *Concordia*, disp. 53, memb. 4.

(20) Suarez, *De Incarnatione*, disp. 37, sect. 3, n. 22.

(21) Lessius, In 3, disp. 8, a. 4.

veram potentiam sedendi, licet de facto numquam uniri queat actus sedendi cum præmotione ad standum» (22).

c) Tertia theoria valde recens videtur, etiamsi non desunt testimonia antiquorum quæ eam insinuare videntur, et quamdam similitudinem habet cum sententia scotista inferius explicanda. Ample eam exponunt L. Jansens, O. S. B., in suo opere «De Deo Homine», et M. de Baets in «De libera Christi obedientia». Ut duæ priores strictum præceptum vindicat, sed solutionem quærerit in natura humanæ libertatis. Juxta Aristotelem «liberum est quod sui causa est» et proinde datur libertas quando datur dominium actus; jam vero, Christus sanctissimus et comprehensor non poterat non obedire præcepto rigoroso, et proinde Christus quadam necessitate obediebat, quia hoc bonum erat et voluntas appetit bonum; sed fundamentaliter vel radicaliter Christi voluntas manebat libera, quia ejus adhäsio non erat cœca et violenta, sed conscientia et spontanea. Id alio modo dici potest: Voluntas Christi manebat «domina actus» quia non dabatur coactio intrinseca, etiam si talem actum non poterat non ponere. Defensores hujus theoriæ distinguunt necessitatem appetitionis, quam conciliare judicant eum libertate, ab illa necessitate Jansenii et Baii quæ dominium actus certo excludit (23).

d) Scotistæ tenent impeccabilitatem Christi et beatorum oriri formaliter ex Dei Providentia ab extrinseco, non a visione beatifica procedere; ideo admittunt potentiam remotam servandi et non servandi præceptum manere in Christo viatore et in beatis; hæc potentia autem non sufficit ad meritum in beatis, sed certe in Christo sufficiebat ex speciale Dei acceptatione.

B - Schola præcepti rigorosi quoad circumstantias. Omnes priores sententiæ servant præceptum rigorosum circa mortem Christi et ejus circumstantias. Gabriel Vasquez, Gregorius de Valentia et præsertim Cardinalis Joannes de Lugo, quos alii moderniores sequuntur, admittunt præceptum absolutum et rigorosum secundum ejus determinationem genericam, sed negant præceptum specificum, id est secundum omnia motiva et gradus intentionis, et proinde negant a fortiori præceptum mortis in individuo, quod determinaret ultimam speciem

(22) Eduardus Hugón, O. P., *Tractatus Dogmaticus*, t. II, 600.

(23) DB. 1039, 1080.

aetuum passionis et omnia adjuncta temporis et loci mortis Christi. Contra hanc sententiam objiciunt aliqui, libertatem Christi versari circa circunstancias mortis, non circa ipsam essentiam actus, proindeque Christum nos redemisse per circumstancias mortis sua, non per ipsam mortem. Ad hanc gravem objectionem respondent defensores theoriae, libertatem realiter versari circa ipsam essentiam actus; nam si modus, et tempus, et locus manent sub libertatis imperio, hic et nunc potest voluntas illum aetum eligere vel non eligere, vel eligere alium aetum; non enim dantur actus in genere sed in individuo, si ergo haec adjuncta sub libertate cadunt, ipsa actus positio est sufficienter libera ad meritum.

Simili modo explicant isti auctores libertatem Christi quoad precepta legis naturalis: precepta positiva, utpote in individuo indeterminata, fuerunt meritoria in Christo, et in eis consistebat Christi libertas; precepta vero negativa, siquidem semper prohibent malum, non erant sub imperio Christi et ipse carebat merito in corum observantia.

Adbue aliud elementum introducit Lugo in suam explicationem et porro ut essentiale: Christus poterat impetrare dispensationem ipsius generici mandati, secundum verba: «An putas quia non possum rogare Patrem meum?» (24).

C - Schola negans preceptum rigorosum. Ultima schola nobis examinanda fundatur in interpretatione verborum «preceptum», «mandatum», et «obedientia». Siquidem circa valorem argumenti patristici hujus sententiae noster totus labor versabitur, eam intimius et sub diversis modalitatibus in temporis transuersu, nobis opus erit serutari.

Elementum essentiale hujus theoriae est Christum non accepisse strictum preceptum moriendi, sed quod dicitur in Scriptura mandatum esse definiendum ostensionem divinae voluntatis, ita Christo propositam ut etiam alii modi Redemptionis Patri forent accepti.

Suarez qui communiter sat complete recenset omnes defensores eujuscumque theoriae, pro hac sententia non invenit nisi nomina duorum theologorum, Paludani et Dyonisii Cisterciensis. Argumenta Paludani reducit Suarez ad unum, principem, nempe, solutum esse legibus. Dyonisius vero cogitavit obligationem precepti repugnare cum merito de condig-

(24) Matt. 26:53.

no (25). Lugo hanc sententiam appellavit singularem et contra communem sensum theologorum» (26).

Sic igitur Suarez (1548-1617), et quadraginta circiter annis post Lugo (1583-1660), ineptam et singularem haec sententiam judicaverunt. Sed eodem anno quo natus est in Hispania Lugo, natus est in Gallia magnus theologus qui jure meritoque appellatus est Pater Theologiae Positivae, Dyonisius Petavius (1583-1652), qui strenue defendit theoriam hanc et plurimis argumentis munit. Usque ad nostram aetatem auctores hanc sententiam propugnantes, ad argumenta et testimonia Petavii confugiunt. Sic ipse suam sententiam declarat: «Patrem, arbitror, Deum homini Christo varios modos, quibus recuperari salus humana posset... Ex his igitur, et aliis innumeris rationibus, quas in arcana Patris mente latentes intuebatur, uti, quam mallet, optaret, integrum fecit illi divina bonitas, adeo ut, quamecumque capesseret, gratam esse sciret et acceptam ac voluntati sue consentaneam» (27).

Pater Nicolaus Raye, S. J., publice defendit undecim theses contra praeceptum rigorosum in Collegio Lovaniense, die 18 Julii anni 1714; Patres diversorum Ordinum vehementer et acriter sententiam Raye impugnaverunt. Tunc ipse, ut eis responderet, edidit opuseculum octo continens theses, ex quibus tertia et quarta plurima testimonia Patrum Latinorum et Graecorum continent. Hoc opuseculum insertum in Thesauro Theologiae Zaccariæ, secundum constituit fontem ex quo argumenta patristica auctores posteriores hanc sententiam tenentes hauriunt (28).

Sæculo decimo nono præcipuus defensor hujus theoriæ fuit egregius Cardinalis Joannes Baptista Franzelin, qui sic suam sententiam exponit: «Illud mandatum, illa voluntas Patris, quatenus antecedit liberam Christi electionem et acceptationem ad ponendam animam suam, intelligi debet divinum beneplacitum humanæ voluntati Redemptoris propositum ita, ut etiam aliis Redemptionis modus Patri foret acceptus» (29). Supposita perfectione humanæ voluntatis

(25) Suarez, *De Inc.*, q. 20, a. 2, sect. 3.

(26) Lugo, *Disp.* 26, sect. 8, n. 100.

(27) D. Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, liber IX, c. 8, n. 13. ,

(28) Socius Academiarum Ecclesiasticarum, *Thesaurus Theologicus*, t. IX, 699.718.

(29) Franzelin, *op. cit.*, p. 443.

Christi, mandatum non aliter videtur posse intelligi quam per modum beneplaciti.

Nostris temporibus Cardinalis Aloysius Billot, S. J. hanc sententiam strenue defendit aliquantulum mutatam: Pro Petavio, Raye, Franzelin et aliis, voluntas Patris redemptiva per mortem Filii, erat conditionata, solumque evenit absoluta post liberam Christi electionem. Secundum Billot, voluntas Patris præcessit quamlibet electionem Christi non conditionata sed absolute. Hæc tamen voluntas numquam fuit præceptiva sed voluntas «signi».

Hujusmodi sententia de præcepto non rigoroso evadit valde communis inter auctores transacti et præsenti sæculi; sufficiat nominare Wireburgenses, Platel, Strengstrup, Jungman, Brambring et Muneunill. Evidem opinor, multum profuisse tali sententiae magna auctoritas qua in mundo theologicō gavisi sunt Franzelin et Billot, ejus eximii sustentatores (30).

6 — Argumenta hujus sententiae. Tria sunt præcipua: 1) Impossibilitas conciliandi præceptum obligatorium cum libertate Christi sanctissimi et comprehensoris. Audiatur Billot: «Voluntas comprehensoris est physice incapax ponendi quemlibet actum amori divini boni repugnantem... Simplieiter dicendum est nullam fuisse in Christo libertatem a necessitate, respectu eorum que per divinam legem vel jubebantur vel prohibebantur... Restat igitur ut præceptum omnino amoveatur» (31). 2) Ipsa exegesis scripturistica locum dat huic interpretationi. Sic scribit Franzelin: «Falsum est hoc nomine (mandato) sive per se sive in usu biblico semper

(30) Fortasse lectori placebit cognoscere judicia duorum theologorum extra Societatem Jesu, circa Cardinalem Billot. Uterque eum judicat maximum theologum in nostris temporibus. Petrus Parente, in «De Verbo Incarnato» p. IX, sit: «Inter theologos recentiores facile princeps, in re presertim speculativa». Et J. Bitremieux, in Eph. Theol. Lov. IX (1932), 293, scribit: «Nous croyons même, et nous ne serons pas seuls de cet avis, que l'histoire de la théologie retiendra le nom de Billot comme celui du plus grand théologien des cinquante derniers années».

Quoad partem negativam sententiae concordat cum Franzelin et Billot clarus P. De la Taille: «Nullum unquam esse Christo impositum a Patre præceptum moriendi obligatio», *Mysterium Fidei*, Eluc. VIII, 99. Ipse tamen explicat Christum contraxisse obligationem moriendi offerendo se ad mortem per sacramentum.

(31) L. Billot, *De Verbo Incarnato*, Theses XXIX, XXX.

designari præceptum strictum et impositum independenter a libera electione voluntatis, cui imponitur» (32). 3) Denique, multi Patres vel expresse hanc sententiam docent, vel eam saltem aperte insinuant. In hoc patristico argumento multum insistunt propugnatores hujus theses, ut notam novitatis ab ea removeant, et ei auctoritatem concilient.

Quoad primum argumentum, consideret lector quam validum sit et videat utrum aliqua ex theoriis superius explicatis, vel alia, valeat compouere Christi libertatem cum ejus impeccabilitate et visione beatifica sub rigoroso præcepto. Neque est nostrum propositum valorem secundi argumenti direete considerare; illud solummodo considerabimus quatenus conneefitur eum tertio argumendo.

7 — *Controversia circa valorem tertii argumenti.* Circa valorem argumenti patristici pro præcepto non rigoroso, multo abhinc tempore controvertitur. Suarez interpretabatur Patres qui tunc temporis pro sententia adueebantur, ut si revera strictum mandatum affirmarent; patristica testimonia Petavii et Raye revocabantur in dubium, et nostris temporibus scribit Galtier: «Immerito, ut videtur, invocatur auctoritas Patrum, nam qui dicuntur eam tenuisse aut insinuasse, eos haud constat locutos esse de Christi humana voluntate; constat potius eos, locis invocatis, non attendisse nisi ipsam Verbi Personam» (33). Contra vero, propugnatores hujus sententiae firmum prorsus esse patristicum argumentum autuinant.

8 — *Scopus et momentum hujus investigationis.* Mos fuit testimonia Patrum ad hanc quæstionem quod attinet, valde mutila atque dissecta referri; Sic Petavius et Raye, et sic hodierni auctores qui illis duobus ut fontibus videntur uti. Cum tamen tot hodie tantaque nos urgeant studia historica et positiva, et tot bonos et copiosos fontes patristicos habeamus, quibus antiqui auctores carabant, opus disideratur quod mentem eorum Patrum in controversiam adductorum circa hoc grave problema theologicum, *complexive et abunde et critice* consideret. Ille erit noster scopus, huic necessitati respondere.

(32) Franzelin, *op. cit.*, p. 444.

(33) P. Galtier, *De Incarnatione et Redemptione*, p. 323.

Iam vero, queritur qui sunt Patres qui in hoc studio examinari debent? Illi quorum auctoritatem invocant defensores hujus theoriae inde a tempore Petavii ad nostram usque ætatem, etiam si non omnes ab unoquoque auctore citentur. Illi autem sunt inter Patres Graecos: Basilius, Gregorius Nazianzenus, Chrysostomus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Theodoretus et Ecumenius; Inter Latinos: Leo Magnus, Ambrosius, Augustinus et Anselmus.

Ut statim apparet, non omnes vocari possunt Patres in stricto sensu, nam ex quattuor quæ ad hoc requiruntur, scilicet antiquitas, doctrina, sanctitas et approbatio Ecclesiæ, saltem Anselmus caret primo (34). Sed cum doctrina Anselmi sit magni momenti in hæc quæstione, et præterea ejus testimonium invocetur ab auctoribus inter testimonia patristica, ejus mentem callere conabimur in postremo capite tertiae sectionis.

Hæc sententia circa præceptum non rigorosum defenditur vel impugnatur ab auctoribus, quin ostendatur momentum ejus ob relationem quam habet cum tota doctrina de Redemptione. P. Galtier ponderat momentum ejus respectu doctrinæ aseptice (35), sed nondum fuit posita sub plena luce implicatio quam habet cum Dogmate Redemtionis. Sufficiat nunc pauca considerare.

Redemptio active spectata plures adspectus habet, nam unicus actus redemptivas Christi potest considerari prout est opus gratiæ et misericordiæ, adoptio filiorum Dei, mediatio Christi, instauratio omnium in Deo, satisfactio vicaria Christi, expiatio et ablatio peccati, reconciliatio hominis cum Deo. Omnia hæc pertinent ad plenam descriptionem actus redemptivi; possumusne tamen hæc omnia elementa hierarchice in syntesim redigere, ita ut unum eorum sit ultimum fundamentum Redemtionis subordinans omnia cetera elementa? In memoriam revocemus duos conatus ad hoc obtinendum in nostris temporibus: P. D'Ales invenit causam formalem Redemtionis in Satisfactione Vicaria Christi, in qua ultimo consistit Redemptio, et ad quam ceteras alias rationes tendunt (36).

(34) *Ætas Patristica, ut communius aestimatur, clauditur in Occidente cum Gregorio Magno (604), vel cum S. Isidoro (636); in Oriente cum Joanne Damasceno (754).*

(35) P. Galtier, «Obéissant jusqu'à la mort». *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, I (1920), 113-149.

(36) A. D'Ales, *De Verbo Incarnato*, pp. 303-341.

P. Hocedez proponit hanc synthesim, non super Satisfactionem ut tales, sed super Sacrificium Redemptivum, specificem ut sacrificium, et opinatur hanc synthesim factam fuisse a P. De la Taille in suo opere *Mysterium Fidei* (37).

Sed sive eligatur Sacrificium aut Satisfactione ut supremum elementum constitutivum Redemptionis, in utroque casu obedientia Christi est certe quod tribuit valorem huic Satisfactioni et huic Christi Sacrificio. Homo, querendo voluptatem et sectando superbiam, inobedivit stricto præcepto Dei et ejus inimicus evadit; Christus, autem, expiando dolorose seseque humiliando, obedivit Patri, nosque eum eo reeonciliavit. Sed obedivitne «stricto» præcepto? Hie parallelismus inter nostrum lapsum et nostram reparationem per Satisfactionem Christi, a Traditione toties inculcatus, videtur strictum et rigorosum præceptum requirere. Sacrificii valor fundatur etiam in voluntaria et amorosa obedientia Christi ut Apostolus explicat in capite decimo Epistolæ ad Hebræos.

Jam vero, si obedientia Christi non est sicut nostra humana obedientia, nec correspondet inobedientiæ Adæ; si mandati realitas non est vera sed metaphorica, revera nostri conceptus circa Redemptionem, prout est Satisfactione Vicaria Christi pro opere inobedientiæ Adæ, vel Sacrificium amorosæ obedientiæ Redemptoris, non parum videntur mutari, eorumque plenus sensus debilitari.

Ut igitur theoriæ præcepti non rigorosi solidam probabilitatem tribuerent, ejus propugnatores magna nomina Patrum Græcorum et Latinorum pro ea citant. Estne revera hæc genuina mens eorum Patrum?

In sequentibus pagellis huic quæstioni respondere pretendo.

(37) E. Hocedez, «A propos d'un livre sur l'Incarnation», *Gregorianum*, XII (1931), 138-147.

SECTIO SECUNDA — PATRES GRÆCI

CAPUT PRIMUM

SANCTUS JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS

1 — Chrysostomus et hæretici ab eo impugnati. Inter Patres Græcos qui dicuntur tenuisse sententiam pro præcepto non rigoroso, primus consideratur Chrysostomus, tum ob copiam testimoniorum ejus, tum ob magnam ejus auctoritatem. Adversarii vero hujus theoriæ valorem argumenti ex Chrysostomo desumpti negare intendunt, eo quod hie Pater contra sectas Arianas pugnans, nou de humana sed de divina Christi voluntate in textibns adductis loquatur. Opus erit proinde totam doctrinam circa libertatem et obedientiam Christi in operibus Chrysostomi considerare diligenter, ut conclusionem firmam eruere valeamus.

Textus qui afferri solet continentur in Homiliis in Joannis Evangelium et in Saneti Pauli Epistolas præsertim; jam vero, in his omnibus Homiliis, Sanctus impugnare debuit plurimas sectas quæ tune temporis serpebant Antiochiæ et Constantinopoli, ubi illæ dictæ fuerunt; sæpenumero aggreditur direete Marcionitas, Samosatenses, Sabellianos, Manichæos et Arianos, et inter Arianos, modo speciali, Anomœos. Hæc secta elegerat Antiochiam ut propugnaculum, et proinde eam Chrysostomus strenue confutare debuit. Ut eam melius refelleret methodum suæ prædicationis mutavit, et loco longarum explanationum moralium, ut fecerat instanter et sedulo in Homiliis in Matthæi Evangelium, Dogma Christologicum, præsertim consubstantialitatem Filii cum Patre, ample in Homiliis in Joannis Evangelium exposuit.

Hæretici Anomœi initio sæculi quarti falsam suam doctrinam propugnare inceperunt; hæc doctrina habuit ut maximum propugnatorem episcopum Ætium, et multa mutuavit ex hæresi ariana, etiamsi inter asseclas utriusque non defuerunt aeres dissensiones. Ejusmodi Anomœi, contra catholicos confitentes ὄντούσια, seu «consubstantialitatem», et contra semirianos ὄμοιούσια, sive similitudinem, tenentes, absolutam ἀνομούσια vel dissimilitudinem inter Patrem et Filium profitebantur, hincque (Anomœi), id est «Dissimiles» sunt

appellati. Præter hanc haeresim alia amentia plena dicebant, quæ Sanctus Doctor debuit non semel exprobari; dicebant, verbi causa, se omnem scientiam cognoscere et ita Deum comprehendere ut ipse Deus seipsum comprehendit. Hac falsa omniscientia sese fultos putantes, verba Scripturæ et præsertim Joannis contra consubstantialitatem esse demonstrare conabantur. Illis textibus utebantur in quibus Christus confitetur voluntatem Patris facere debere ei præceptis parere.

Contra hos, igitur, adversarios concertavit Chrysostomus; illa loca Joannis et Pauli præcipue explanavit quæ vel directe probant divinitatem Christi ejusque cum Patre consubstantialitatem, vel ea quæ majorem difficultatem generant ex eo quod Christum minorem Patre aliquomodo ostendunt. Postquam octoginta et octo Homiliae in Joannis Evangelium prædicavit Antiochiæ, incepit Chrysostomus commentari Epistolas Pauli, et reliquit nobis ducentas quinquaginta Homiliae quæ jure considerantur optimum commentarium in Apostolum unquam in viginti sæculis Christianismi scriptum. Epistolæ præsertim ad Philippenses et ad Hebreos occasionem optimam offerebant Chrysostomo consubstantialitatem Filii demonstrandi.

2 — Libertas Christi respectu hominum et diaboli. Quinque ex melioribus Homiliis dicavit Chrysostomus ad colloquium Christi cum Nicodemo commentandum, in quibus multa circa divinitatem Christi exaravit contra Anomœos. In quarta carum explicat figuram a Christo usurpatam serpenti exaltati a Moyse in deserto, et pulchram instituit comparationem inter Christum libenter amplectentem crucem et strenuum athletam bravum victoriæ reportantem (1):

Cur autem non clare dixit se crucifigendum esse, sed ad veterem figuram auditorum remisit?... Deinde ut intelligas, ipsum non invitum ad mortem venisse... Quemadmodum enim athleta strenuus, cum sublimem actum adversarium prosternit, clarorem refert victoriam: sic et Christus toto spectante orbe, adversarias potestates dejicit; et eis qui in solitudine vulnerati fuerant curatis, ab omnibus feris ipse in cruce suspensus liberavit. Verum non dixit, Suspendi oportet, sed, Exaltari.

Sie igitur explicat Chrysostomus libertatem Christi in morte futura; cum his consonat optime quod ipse Chrysos-

(1) In Jean. Hom. XXII. n. 2; PG, LIX, 158-159. In hac secunda sectione dabimus originale græcum eorum textuum qui magis directe ad nostram quæstionem pertinent; ceterorum autem curabimus præbere completam referentiam.

tomus dicit de libertate in morte a Christo in facto sublata. Idea libertatis Christi, idea dominii actus, fortiter declaratur a Chrysostomo in morte Christi ut prædicta et deinde ut acceptata et consummata. En Verba Chrysostomi (2) :

Cum enim omnia consummata essent, inclinato capite (non enim illud clavis erat affixum), tradidit spiritum, hoc est, expiravit... Non postquam expiraverat caput inclinavit, ut apud nos fieri solet: sed postquam inclinaverat, expiravit. Quibus omnibus declaravit evangelista, ipsum universorum esse Dominum.

Contra eos qui dicebant Christum mortuum fuisse ut pretium debitum diabolo solveret, statuit Chrysostomus Christum nihil diabolo debuisse et proinde neque ex hoc capite ejus mortem opus obligatorium dici posse (3) :

Quid ergo? diabolusne te perdidit? Minime; nihil enim in me habet. Cur ergo te illi interficiunt? Quia ita volo... non enim quod sim morti obnoxius, neque quod illi (diabolo) quidquam debeam.

Sic ergo apparet Christum, secundum claram doctrinam Chrysostomi, nulla coactione sive ab hominibus, sive a diabolo, passionem subiisse. Sed ut proprius ad punctum nostrum accedamus in nostra investigatione, oportet jam cognoscere mentem Chrysostomi circa libertatem Christi respectu præcepti Patris sui.

3 — Libertas Christi et mandatum Patris. Sæpe Chrysostomus exprimit ideam sibi gratissimam et quæ nobis lucem afferre potest ad nostram inquisitionem: Christi scilicet mortem esse super omnia et ante omnia opus ejus amoris erga Patrem; multos textus poteramus afferre, sed sit satis videre quomodo concludat textum anteriorem (4) :

Ut cognoscat mundus quod Patrem diligam. Non enim quod sim morti obnoxius... sed ob amorem erga Patrem hæc subeo... Non ex necessitate hæ patior, sed ob Patris amorem... siquidem admodum diligebat illum, et dilectus ita volebat.

Quater in una paragrapho repetit eamdem ideam; et quidem hæc idea est centralis in prædicatione Chrysostomi, et sub ejus luce possumus intelligere aliqua non adeo clara quæ Sanetus dicit de mandato Patris et de obedientia Christi in morte.

(2) In Joan. Hom. LXXXV, n. 2; PG, LIX, 462-463.

(3) In Joan. Hom. LXXV, n. 4; PG, LIX, 408.

(4) Ibid.

Nunc autem videamus quid dicat Chrysostomus de «obedientia» quam Apostolus tribuit Christo in secundo capite Ep. ad Philippenses. Siquidem magni momenti est pro nostro scopo hæc explicatio, debemus tria clare patefacere: primum, quid dicat Chrysostomus, secundum, utrum illud de divina vel de humana natura et voluntate Christi dicat, et tertium eni theoriæ faveant hæc verba Sancti Doctoris (5):

Humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. En, inquiunt (anomœi), factus est obediens, cum ei minime æqualis esset cui obediuit. O stolidi ac dementes, hoc de illo nihil detrahit; nam nos etiam amicis obedimus, neque id tamen nos minores facit. Sponte Filius Patri obediuit, non ei in servilem conditionem decidens, sed hoc ipso servans admirabilem illam germani Filii dignitatem, magnum Patri honorem exhibendo.

Quoad primum quod proposuimus investigandum, mihi sane videtur Chrysostomum non veram et stricte dictam obedientiam, eam porro quæ viget superiorem et inferiorem per verum præceptum, intellexisse, sed obedientiam late dictam quæ potest prædicari inter amicos, nullo intercedente præcepto: «Nos etiam obedimus amicis». Sie proinde videtur ad primum punctum respondendum.

Sed queritur secundo, an hæc dicat Chrysostomus de Christo ut Deo vel ut homine? Postquam in eadem Homilia egit contra Marcionitas et Samosatenses, annuntiat Chrysostomus sequentia esse contra Arianos: «Iterum contra Arianos agitur»; in præecedentibus accurate distinguit inter ea quæ dicuntur de Christo ut Deo et de Christo ut homine; sic verbi causa: «Formam servi accepit, non de divina natura sed de humana prædicantur» (6). Cum autem pervenit ad explicandum sensum «obedientiæ» in Christo, nullam facit distinctionem. Facile poterat admittere veram et strictam obedientiam secundum humanam naturam, ut immediate ante admittebat humiliationes alias. Sed in obedientia hanc distinctionem

(5) In Ep. ad Philip. Hom. VII, n. 3; PG, LXII, 232: Ἐταπείνωσεν ἔσυτὸν, ὑπήκοος γενόμενος μέχοι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. Ἰδοὺ, φησὶν, ὑπήκοος γέγονεν, οὐκ ἵστος ὁν ὁ υπήκοος εν. Οὐδὲν τοῦτο, αὐτὸν ἐλάττον, ἡ ἀγνώμονες καὶ ἀνόητοι ἔκει καὶ φίλοις πολλάκις ὑκακούμεν ἥμεις, καὶ οὐδὲν τοῦτο ἥμας ἐλάττονς ποιεῖ. Ως Υἱὸς Πατρὶ ὑπήκοοσεν ἕκῶν, οὐκ εἰς δουλικὸν ἀξίωμα καταπεσὼν, ἀλλὰ τούτῳ αὐτῷ μάλιστα φυλάττων τῆς γνησιότητος τὸ θαῦμα, τῇ πολλῇ περὶ τὸν Πατέρα τιμῇ.

(6) Loc. cit.

et explicationem omittit, consulto ut videtur, et se confugit ad explicationem obedientiae quae vigere potest inter aequales et amicos. Ex his licet nobis deducere, mentem Chrysostomi esse excludere veram obedientiam in Christo absque ulla distinctione, id est, Christum neque qua hominem neque qua Deum, fuisse unquam strictum vera obedientia, sed solo amicali. Hinc clare videntur favere sententiae praecepti non rigorosi.

Quae hucusque dicta sunt, optime confirmantur comentario Chrysostomi ad 1 Cor. 15:28, quod sic se habet (7) :

Cum autem subjecta fuerint illi omnia, tunc et ipse Filius subjectus erit illi; ostendit ejus magnam cum Patre concordiam et quod is (Pater) est principium bonorum omnium.

Hæc verba resumunt longam explicationem circa «subjectationem» Christi, et ut appareat, illam identificant eum «concordia» et quidem loquendo de Christo secundum naturam assumptam.

Sed ad Homilia in Joannis Evangelium redeamus; in LXXVI declarat brevissime Chrysostomus textum Jo. 15:10, in quo affirmat Christum servavisse præceptum Patris (8) :

«Si præcepta mea servaveritis, sicut et ego præcepta Patris mei servavi rursus humano more sermo procedit. Neque enim legislator præceptis subditus esse debebat. Vident id quod semper dico hic etiam exhibere propter auditorium imbecillitatem?

Hic iterum videtur Chrysostomus contemplari Christum completum, Personam nempe Verbi cum assumpta humana natura, et de eo docere non accepisse præceptum. Cur igitur Christus de præcepto loquitur? — «Propter auditorum imbecillitatem», vel ut saepe dicit Chrysostomus: «Secundum audientium opinionem».

Istæ expressiones a Chrysostomo passim adhibitæ consti-
tuunt multoties veram clavem interpretationis. Cum enim

(7) In Ep. ad Cor. Hom. XXXIX, n. 5; PG. LXI, 340: "Οταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τὴν πολλὴν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ὅμονοιαν δεικνύς, καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸς ἀρχὴ πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

(8) In Ioan. Hom. LXXVI, n. 2; PG, LIX, 412: "Εὖν τὰς ἐντολὰς μοι ἦργητε, φησί, καθὼς ἔγώ του πατρὸς τὰς ἐντολὰς τετίρησκα. Πάλιν ἀνθροπίνως ὁ λόγος προεισιν. Οὐ γὰρ δῆκον ὁ νομοθέτης ὑπὸ ἐντολὰς ἔμελλε κείσεσθαι. Οορᾶς ὅτι, ὅπερ ἀεὶ λέγω, τοῦτο καὶ ἐνταῦθα δεῖνυται διὰ τῶν ἀκροωμένων ἀσθένειαν.

Christus aliquid loquitur significans suam inferioritatem vel ignorantiam, multi Patres illud cogitant dictum fuisse secundum naturam humanam. Chrysostomus etiam haec distinctione aliquando utitur, sed saepius recurrit ad «œconomiam» revelationis: Christus hoc vel illud dixit, ut «auditores aliquid possint capere» vel «secundum eorum opinionem, non secundum ipsam rem» (9).

Eudem processum habet Chrysostomus eum de præcepto Christo imposito loquitur. Locum distinguendi et admittendi verum mandatum impositum Christo homini, dieit Christum verba sua auditorum opinioni et imbecillitate attemperasse.

Sed jam tandem veniamus ad præcipuum textum in quo Christus aperte docet accepisse præceptum moriendi: Jo. 10:17. Commentarium Chrysostomi in hunc locum est magni momenti pro nobis, nam clarissima verba Christi circa mandatum debent explicari (10):

«Hoc est præceptum quod accepi a Patre» Quodnam? Ut moriar pro mundo. Nunc expectavit donec audiret, et tunc acquievit, et an opus habuit discere?... sic et hoc loco cum dicit se præceptum accepisse a Patre, nihil aliud declarat, quam Patri placere quod ipse fecit;... Nam si præcepto opus habuisset, cur dixisset, «A me ipso pono»? Nam qui a se ipso ponit non eget præcepto... Nihil aliud ergo hic sibi vult præceptum, quam concordiam cum Patre ostendere. Quod si tamen humano et humili more dictum sit, id auditorum imbecillitati tribuendum.

Inneccarium videtur animadvertere Chrysostomum iterum non distinguere inter humanam et divinam voluntatem Christi, sed a toto Christo, a Bono Pastore, removere præceptum, et «auditorum imbecillitati» tribuendum judicare quod Christus dicit de mandato. Verbum «præceptum» vel «mandatum», solummodo indicat «concordiam» Christi cum suo Patre.

(9) Cf. Ibid. 403, 404, et passim.

(10) In Joan. Hom. LX, n. 2; PG, LIX, 330-331: Ταύτην τὴν ἐντολήν ἔλυθον παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς. Ποίαν δὴ ταύτην; Τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου Ἀδὲ οὖν ἀνέιμενεν ἀκοῦσαι πρότερον, καὶ τότε εἶλετο, καὶ ἐδέησεν αὐτὸ μαθεῖν.... Οὗτῳ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐντολὴν εἴληφέναι παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς εἰπών, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐμφαίνει, οὐδὲ τοιούτην δοκεῖ τοῦτο, δὲ γὰρ ποιῶ... Ὁ γὰρ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τιθεὶς οὐ δέεται ἐντολῆς... Οὐδὲν οὖν ἄλλο οὐ ἐντολὴ ἐνταῦθα βούλεται κειμένε, ἀλλ' η πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα δρόντων δεῖξαι... Εἰ δὲ οὕτω τιπενῶς εἴρηται καὶ ἀνθρωπίνως, τῆς των ἀκοουσόντων ἔστιν ἀσθενεῖς η αἵτια.

Contra has clarissimas propositiones Chrysostomi adversarii theoriæ præcepti non rigorosi, volentes infirmare argumentum ex Chrysostomo desumptum, dicunt hunc Patrem semper præ oculis habuisse divinam Christi voluntatem in hac quæstione agenda, nam contra Arianos disputabat. Ex nostro studio præcedenti videtur constare Chrysostomum agere de toto Christo et ab eo omnino removere præceptum. Nec omitendum est Chrysostomum intendere non solum argumenta contra adversarios invenire, sed docere suos fideles circa verum sensum verborum Christi, et proinde circa verum sensum verbi «mandati» prout Christus illud protulit.

Ille tonus apologeticus qui reperitur in Homiliis in Joannis Evangelium et Pauli Epistolas, ab Homiliis abest in Matthæum in quibus Chrysostomus, modo simplici et directo, docet suos fideles, prescindendo ab adversariis. Iam vero, in paucis referentiis quæ inveniantur in his Homiliis ad Christi libertatem et voluntatem præceptivam Patris, eamdem doctrinam invenimus. Valor sequentium textuum melius intelligitur, post omnia quæ antea vidimus in Joannis commentario. Ad verba Domini, in Mt. 26:18 «Ite ad civitatem ad quemdam, et dieite ei: Magister dicit: Tempus meum prope est, apud te facio Pascha cum discipulis meis» apponit hæc Chrysostomus: «Et eur ad ignotum hominem mittit? Hinc ostendens se non passurum fuisse si voluisset» (11).

In explicatione Orationis Domini in Horto, optimam habebat occasionem Chrysostomus docendi suos fideles humanam subordinationem Christi, voluntatem præceptivam Patris sectando. Sed contra vero, idem dieit ac in Homiliis in Joannis Evangelium (12):

Cum ergo ait «si possibile est transeat» humanitatem ostendit; cum autem dicit «verumtamen non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu» virtutem philosophiamque exhibit, monetque, retinente quoque natura, Deum esse secundum... «Pater, si non potest hic calix transire, nisi bibam illum, fiat voluntas tua, hic ostendens se cum voluntate Dei admodum consonare, et ubique illum sequi oportere.

Denique, Chrysostomus non solum indicat Christum habuisse plenam libertatem in morte subeunda, sed modum mortis declarat fuisse sub Christi imperio. Hæc omnia difficile componi possunt cum rigoroso præcepto (13):

(11) In Matt. Hom. LXXXI; PG, LVIII, 730.

(12) In Matt. Hom. LXXXIII, n. 1; PG, LVIII, 746-747.

(13) In Ep. ad Heb. XII, 2; PG, LXIII, 193.

Si enim qui minime necesse habebat crucifigi, propter nos fuit crucifixus: quanto magis par est ut nos omnia fortiter feramus? «Qui proposito, inquit, sibi gaudio, sustinuit crucem, confusione contempta». Probrosum, inquit, elegit mortem.

Ex diversis interpretationibus quas hæc verba Sancti Pauli habent: «Qui proposito sibi gaudio, sustinuit crucem, confusione contempta», eam elegit Chrysostomus quæ magis directe indicat potestatem Christi eligendi inter mortem et contemptum ex una parte, et gaudium ex altera.

4—*Conclusiones.* Ex omnibus his hæc videntur posse erui conclusiones: 1) Praeceptum rigorosum impositum Christo, non possumus cognoscere nisi per revelationem; jam vero, omnes textus in quibus declarantur vel insinuantur mandatum et præceptum, declarantur et explicantur a Sancto Chrysostomo ut si non esset strictum præceptum. 2) Non semel nec bis ita loquitur Chrysostomus, sed nobis legavit amplum complexum doctrinæ in quo appareat eadem mens semper. 3) Denique, hoc declarat Chrysostomus non solum refutando Arianos, sed in consuetis explicationibus pro suis fidelibus, et saepè sine intentione controversiæ; nominquam videtur loqui directe et expresse de Christi humana voluntate.

Unde jure meritoque possumus dicere Chrysostomum docere Christum nullo pacto obstrictum fuisse vere rigoroso moriendi præcepto.

CAPUT SECUNDUM

SANCTI BASILIUS ET GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS

1—*Sanctus Basilius.* Circa quindecim annos ante ortum Chrysostomum Antiochiæ (c. a. 345), natus est Basilius Cæsareæ in Cappadocia (c. a. 330), et in eadem urbe per viginti annos contra Arianos acerrime pugnavit.

Post accuratam investigationem omnium operum Sancti Doctoris, et præsertim eorum in quibus contra Arianos agit, paucos authenticos textus circa nostrum problema potuimus invenire; eos accurate perpendainus.

In Libro Secundo de Spiritu Sancto, caput octavum agit de recta intelligentia particulæ «per quem» cum ad Filium

applicatur, et haec occasione sensum verbi «mandatum» Basilius investigat. In hoc capite ut in prioribus vult ostendere divinitatem Christi et ejus aequalitatem cum Patre. Sic declarat illa verba Novi Testamenti quae inferioritatem Filii suggerere possunt (14) :

Itaque cum ait: «Ego ex me ipso locutus non sum»; et rursum: «Sicut dixit mihi Pater ita loquo», et: «Sermo quod audistis non est meus, sed ejus qui misit me»; et alibi: «Quemadmodum mandavit mihi Pater, sic facio»: non quod careat libero arbitrio ac voluntatis motu, neque quod ex datis signis veniam ac licentiam agendi expectet, ideo talis utitur verbis; sed ut declaret propriam voluntatem conjuncte atque inseparabiliter Patri adhaerentem.

Ex solo hoc textu non apparet utrum Sanctus Basilius agat de natura divina vel humana Christi. De utraque voluntate divina et humana, praedicari potest: «Propriam voluntatem conjunctam atque inseparabiliter Patri adhaerentem». Præcedens tamen contextus, in quo de divina Christi voluntate agitur, ostendit Basiliūm hic etiam loqui de hæc divina voluntate. Post hæc verba prosequitur Basilius (15) :

Proinde quod dicitur mandatum, ne sermonem imperiosum per vocalia organa prolatum intelligamus, Filio velut subdito præscribentem quid facere debeat: sed juxta sensum Deo dignum, intelligamus voluntatis communicationem, veluti formæ cujuspam in specie imaginem, a Patre in Filium sine tempore demanantem.

Basilius certe agit in his verbis de specifico mandato mortis, nam commentatur verba Joannis XIV: 13, quæ reddunt hunc sensum. Sed Basilius refertur non ad Christum ut hominem sed ut Deum; mandatum est communicatio voluntatis Patris in Filium sine tempore dimanans. Animadvertisit

(14) S. Basilios, Liber de Spiritu Saneto, c. VIII, n. 20; PG. XXXII, 103: Ὄταν οὖν λέγῃ· Ἐγὼ ἐξ ἑμαυτοῦ οὐκέτι ἔλλησί· καὶ πάλιν· Καθὼς ἔιρηκε μοι δὲ Πατήρ, οὕτω λαλῶ. Καὶ, Οὐ λόγος δὲ ἀκούσετε, οὐκ ἔστιν ἔμος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πεμφαντὸς με. Καὶ ἐτέρωθι· Καθὼς ἐνετείλατο μοι δὲ Πατήρ, οὕτω ποιῶ οὐκέτι ἀπροσίθετος ὅν, οὐδὲ ἀνόμητος, οὐδὲ τὸ εκ τῶν συνθημάτων ἐνδύσιμον ἀνεμένων, ταῖς τοιαύταις ϕρωναῖς· ἀλλὰ δηλῶν τὴν οἰκείαν γνῶμην ἡνωμένως καὶ ἀδιαστάτως τον Πατρὸς ἔχομένην.

(15) Loc. cit. Άρα οὖν καὶ τὴν λεγομένην ἐντολὴν μὴ λόγον προστατικὸν διὰ τῶν φρόνητικῶν δργάνων ἐξαγγελλώμενον ἐκδεχόμεθα, περὶ τῶν ποιητέων τῷ Υἱῷ, ὃς ὑπερόψιος νομοθετούντα. ἀλλὰ θεοπρεπῶς νοῶμεν θελήματος διαδοσιν οἰον τινος μορφῆς ἐμφασιν ἐν κατόπτρῳ, ἐπὶ Πατρὸς εἰς Υἱὸν ἀχρόνως διέκνουμένην.

etiam eura Sancti Doctoris vitandi quidquid anthropomorphismum redolere possit: «ne sermonem per vocalia organa intelligamus... sed juxta sensum Deo dignum...». Proinde hie textus, qui communiter citatur mutilus a patronis theoriæ præcepti non rigorosi, non favet directe huic sententiæ, sed solum indirecte, quatenus demonstrat Basilius docuisse verbum «mandatum» non semper debere accipi in Scriptura ut strictum præceptum significans.

In eodem capite, immediate post explicacionem identitatis essentiae Patris cum essentia Filii, componit hanc explicacionem cum verbis Sancti Pauli circa obedientiam Christi in morte obeunda, hoc modo (16) :

Quid igitur sibi vult illud, Factus obediens? item illud: Pro nobis omnibus tradidit eum? Significatur videlicet Filium a Patre hoc habuisse, ut pro sua bonitate, operaretur pro hominibus.

Nec textus græcus, nec versio latina, claram ostendunt mentem Sancti Basilii; clarior evaderet si pro illis verbis «pro sua bonitate», admitteremus lectionem «secundum filiationem» ut invenitur in Manuseripto Regii Secundi. Sed ex textu et contextu, quacumque lectione admissa, solum argumentum indirectum deduci potest, in quantum scilicet vox «obedientia» sumitur a Basilio nonnumquam in latiore sensu.

Nee quid aliud authenticum circa nostrum problema invenimus in Sancti Basilii operibus; in longa oratione contra Sabellianos, Arium et Anomoeos, ubi sperari aliquid posse, nee verbum ullum dicit ad nostra pertinens (17). A. P. Raye, *De la Taille et aliis citantur quædam verba ex Libro IX contra Eunomium*; sed hodie non admittitur authenticitas ejusmodi libri (18).

2 — *Sanctus Gregorius Nazianzenus*. In eodem capite cum Sancto Basilio, liceat nobis considerare doctrinam illius qui

(16) *Ibid.* 106.

(17) PG, XXXI, 599-618.

(18) Jam Bellarminus cogitaverat hos libros non esse a Sancto Basilio scriptos; Erasmus dicebat eos indignos esse tam magni auctoris; tamen Migne admisit eos in *Patrologia* ut authenticos. Cayre (*Patr.* I, 403), Altaner (*Patr.* p. 181), Steidle (*Patr.* p. 113) et omnes critici moderni rejiciunt eorum authenticitatem. G. Bardy tribuit eos Didymo Cæco (*Didyme l'Aveugle*, p. 23). Non mirum si auctores antioquiores ut Raye admittunt hos libros, sed certe mirum quod P. de la Taille eos admittat ut S. Basillii (*Myst. Fidei*, p. 96).

etiam si maximus eius amicus in vita fuit, laudesque mirabiliter in eius morte protulit, tamen adeo dissimilis in naturali animæ dispositione et in charactere ei fuit.

Inter illas quinque magnificas orationes, ab ipso Gregorio appellatas «Theologicas», habitasque Constantinopoli contra Arianos, anno 380, tertia illarum refutat vana argumenta adversarium contra Filii consubstantialitatem; postquam alias objectiones ex generatione Verbi desumptas solvit, hoc modo, suo pulchro et harmonioso stilo, ceteras Arianorum objections enumerat (19) :

Tu mihi contra, illas ingrati animi tui voces enumeras, has videlicet: Deus meus et Deus vester, major, creavit, fecit, sanctificavit, servum etiam, si ita lubet, et obedientiam adjunge; atque haec etiam, dedit, didicit, mandatum est, missus est; Illud etiam, quod a se ipso quidquam facere non posset aut loqui, aut judicare, aut donare, aut velle... Adde ignorantiam, subjectionem.

Ut ex his apparet, inter objectiones Arianorum enumerat Gregorius mandatum, subjectionem, obedientiam, servitutem, quarum solutionem a Gregorio datam nobis præstat cognoscere. In hac oratione ille respondet in genere, et quidem dupli modo: indirecte: tu taces que favent divinitati vel eam absolute probant, ut resurrectionem, ascensionem. Directe, autem, hoc modo (20) :

Ut autem rem summatim contraham, hoc tibi faciendum est, ut sublimiores voces divinitati... humiliores vero tribuas conposito, et tua causa inanito atque incarnato.

His simplicibus verbis videtur Gregorius omnia concedere in proprio sensu verborum, et proinde obedientiam, subjectionem et mandatum, dummodo ea referantur ad Christum inanitum, incarnatum et humiliatum.

Sequentem orationem expendit Gregorius in speciali consideratione et refutatione earumdem objectionum ex Sacris Litteris desumptarum. In capite sexto his verbis obedientiam Christi declarat (21) :

Ejusdem speculationis illud etiam est, quod ex his quæ passus est, obedientiam didicit... Ut Verbum, nec obediens erat nec inobediens...

(19) *Oratio Theologica III; PG, XXXVI, 98.*

(20) *Loc. cit.*

(21) *Oratio XXX, Theologica IV, c. VI; PG, XXXVI, 110.*

Ut autem servi forma, ad conservos, immo ad servos sese demittit, atque alienam formam suscipit, totum me, simul cum iis quæ mea sunt, in se ipso ferens, ut, quod deterius est, in seipso absumat... Quocirca re ipsa obedientiam honore afficit, eamque perpetiendis doloribus experitur.

Animadvertisendum est quod obedientia quam Christus didicit «ex his quæ passus est», non distinctam naturam habet quam nostra humana obedientia: illa obedientia Christi hominis, honore afficit conservorum suorum obedientiam. Eamdem ideam expresserat antea ipse Gregorius non semel. Et si in capite quinto istius Orationis negat strictam subjectionem Christi, eam negat quam affirmabant Ariani de Christo Deo: «Nec enim quidquam aliud est, mea quidem sententia, Christi subjectio, quam paternæ voluntatis expletio. Subjicit autem, et Filius Patri et viceversa Filio Pater» (23).

Proinde, in his duabus Orationibus, in quibus Gregorius directe et expresse agit de obedientia et mandato, nulla in parte negat contra Arianos verum præceptum impositum Christo ut homini, sed contra, in prima Oratione modo generali admittit verum præceptum et veram obedientiam, et in altera explicat naturam talis obedientiæ in Passione eo modo ut non nisi de vero præcepto intelligi possit.

Nunc autem, eos textus Nazianzeni perpendamus qui contra hanc conclusionem nostram possunt afferri. P. Raye appellat modo generali ad Orationem XXXVI, quin ulla verba in particulari citet; jam vero, in hac «Oratione de Se Ipso» nihil prorsus Gregorius diecit ad hoc problema pertinens (24).

In Oratione XL «In Sanctum Baptismum», urget Nazianzenus opportunam et promptam receptionem hujus sacramenti; contra difficultatem auditoris «Christus trigesimo anno baptizatur, idque eum Deus esset; tu vero me baptismum urgere jubes?» hoc modo respondet (25):

Cum «Deus» dixisti, quæstio abs te soluta est... Nec vero ei quidquam periculi metuendum erat, baptismum proroganti; quippe qui passionis quoque suæ arbiter esset, quemadmodum nativitatis.

(22) Loc. cit.

(23) Ibid. 106.

(24) Raye. op. cit. p. 706.

(25) Oratio XL, In Sanctum Baptisma, c. XXIX; PG, XXXVI, 399: Θεὸν εἰπόν, λέλυχας τὸ ζητούμενον... Οὐδὲ κίνδυνος ἡν αὐτῷ τὸ βάπτισμα παρατείνοντι: αὐτὸς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ παθεῖν ἡν ἔκαντῷ ταμίᾳ, δισπερ καὶ χῆς γεννήσεως.

Illa verba «Christus arbiter erat suæ passionis» non possunt recte objici contra anteriorem nostram conclusionem, nam ea referuntur ad Christum ut Deum, ut patet ex illo «Cum Deus dixisti», et ex comparatione cum nativitate.

Demum citantur contra strictum præceptum verba quædam Orationis XLV «In Sanctum Pascha», quæ difficultatem gignunt non parvam (26) :

Quod si redemptionis pretium non alii ulli, quam ei qui captivos tenet, persolvitur, quæro cui tandem oblatum est et quam ob causam? Si pravo illi (diabolo), o gravem contumeliam... Si autem Patri, primum quomodo id factum est?... quæ ratio afferri potest, ut unigeniti sanguine Pater oblectetur?... Perspicuum quidem est, Patrem accepisse, non tamen quod petierit, aut eo opus habuerit, verum certa consilii ratione et dispensatione.

His verbis Gregorius refutat duos errores sui temporis circa Redemptionem: Primum, illum celebrem ab Irenæo, Origene, et Gregorio Nisseno defensum saltem ut partiale explicationem Redemptionis, asserentem Sanguinem Christi pretium fuisse solutum diabolo; secundum, dicentem Patrem petisse Sanguinem Filii «ut delectaretur sanguine effuso» (27). In hoc sensu possumus intelligere ea verba Gregorii: «Patrem accepisse non tamen quod petierit»; non negat mandatum quod prius concederat, sed negat Patrem petiisse hoc modo Sanguinem Filii «ut oblectaretur» hoc sanguine. Sic proinde ex contextu historico et verbali, videtur Gregorius libertatem et spontaneitatem Christi in hoc textu tueri, intentionem autem delectationis ex parte Patris negare, sed non sese contradicere, fecisset si mandatum prius acceptum his verbis negasset.

Sic tandem possumus investigationem hujus capituli circa sententiam Basili et Nazianzeni summatim colligere: 1) Ex paucis quæ Basilius nobis reliquit circa nostram quæstionem, non constat plane eum negasse strictum præceptum aut illud

(26) Oratio XLV, In Sanctum Pascha, c. XXII; PG; XXXVI, 654:

Εἰ δὲ τὸ λόγον οὐκ ἄλλον τινὸς, ἢ τοῦ κατέχοντος γίνεται, ζητῶ τίνι τούτῳ εἰσηγέθη, καὶ διῆντινα τὴν αἵτιαν; Εἰ μὲν τῷ πονηρῷ, φεύ τῆς ὑβρεως... Εἰ δὲ τῷ Πατρὶ, πρῶτον μὲν πῶς;... Τίς δὲ λόγος Μονογενοῦς αὕτη τέρπειν Πατέρα?... Ἡ δῆλον, ὅτι λαμβάνει μὲν δὲ Πατήρ, οὐκ αἴτιος, οὐδὲ δειθσίς ἄλλὰ διὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν...

(27) De his et aliis theoriis circa Redemptionem vide J. Riviere, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*.

affirmasse, si de Christo homine agitur. 2) Valde probabile, et fortasse moraliter certum dici possit, est Sanctum Gregorium, magis expresse rem nostram tractantem, affirmasse verum et rigorosum præceptum, veramque et ut nostram humanam obedientiam in Christi Passione.

CAPUT TERTIUM

SANCTUS CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS

1 — Christologia Cyrilli. In abundantissima doctrina christologica Sancti Cyrilli, multa reperiuntur ad libertatem et obedientiam Christi pertinentia; sed tamen valde difficile arbitror ad certam conclusionem pervenire circa mentem magni Doctoris Alexandrini in nostra quæstione. Evidem non miror quod oppositarum opinionum defensores eum pro suis contrariis sententiis patronum habere intendant, nec quod alii, qui forte melius caluerunt mentem Cyrilli, videant veluti «antinomiam» aliquam in ejus doctrina (28).

Ut quid firmum et solidum haberi possit, illud deberet fluere ex completo et profundo studio totius Christologie Cyrilli; ego pro meis viribus conabor puncta quædam ad hanc Christologiam pertinentia et magis cum hac investigatione conjuncta elucidare.

Chrysostomus, de ejus doctrina in primo capite egimus, minus profundus theologus quam excelsus orator ostenditur, et magis ut testis fidei traditionis quam ut inquisitor et investigator profunditatis dogmatis excelluit. Cyrus vero, «fidei catholice gloriosissimus defensor» a Sancto Prospero ab Aquitania appellatus, et «Signaculum Patrum» a Sancto Anastasio (29), magno et aento ingenio prædictus, profundissimas quæstiones Trinitatis et Incarnationis apte aggressus est. Præterea Cyrus debuit non solum contra arianas et omnes priores sectas contendere, sed etiam contra novam nestorianam hæresim orthodoxam fidem defendere. Ex hac pugna dogma catholicum, ex se invariabile sed ditissimum et multiplex, novos adspectus ostendit.

(28) De la Taille, *Mysterium Fidei*, Eluc, VIII, 97.

(29) Cf. a Fessler-Jungman, *Patrologia*, t. II, Pars altera, p. 81.

Ex his duobus, ex potentia videlicet intellectuali Cyrilli et ex progressu dogmatis ob pugnas contra novas hæreses, oritur, opinor, disserimen inter Christologiam Chrysostomi et Cyrilli: disserimen quidem non in ipso dogmate, sed in ejus explicatione.

Nunc autem, applicationem et adaptationem istiusmodi ad nostram tractationem videamus. Cum Chrysostomus, commentando Saeram Scripturam et præsertim Quartum Evangelium, inventit verba quæ possint indicare inferioritatem vel subjectionem Christi, sæpius solutionem querit contra Anomœos ea verba tribuendo benignitati Domini, qui suum sermonem attemperavit auditorum ignorantiae vel malitiæ. Cyrius autem, disputando non solum contra Arianos sed etiam contra Nestorianos, exaltat quidem divinitatem et consubstantialitatem Christi, sed in humilibus consecatriis assumptio-nis humanæ naturæ fortiter insistit. Et inter ea consecaria, subjectionem et obedientiam Christi ut præcipua Cyrius considerat. In sua doctrina verba Pauli «Formam servi accipiens» sunt vera clavis solutionem pro multis difficultatibus, et ad ea sæpe recurrit.

In explicatione capituli 53 Prophetæ Isaiæ, videtur Cyrius indicare Passionem Christi fuisse sub stricto præcepto Patris sine ulla attemperatione. Cum loquitur de subjectione et obedientia Christi ut servi Yahweh nullam glossam apponit ad mitigandum rigorem verborum (30):

Subiit crucem, ignominia contempta, Dominus noster Jesus Christus, et factus est obediens Patri usque ad mortem, et judæorum impietatem sustinuit... cum nihil ad hoc legalis littera vel legalis cultus conduceret... Atqui universorum Dominus, id est, Deus et Pater, propter peccata nostra tradidit eum ut a poena absolveret, credentesque conservaret.

Pater igitur tradidit Christum, et ratio est quia Christus formam servi accepit: «Quomodo servi forma recte ei tribueretur, nisi de ipso quiddam etiam servo conveniens scriptum esse?» (31). Depressionem et humiliationem Christi ob Incarnationem, et simul æqualitatem ejus cum Patre considerat Cyrius cardines esse totius Christologiae. Hoc resumitur in his verbis: «Quando enim servilem formam assumpsit, con-

(30) In Isaiam. Lib. V, T, I, vv. 4-6; PG, LXX, 1174.

(31) In Joan. Ev. Lib. II, c. I, n. 124; PG, LXXIII, 207.

veniens quoque servo ministerium explet, nequaquam desinens esse Deus, ac Dominus atque adorandus» (32).

Multum disputatione Scholastici utrum Christus vocari posset «servus» et **utrum** dici posset eum habuisse «servitatem». Chrysostomus has voce caute evitat, sed Cyrillus aperte docet Christum funetum fuisse ministerio servi: «Si enim homo nuncupatus plane non est, si non factus est in forma Dei servi, est cur jure turbemus, cum dicit aliquid servo conveniens» (33). Et alia in parte dicit respectu servitatis legi: «Tamquam legi subditus cum legi subditis... Ceterum nemo reprehendat eum qui legislator quidem est natura sua, sed propter similitudinem quam habet nobiscum legem observat» (34).

Hæc subjectio talis naturæ est, juxta Cyrillum, ut aliquando non sinat Christum plenam libertatem et plenam auctoritatem in verbis adhibere: «Nam qui servi formam assumpsit, et homo factus est, propter carnis subjectionem, non semper ea quæ Deo convenit libertate atque auctoritate in loquendo utebatur» (35); et contra Arianos qui vocem «subjectiōnem» usurpabant ut inferioritatem significantem, non vocem sed malam ejus interpretationem reprehendit: «Nam si in simplicitate hæc a vobis dicta essent, merito tacuissem, nec vocis illius disquisitione, aggressus essem».

2 — Obedientia Christi in morte. Jam vero, hanc subjectionem, hanc obedientiam illius qui formam servi accepit et simul ejus consectaria, Cyrillus applicat ad passionem Christi. Pater tradidit eum ad mortem, et Christus obediuit in re quam ipse nolbat secundum humanam naturam (37):

Quidnam autem est, quæso, in Christo voluntarium et non voluntarium? Ludibria per Judæos illata, cōnvicia, injuriæ, calumniæ, flagella,

(32) Ibid. c. V; PG, LXXIII, 294.

(33) Ibid. c. IV; Ibid. 303.

(34) In Joan. Ev. Lib. I, c. IV; PG, LXXIII, 59.

(35) In Joan. Ev. Lib. II, c. VI; PG, LXXIII, 358.

(36) In Joan. Ev. Lib. IV, c. I; PG, LXXIII, 534.

(37) Ibid. PG, LXXIII, 530: Τί δὲ ἦν ἄρα τὸ αὐτεθέλιτόν τε καὶ θελητὸν τῷ Χριστῷ; Ή παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπιμία, λοιδορία, καὶ ὕβρεις, καὶ αἰχίαι, καὶ μάστιγες, καὶ ἐμπτύσματα καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἔτι συκοφαντίαι, καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἐφ' ἀπασιν ὁ τῆς σωρός θάνατος. Ταῦτα μὲν γὰρ διῆμας ἐκών νκεμένεν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλ᾽ εἴπερ ἐνεδέχετο μὴ παθόντα κατορθοῦν τὸ ἐφ' ἥμερην σπυδαζόμενον, οὐκ ἀν ἡθελήσει παθεῖν.

verbera, sputa, et omnium postremum, mors corporis. Hæc enim Christi natura propter nos volens sustinuit; sed si fieri potuisset ut citra passionem ullum opus nostræ salutis impleret, pati noluisset.

Proinde voluntas humana Christi subjiciebatur voluntati Patris, repugnante natura humana. Differenter quidem loquitur Cyrillus ab aliis Patribus qui perfectam conformitatem sine ulla repugnantia prædicant, et sub liberæ electioni voluntatis humanae Christi ponunt tormenta et supplicia, etiam si Christo homini propositæ fuissent aliæ viæ redemptionis. Pro Cyrillo: «Si fieri potuisset ut citra passionem ullam opus nostræ salutis impleret, pati certe noluisset. Sed voluntariam fecit quod præter voluntatem est.

Secundum mentem Cyrilli, Christus debuit sese violentiā aliquomodo inferre in passione, hæc idea exprimitur saepè, et ea magis evolvitur in Commentario in cap. decimum tertium Sancti Lucæ, ubi longe de Oratione in Horto agitur; sic verbi causa: «Porro et non moriendi inerat ei voluntas, quia naturaliter caro mortem recusat» (38). Neque dubitat Cyrillus quandam necessitatem passionis Christi affirmare, propter sævitiam Judæorum (39):

Ergo quod attinet quidem ad passionis ignominiam, pati noluisset. Quia vero fieri non poterat ut non pateretur, propter iudeorum adversus eum sævitiam atque contumaciam, sustinuit crucem, confusione contempta.

Cum his igitur quæ hueusque coram oculis posuimus, jam expectari potest Cyrillum tenere Christum accepisse strictum et rigorosum mandati moriendi; hæc euim doctrina de rigoro præcepto apparet velut corollarium eorum quæ Cyrillus docet circa subjectionem, obedientiam et cetera humilia quæ ob assumptionem formæ servi Christo venerunt. Immo, hoc videtur Cyrillus expresse asserere in commentario illorum Christi verborum: «Quia ego ex meipso non sum locutus, sed qui misit me Pater, ipse mandatum dedit quid dicam et quid loquar». En quomodo objic和平 et quomodo ei respondeat Cyrillus (40):

Atenim, inquieris, consubstantialitates quidem manent, sed dignitate minores qui alienis ministrant imperiis. Ego idem quoque tibi respondeo de Unigenito. Si enim scriptum non esset de eo: «Qui cum in forma Dei

(38) In Luc. Ev. c. XXII; PG, LXII, 923.

(39) Ibid. PG, Ibid. 926.

(40) In Joan. Lib. IX; PG, LXXIV, 110.

esset...» nonnihil fortassis hæc tua ratio momenti habere videretur; verum cum subjectionis et demissionis modus universis pateat, cur temere accusas eum qui propter nos etiam hoc pati sustinuit?

Proinde Cyrillus concedit Christum accepisse mandatum a Patre, et tale mandatum quod eum ostendat minorem Patre, et proinde verum et strictum præceptum, non solum «concordiam» quam Chrysostomus dicebat. Et mandatum quatenus homo, quia solum quatenus homo poterat accipere tale mandatum.

3 — Christus se tradidit morti. Sed estne hæc completa mens Saneti Doctoris? Si ita esset non appareret cur difficultem vocaverimus hanc inquisitionem, nec ubi esset «antinomia» vel paradoxa ejus doctrinæ. Hucusque primum adspectum solutionis consideravimus, restat ut alterum contemplemur.

In ipso commentario Servi Yahweh, de quo supra egimus, simul cum subjectione et obedientia Christi, asserit Cyrillus ejus libertatem et spontaneitatem in cruce Sacrificio. Revera Cyrillus conjungit illa duo quæ conjungenda sunt, quin tamen explicet modum conjunctionis, nam ibi nodus mysterii reperitur: obedientiam Christi et ejus libertatem in morte. Pater tradidit Filium, sed ipse Filius se tradidit voluntarie. «Se ipsum in odorem bouæ fragantiæ pro nobis obtulit» (41), ait Cyrillus; in alia parte dicit: «Pro peccatis populi mei, volens mortis sententiam subiit» (42).

Idem docet Cyrillus eum Passionem Domini explicat juxta Zachariam Prophetam: Passio fuit plene voluntaria, etiamsi natura humana Christi ab ea abhorreret: «Posuit igitur animam suam libens pro nobis» (43). In Commentario in Jo. X: 15; firmiter insistit in hac libertate oblationis Christi (44):

Et quidem notandum est mortem pro nobis non invitum sustinuisse Christum, immo ultiro ei volens se offerte conspicitur, quamvis, si nollet pati, nullo negotio passionem posset evitare.

(41) In Isaiam, Lib. V, t. 1, n. 744.

(42) Ibid. n. 748; PG, Ibid. 1182.

(43) Ibid. Lib. I, Orat. V, n. 143; PG; LXX, 235.

(44) In Joan. Lib. IV, c. X, v. 14; PG, LXXIII, 1050: Σημειωτεύον γε μὴν δὲ τὸν ὑπέρ ἡμῶν καὶ διῆμας θάνατον σὺν ἀκούσιον ὑπέμεινεν δὲ Χριστὸς, ἐθεοντής δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο βαδίζον δρᾶται, καίτοι δρᾶται τὸ πάσχειν διαδρᾶναι δυνάμεος, εἰ μὴ βούλοιτο παθεῖν.

Sed maxime operæ pretium est considerare quod dicit *Cyrillus* in commentario verborum Christi ad Pilatum: «Non haberes potestatem adversus me ullam, nisi tibi datum esset desuper» (45). En verba *Cyrilli* (46):

Desuper vero datam esse Pilato potestatem ait, non quasi Deus ac Pater crucis passionem invito Filio imposuerit, sed quod ipse Unigenitus se ipsum suppliciis offerat pro nobis, et Pater mysteriorum illud impleri sinat.

In hoc loco, ut bene notat *P. De la Taille*, agitur de Christo ut homine, nam *Cyrillus* opponit voluntatem Christi et permissionem Patris (47). Si igitur non imponitur a Patre passio, sed ille consentit quod vult Filius ut homo, et Filius vellet si possibile esset vitare passionem, unde procedit necessitas passionis? Aliquando videtur *Cyrillus* hanc necessitatem reponere in mala voluntate Judæorum; sic prosequitur textum anteriorem: «Sed quia Judæi omnino et inevitabiliter ausuri erant quod in eum patrarunt, passionem suscepit, et voluntarium fecit quod præter voluntatem erat». Tamen *Cyrillus* docet eum tota Traditione libertatem et potestatem Christi respectu violentiam Judæorum. Quodecumque sit respondendum ad hanc difficultatem, patet *Cyrillum* velle in tuto reponere libertatem humanam Christi in morte obeunda.

Sed jam perveniamus ad commentarium celebris textus *Jo. X:18*, quod ad hunc ultimum locum reservabimus ut maximi momenti ad completam doctrinam *Cyrilli* cognoscendam. Ut antea monuimus, hic est textus præcipuus ad cognoscendum Christum accepisse mandatum moriendi. Quid igitur de hoc textu cogitavit *Cyrillus*? Mea conclusi, post attentum analysim, est *Cyrillum* interpretari verbum «mandatum», in hoc versu Sancti Joannis, non ut rigorosum præceptum sed ut concordiam Filii eum Patre, sed simul, *Cyrillum* referre

(45) *Jo. 19:11.*

(46) In *Joan. Lib. XII, c. XIX; PG, LXXIV, 642*: "Ανισθεν δὲ δεδόσθαι τὴν ἔξουσίαν τῷ Πιλάτῳ φησίν, οὐχ ὡς ἀβούλητον ἐπιφέροντος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τῷ σταυρῷ κάθος, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτοῦ μὲν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ἐπιδόντος ἑαυτὸν τῷ παθεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἀφέντος δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῷ πληροῦσθαι μωσῆριον.

(47) *De la Taille*, op. cit., *Eluc. VIII*, p. 95.

hoc verbum ad Christum ut Deum, non ut hominem. Præcipua videamus unde hæc condi possunt (48) :

Quando dicit se mandatum accepisse, in hoc consentientem convenientemque voluntate ostendit Patrem, et tamquam ab una mente et sensu ad id se venire fatetur... ergo mandatum indicat concordiam cum Patre, etsi humiliiter loquatur... communionem consilii cum Deo et Patre tamquam mandatum se accepisse dicens.

Ex his patet Cyrillum intellexisse mandatum, in hoc loco Joannis, in amplissimo sensu ut concordiam et communionem consilii; sed hoc mandatum prout hic stabilitur, videtur ad Christum ut Deum referri, et non exclusive ad mortem sed ad totum opus Redemptionis, quod ctiam Incarnationem comprehendit (49) :

Ergo neque Patre Filius inferior, etsi factus est homo... Verum tamen mandati nomen, cum extra essentiam sit, nullo modo essentia præjudicat... Novit igitur Filius, tamquam consilium et sapientia Patris, quod ab eo convenienter judicatum est.

Hoc mandatum acceptum a Filio est ipse «sermo» quem Joannis dicit Filium accepisse; sed advertit Cyrillus hoc verbum mandatum nequire exprimere illam ineffabilem et supremam concordiam Patris et Filii circa missionem Verbi ad hominem salvandum, et solum ob «verborum infirmitatem» usum eo Christum fuisse (50) :

Si tamquam mandatum accipit, ne mireris; humanis enim sermonibus quæ supra sermonem sunt significantur... quare incusabimus verborum infirmitatem, quæ qualitatem accuratamque interpretationem earum dignitate assequi non valent.

(48) In Joan. Lib. VII, c. X, v. 8; PG, LXXIV, 11 et 14: Δι' ὧν φησιν. "Ἐλαβον ἐντολὴν, συμφωνοῦντα πρὸς τοῦτο καὶ συνθέλοντα δείκνυσι καὶ τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ μιᾶς γνώμης εἰς τοῦτο παρελθεῖν δύολογες... Ἡ οὖν ἐντολὴ δῆλοι τὴν διμόνουν τὴν προς τὸν Πατέρα, εἰ καὶ ταπεινῶς λαλεῖ... τὴν προς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα κοινοθουλίαν, ὡς ἐντολὴν δεδέχθαι λέγον.

(49) In Joan. Lib. VII, c. X, v. 18; PG, LXXIV, 11 et 14: Οὐκ οὖν οὔτε τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱος ἔλάττων, εἰ καὶ γέγονεν ἀνθρωπος... "Ομως το τῆς ἐντολῆς ὄνομα ἔξωθεν τῆς οὐσίας ὑπάρχον, οὐκ ἀν γένοιτο τῆς οὐσίας ἔγκλημα... Οἴδε τοίνυν ὁ Υἱὸς ὡς βουλὴ καὶ σοφία τοῦ Πατρὸς, το ἀραιότατος κεκριμένον παρ' αὐτοῦ.

(50) Loc. cit.: Εἰ δὲ ὡς ἐντολὴν δέχεται, μὴ θαυμάσῃς. ἀνθρωπίννοις γὰρ λόγοις τὰ ὑπέρ λόγον σημαίνεται... Αἰτιασώμεθα τοίνυν, τὴν τῶν ἀημάτων ἀσθένειαν οὐδὲ δυναμένων ἐφικέσθαι, καθ' ὃν ἔδει τρόπον, τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ποιότητος καὶ ἀκριβοῦς ἐξιηνείας.

4 — Conclusio. Ingenue curavi ante oculos lectoris objective ponere quod sufficiens mihi visum fuit ad integrum mentem Cyrilli ostendendam. Ut ex dupli serie textuum apparet, non facile negotium est eligere unam vel alteram sententiam in interpretatione Cyrilli; notare igitur possumus, quam inaccurate procedunt aliqui auctores qui, uno vel duobus textibus Cyrilli citatis, aestimant eum posse inter patronos unius vel alterius sententiae enumerare. Cum his quos adduxi, jam potest lector suam efformare et eligere sententiam; attamen audebo alias considerationes facere et deinde meam finalem opinionem dicere.

Ex secunda serie textuum, solummodo ultimus videtur negare mandatum strictum; ceteri omnes non nisi libertatem et spontaneitatem mortis Christi asserunt.

In postremo hoc textu Cyrillus negat mandatum strictum impositum Christo ut Deo, et ad opus Redemptionis et Incarnationis; certe contra Arianos haec loquitur Cyrillus; proinde ex hoc textu non infertur Cyrrillum negasse mandatum rigorosum impositum Christo ut homini.

Immo, Cyrillus videtur affirmare mandatum rigorosum et obedientiam strictam, ut jam notavimus, Haec doctrina de stricta obedientia magis consona est cum Christologia Sancti Doctoris.

Si queritur cur ipse non doceat in Jo. X:18 strictum mandatum, fortasse dici potest eum sequi alios Patres, Chrysostomum, Basilius et alios, qui hunc textum intellexerunt hoc sensu.

Unde haec sit hujus capituli conclusio: Videtur valde probabile Cyrrillum docere verum et strictum praeceptum, veram et strictam obedientiam, etiamsi verbum mandatum non semper eligat in hoc sensu.

CAPUT QUARTUM

THEODORETUS ET CECUMENIUS

1 — Theodoretus. Inter commentatores Saneti Pauli, secundum post Chrysostomum occupat locum Episcopus Cyrensis Theodoretus, Antiochiae natus jam saeculo quarto labente. Ex tranquillitate monasticae vitae quam in alta Apnea degebat, ad publicum ministerium inter nestorianas et eutychianas

lites invitus fuit adductus, nec omniō immunem ab hæresi nestoriana inter tot illius temporis fluctuationes se servabit. In postremis tamen suae vitæ annis ad orthodoxam fidem post humilem retractationem revertit, et pie in Domino dormivit anno quadrigentesimo quinquagesimo octavo.

Præter opera historica, plurima commentaria in Vetus Testamentum seripsit, et in eis sensui litterali magna cum perspicuitate inhaesit. Sed suū præstantissimum opus sunt commentaria, vel ut ipse ea appellat, Interpretationes quatuordecim Epistolarum Sancti Pauli, quæ maximam ei anætoritatem præsertim inter antiquos conciliaverunt; inter modernos, Cardinalis Newman magnus fuit admirator Theodoreti.

A quibusdam citatur Theodoretus ut patronus theoriæ præcepti non rigorosi mortis Christi. Qualis sit vera ejus mens videre conabimur Psalmum decimum quintum applicat Theodoretus ad Personam Christi Salvatoris secundum humanam naturam sequentibus verbis (51):

Dixi Domino: Dominus es tu. De persona Salvatoris dictus est hic psalmus, sed secundum humanam ejus naturam; sicut et in Sacris Evangelii invenimus. Et tale est illud: «Pater, si fieri potest, transeat a me calix iste: verumtamen non ut ego volo, sed ut tu». Et «Vado ad Patrem meum et Patrem vestrum, Deum meum et Deum vestrum»... Dicit autem sic Apostolus in Epistola ad Hebreos: «Qui in diebus carnis suæ preces supplicationesque ad eum qui posset illum salvum facere a morte, cum clamore valido et lacrimis offerens, exauditus est pro sua reverentia. Et quidem cum esset Filius Dei, didicit ex eis quæ passus est obedientiam, et consummatus factus est omnibus obtemperantibus illi causa salutis æternæ». Consummatus est autem, non Deus Verbum qui ante sæcula perfectus erat, sed forma servi.

Revera Theodoretus has omnes humiliationes in pleno et obvio sensu intellectas admittit de Christo ut homine, et inter eas quæ nequeunt dici de Christo ut Deo computat obedientiam. Obedientia hic igitur intelligitur plena et humana. En quomodo eumdem textum Sancti Pauli explicet in Interpretatione Epistolæ ad Hebreos, intelligendo obedientiam in obvio et litterali sensu (52):

Et quidem cum esset Filius, didicit ex iis quæ passus est obedientiam... Quis nisi valde emotæ mentis dixerit hæc dicta esse de divina natura?... Didicit ex iis quæ passus est obedientiam, posuit Apostolus

(51) In Psalm. XV; PG, LXXX, 958.

(52) Interp. Ep. ad Heb. V, 7-10; PG, LXXXII, 711.

hyperbolice. Obedientiam enim non post passionem, sed ante passionem exhibuit.

Agitur de obedientia quae nequit adscribi divinæ naturæ ut nequeunt adscribi preces supplicationesque; obedientia quidem exhibita ante passionem, id est, obedientia præcepto moriendi. Adverbum «hyperbolice» quo Theodoretus utitur in hoc textu, adhibetur ab ipso secundum etymon vocis, nihilque invalidans proinde rigorem sensus vocis obedientiæ de quo agitur.

Eodem modo intelligit Theodoretus alios messianicos Psalmos qui ad Passionem Christi referuntur, ut vigesimum primum et trigesimum nonum, etiamsi non adeo clare in illis loquatur. Sed jam ad duos textus qui ab auctoribus citantur pervenimus. Sie commentatur verba Apostoli ad Philippienses (53) :

Humiliavit semetipsum, factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. Non enim tamquam servus dominicum jussum implevit: sed sponte sua salutem pro nobis suscepit, et obediuit ut filius non ut servus.

Si attente et sine ullo præjudicio hic textus examinatur, cum magis videtur contrariæ sententiæ favere. «Obediuit ut filius non servus», filialem sed veram obedientiam Theodoretus affirmat, dicitque Christum implevisse «dominicū jussū», quæ verba in originale græco non minorem vim habent. Unice proinde servilis et invita obedientia.

Secundus textus invenitur in Interpretatione undecimi capituli Epistolæ ad Hebraeos (54) :

Qui proposito sibi gaudio sustinuit crucem, ignominia contempta, atque in dextera sedis Dei consedit. Potuisset, inquit, non pati, si hoc voluisset: sed passionem sustinuit, beneficio omnes afficiens.

Hæc verba sunt valde similia illis Sancti Chrysostomi in eundem locum, supra commentatis. Diserimen tamen adest in

(53) Interp. Ep. ad Philip. VIII, 8; PG, LXXXII, 570: Ἐταπείνωσεν ἐυαγ-
τὸν γενόμενος ὑπῆκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. Οὐ γάρ
ώς δοῦλος δεσποτικὸν πεπλήρωκε πρόσταγμα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκων τὴν ὑπερ ἡμῶν
ἀνεδέξετο σωτηρίαν, καὶ ὑπάκουοντεν ὡς νίδες, οὐχ ώς δοῦλος.

(54) Interp. Ep. ad Heb. XII, 2; PG, LXXXII, 770: Ὡς ἀντὶ τῆς προ-
κειμένης αυτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπέιμενε οτιαρόν, αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσους, ἐν
δεξιῇ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ πεκάθαμεν. Πιδύνατο, ιρησί, μὴ παθεῖν,
εἴπερ τοῦτο ἡθέλησεν ἀλλὰ τοῦ πάθους ἡγέρηστο, πάντας εὐεργετῶν.

generali contextu, nam dum Chrysostomus ubique rejicit verum praeceptum strictamque obedientiam, Theodoretus non eam negat sed potius admittit, ut vidimus antea. Hæc proinde verba possunt intellegi de supraem Christi potentia ut Dei, ne contradictorium quid ponatur in Theodoreto, maxime cum ipse determinet hie et nunc de qua Christi natura specificie loquatur.

Igitur, ut sit supraem conclusio, videtur Theodoretus nullum solidum fundamentum dare ut patronus theoriæ præcepti non rigorosi dicatur.

2 — *Œcumenius.* *Œcumenius*, valde incertus auctor de quo fertur episcopum fuisse et sedem Tricæ in Thessalia occupavisse, commentaria scripsit in Actus Apostolorum et in Epistolas. Ejus vita prorsus ignoratur, nec certo constat in quo sæculo vixerit. Hinc apparet, eum non magna auctoritate gaudere, sed siquidem ejus testimonia afferuntur ab aliquibus auctoriis, quid ipse dicat in nostro problemate leviter considerare debemus.

Duos textus invenimus in quibus *Œcumenius* modum obedientiae Christi explicat. Primus qui citari solet, sic se habet (55) :

Factus obediens: Tanquam Filius, non tamquam servus. Per hoc enim potissimum ostendit quod naturalis esset Filius, quia obediuit. Nam propterea dixit: Humiliavit semetipsum, ne quid servile cogites. Ob id, audi, ait: Obediens, ut ostendat honorem quem Patri tamquam suo principio deferebat. Usque ad mortem: Multæ sunt humiliationis excellentiae: hominem fieri, mori, idque per crucem.

Jam ver queritur, primo, agitne *Œcumenius* in his verbis de Christo ut homine vel ut Deo? Panis lineis antea, interpellat eos qui dicunt Christum incarnatum esse propter necessitatem: «Ubi sunt qui dicunt quod ex necessitate et Patris subjectione invitatus est incarnatus?» (56). *Œcumenius* conjugit obedientiam Christi in morte eum ejus humiliatione vel exinanitione in Incarnatione, et totum opus incarnationem-redemptionem dicit non invite factum fuisse; agit proinde de Christo ut Deo et sic intelliguntur illa postrema verba: «Multæ sunt humiliationis excellentiae: hominem fieri, mori, idque per crucem».

(55) Comm. In Ep. ad Philip. II, 5; PG. CXVIII, 1283.

(56) Lœ. cit.

Sed præterea, supposito et non concessso quod de Christo homine in hoc textu agatur, non possumus inde deducere *Œcumenum* affirmare vel negare verum et rigorosum præceptum strictamque obedientiam, utpote solum servilem obedientiam excludit.

Alter textus reperitur in Commentario in Epistolam ad Hebræos, et sic dicit (57):

«Qui pro gaudio sibi proposito». Ipsi, inquit, licuisset cum gaudio et gloria degere in hoc mundo; ait enim: «Potestatem habeo ponendi animam meam et recipiendi eam». Sed non voluit, imo voluntarie crucem sustinuit, «ignominia contempta».

Clare apparet *Œcumenum* sequi interpretationem Chrysostomi in hoc textu Sancti Pauli, et sic potest ejus testimonium aliquomodo inservire auctoribus qui theoriam præcepti non rigorosi propugnant. Attamen tales auctores obliviscuntur verba quæ immediate sequuntur, in quibus *Œcumenus* acceptat etiam aliam theoriam et proinde infirmatur non parum valor præcedentis testimonii (58):

Aut quod dicitur «Pro gaudio sibi proposito», ita accipe, sicut et Gregorius ait. Cui cum liberum, inquit, fuisse manere in propria gloria et divinitate, non solum exinanivit semetipsum usque ad formam servi, sed et crucem sustinuit ignominia contempta.

Electio proponitur inter «manere in propria gloria» ex una parte, et nasci morique in cruce, ex altera. Proinde ad Christum prout Deus est, verba Pauli applicat *Œcumenus* in hac secunda explicacione.

At non alia invenimus in hoc auctore quæ possint ejus mentem acclarare. Quæ adducuntur non sufficiunt ut ille inter defensores præcepti non rigorosi reponatur.

(57) *Comm. Ad Heb. XII, 2; PG, CXIX, 423*: "Ος αυτὶ τῆς προκειμένης". Εἶδην αὐτῷ, φησί, μετὰ δόξης καὶ χαρᾶς διασειν ἐν αὐτῷ κόσμῳ. "ἔξουσίαν γάρ", φησίν, "ἔχω θεῖναι τὴν ψυχήν μου καὶ λαβεῖν αὐτήν". ἀλλ' οὐκ ηβούλιμη, ἀλλ' ἔκουσίος ὑπέμεινε σταυρόν.

(58) *Comm. ad Heb. XII, 2; PG, CXIX, 426*: "Η τὸ, "Αυτὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς, οὕτως δέξαι, ὃς καὶ Γρηγόριος φησιν" Ο ἔξον, φησίν, μένειν ἐπὶ τῆς ιδίας δόξης τε καὶ θεάτητος, οὐ μόνον ἐωνόπεν ὅχοι τῆς δούλου μορφῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρόν ὑπέμεινεν.

SECTIO TERTIA — PATRES LATINI

CAPUT PRIMUM

SANCTI AMBROSIUS ET LEO MAGNUS

1 — Sanctus Ambrosius. Valde perspicue videntur primo visu illa verba Sancti Ambrosii quæ solent proponi a defensoribus præcepti non rigorosi, hoc præceptum a Christo excludere. Ut ordinate procedamus, quid ipse textus Sancti Ambrosii ab auctoribus citatus dicat videbimus, deinde proximum ejus contextum examinabimus, et demum remotum contextum per totam Sancti Ambrosii doctrinam circa hoc problema scrutabimus. Hæc sunt verba Sancti Doctoris (1) :

Considerate quid lectum sit hodie de Domino Jesu, «quia mortuus est pro nobis, ut sive vigilemus, sive dormiamus, simul cum illo vivamus». Cujus mors vita est, hujus divinitas vita non est, cum divinitas vita sit sempiterna?... An vero vita ejus in Patris est potestate? Sed ne corporis quidem sui vitam in alterius fuisse potestatem memoravit, sicut scriptum: «Ego pono animam meam et iterum sumam illam».

Videtur Ambrosius excludere potestatem a Patre circa mortem Christi et proinde omne præceptum moriendi. Sed tamen præ oculis habere debemus Sanctum his verbis voluisse refutare argumentum Arianorum deducens inferioritatem Filii ex verbis «Ego vivo propter Patrem» (2). In toto hoc capite et in toto hoc tractatu De Fide, Ambrosius probat æqualitatem Filii eum Patre. Hæc verba proinde ad divinitatem sunt applicanda, eorum sensus est Christum ut Deum habere penes suam potestatem vitam suam æternam vitamque temporalem, quin tamen Ambrosius neget ex eo mandatum moriendi de Christo ut homine ut neque negat originem a Patre prout Deus est. In hoc sensu videntur intelligenda esse verba quæ paulo inferius proponit Ambrosius (3) :

Sed sicut potestatis suæ esse significat ponere animam, et liberæ voluntatis: ita etiam quod secundum mandatum depositum Patris, suæ ac paternæ voluntatis significat unitatem.

(1) *De Fide*, IV, X; PL, XVI, 666.

(2) *Jo. 6:58.*

(3) *De Fide*, loc. cit.

Attamen ut quid revera sensuerit Ambrosius cognoscere valeamus, præstat non solum hunc textum in suo proximo contextu examinare, sed alios textus in quibus Sanctus suam mentem expresserit enucleare. In Libro de Paradiso, ad questionem «An decuerit a Deo præceptum de cibo dari?», respondet Ambrosius illum cibum significare voluntatem Dei, et proinde qui impleverint præceptum circa hunc cibum, voluntatem Dei facient, quod est optimum in hac vita; deinde sic procedit (4):

Est enim bonus panis, si facias voluntatem Dei. Vis scire quam bonus panis? Ipse Filius manducate hunc panem, de quo ait: «Meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem Dei».

Unde Christus manducavit hunc panem, ut ceteri homines manducare cum debemus, et Adam recusavit; scilicet, implevit præceptum, nam de præcepto ibi agitur.

In Enarratione in Psalmum XXXIX, illa verba «Ecce venio ut faciam voluntatem tuam», connectit Ambrosius eum illis «Non quod ego volo sed sicut tu vis», et eum aliis «Si non potest hoc transire, nisi illud bibam, fiat voluntas tua». Plenam reluctantiam humanæ voluntatis Christi et plenam subjectionem voluntati Patris affirmat Ambrosius, et unica ratio quam ad hoc explicandum præbet, quia temperet rigorem impositionis voluntatis Patris, est quia (5):

etsi caro Christi fortis, nec peccato obnoxia, tamen peccata suscepit: infirmitates suscepit, etsi nihil habuit quod doleret... Etsi de Virgine natus est et de Spiritu Sancto, tamen hominis est filius, quia homo Virgo.

In toto hoc contextu nihil rejicit Ambrosius a Christo quod sit proprium filio hominis nisi peccatum, implice admittens ergo præceptum in obedientia Christi adeo stricte inucleata.

Forte magis explicite et strenue hos eosdem sensus evolvit Enarratio in Psalmum LXI, ad verba: «Nonne Deo subjecta erit anima mea?»; quæ ibi dieuntur de Christi subjectione et obedientia minime videntur consonare cum theoria quæ vult removere a Christo strictum præceptum mortis. Obedientia Christi est, ait Ambrosius, vera et necessaria medicina contra inobedientiam Adæ; dignosque judicat reprehendere.

(4) Liber de Paradiso, c. IX; PL, XIV, 311.

(5) Enarr. in Ps. XXXIX, n. 18; PL, XIV, 1115.

sionis eos qui dicere audent Christum suscepisse carnem, sed non suscepisse affectus et passiones carnis assumptæ —propassiones dieent Scholastici— ut sunt obedientia et subjectio. Aliqua transcribamus (6) :

Unde valde errare eos judicat (Psalmista) qui carnem hominis a Christo aiunt esse susceptam, affectumque negant... Itaque quasi homo infirmitates suscepit, quasi homo doluit... Suscepit itaque compassionem nostram, suscepit et subjectionem... Suscepit ipse obedientiam, ut nobis eam transfunderet... nam quia per inobedientiam culpa irrepserat, dum mandata divina temerantur, obedientiam utique præ ceteris debuit reformatre, ut seminarium erroris excluderet... Sicut Apostolus dicit, non jugem et perpetuum, sed temporalem subjectionem volens declarare... Quasi homo ergo ex his quæ passus est didicit obedientiam; ut consummaretur in carne, et per obedientiam transfussam in nos successionem causa fieret nobis salutis æternæ, quibus ante per inobedientiæ hæreditatem primus ille Adam causa factus est mortis.

Hæc antithesis inter Adam inobedientem præcepto (rigoroso sane et positivo), indeque mortem nostram causantem, et Christum obedientem «usque ad mortem», nostramque itaque salutem generantem, sæpe in Ambrosio recurrit, suamque mentem in nostra inquisitione valde clare insinuat.

Seriem citationum claudamus cum textu aliquo ex ipso tractatu «De Fide» desumpto, ex quo tractatu sunt desumpta illa verba quæ pro theoria præcepti non rigorosi citantur, ut antea notavimus. En textum (7) :

aliud est igitur secundum divinam substantiam, aliud secundum susceptionem carnis Filium nominari: nam secundum generationem divinam Deo Patri æqualis est Filius, et secundum susceptionem corporis Deo Patri servus est... Disce igitur quid sit: «Formam servi accepit», id est plenitudinem perfectionis humanæ, plenitudinem obedientiæ... Quis nimis humiliatus est, nisi Christus, qui venit ut omnes liberaret per obedientiam? «Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius hominis peccatores constituti sunt multi, ita per unius obedientiam justi constituuntur multi». Quis calicem salutarem accepit, Christus princeps sacerdotum, an David, qui neque sacerdotium habuit, neque passionem subiit?

Hæc clara distinctio a Saneto Ambrosio facta inter ea quæ de Christo ut Deo et de Christo ut homine dicenda sunt respectu obedientiæ et subjectionis, hæc realistica, ut ita dicam, explicatio servitutis Christi hominis per «plenitudinem obedientiæ» et quidem in gustandum calicem passionis, hæc

(6) Enarr. in Ps. LXI; PL, XV, 1224. Cf. Enarr. in Ps. XXVIII et CVIII.

(7) De Fide, VIII; PL, XVI, 697.

omnia simul cum illis quæ supra diximus, uos inducunt ad judicandum Sanctum Ambrosium nullo pacto negare strictum mandatum moriendi, nostramque explicationem textus adducti ab auctoribus contrarie sentientibus, solide fundatam esse in complexu doctrinæ magni Archiepiscopi Milanensis.

2 — *Sanctus Leo Magnus.* In decem et novem sermonibus quos Sanctus Leo Papa in Urbe dixit, sibi constat in exaltando magis potestatem et imperium Christi in toto docens Passionis, quam in ejus humilitatem et obedientiam penderando; nec mirum cum adjuneta temporum et fallacie hæretorum prorsus hunc modum prædicandi postularent.

Coram lectore proponemus illa Sancti Leonis verba quæ adducta sunt vel adduei possunt ut ille inter auctoritates latinas pro mandato non rigoroso computetur. A textu proposito a Patre Petavio incipiamus (8) :

Quidquid Domino illusionis et contumeliae, quidquid vexationis et poenæ intulit furor impiorum, non de necessitate toleratum, sed de voluntate susceptum est.

Ego ingenuè confiteor, me nihil in hoc textu invenire nisi libertatem Christi in morte obeunda assertam, et necessitatem expresse rejectam, quæ componi possunt et debent cum stricto præcepto, si illud admittatur.

Auctores moderni potius solent recurrere ad sequentem textum, qui relationem directam dicit inter Christum hominem et Patris voluntatem (9) :

At Jesus, consilii sui certus, et in opere paternæ dispositionis intrepidus, Vetus Testamentum consummabat et Pascha condebat.

Quod Christus sit «conclii sui certus» suam scientiam simul et libertatem respectu mortis denuntiat; quod sit «in opere paternæ dispositionis intrepidus», obedientiam aliquam significat, quin declareret naturam hujus obedientiae nec præcepti huic obedientiae conjuncti.

A nullo auctore vidimus sequentem textum adductum, qui tamen non minoris esse momenti videtur (10) :

(8) *Sermo tertius de Pascha*, c. II.

(9) *Serm. LVIII*, c. III; *PL*, LIV, 333.

(10) *Ibid.*; *PL*, *ibid.* 335.

Quod facis, inquit, fac citius. Vox hæc non jubentis est, sed silentis, nec trepidi, sed parati: qui habens omnium temporum potestatem, ostendit se et moram non facere traditori, et sic ad redemptionem mundi paternam exequi voluntatem, ut facinus quod a persequentibus parabatur nec impelleret, nec timeret.

In anteriori textu loquebatur Sanctus Leo de «paterna dispositione», in hoc vero, post declaratam libertatem potentiamque Christi, illa verba adjungit «paternam exequi voluntatem», ubi insinuatur aliquomodo contrapositio inter potentiam Christi respectu Judæ et Judæorum, et ejus submissionem et obedientiam respectu alterius voluntatis, voluntatis scilicet paternæ.

Sanctus Leo tamen magis extollit æqualitatem et communitatem voluntatis Patris et Verbi in morte Christi quam hanc submissionem. «In salvandis enim omnibus per crucem Christi communis erat voluntas Patris et Filii, commune consilium» (11), dicit in eodem sermone. Etiam animadvertisit Christum habuisse potestatem non solum circa essentiam actus sed circa temporis circumstantias, quod est contra Lugonis theoriā: «Quod igitur in tempore præstituto, secundum propositum voluntatis suæ Jesus Christus crucifixus est» (12).

Reete concludi posse judicamus, Sanctum Leonem Pontificem non negare præceptum rigorosum nec illud affirmare, etiamsi confitendum est totam suam prædicationem magis ad exaltationē potentiae et libertatis Christi tendere, quam ad ejus obedientiam et submissionem, prout confutatio sectarum tunc temporis grassantium postulabat.

CAPUT SECUNDUM

SANCTUS AUGUSTINUS

Multum proderat theoriæ præcepti non rigorosi, suam sententiam auctoritate maximi Ecclesiæ Doctoris fulcire; inde ejus defensorum conatus et inquisitiones ad aliquos textus Sancti Augustini inveniendos qui aliquomodo ad eam corroborandam profuissent.

(11) Serm. LVIII, c. III; PL, LIV, 335.

(12) Serm. LXVII, c. V; PL, LIV, 371.

Ut clare et complete mentem Sancti Doctoris detegamus, tria puneta hoc studium amplectabitur, ut ita conclusiones firmius fundatas in fine capitum stabilire possimus. Sic igitur primo de affirmatione libertatis Christi in sua morte ad mentem Augustini agemus; secundo, quo sub speciali aspectu Augustinus hanc libertatem affirmare soleat dicemus, et deinde de mandato Patris et obedientia Christi circa mortem, tractabimus.

1 — De libertate Christi in morte eligenda et subcunda. In sermone quinto ad populum dieit Augustinus: «Quid illi (Christo) opus erat tanta pati, cui licebat et non pati?». Solum haec verba adducit P. Rayé ut Augustinum ducem inter Patres Latinos suae theoriæ constituant; sic ille haec verba commentatur: «Huc oculos, huc animum. An licuisset et conscientiam obligans?» (13). Sed haec verba Augustini, frequenter post Rayé citata, debent considerari in suo contextu ut verus eorum valor intelligatur (14):

Si enim vellet Christus jubere terræ, quando a Judæis tanta passus est, ut aperta sorberet persecutores ejus, non posset? Si ergo qui habuit potestatem, sic eos pertulit, quousque levaretur in cruce, et pendens in cruce ait, Pater, ignosce illos quia nesciunt quid faciunt; tu serve redempte sanguine crucifixi Domini tui, non imitaberis Salvatorem tuum? quid enim illi opus erat tanta pati, cui licebat et non pati?

Evidens est illud «eui licebat et non pati» referri in hoc textu ad illam potestatem Christi quæ poterat jubere terræ ut sorberet Judæos, et proinde ad divinam Christi potentiam; etiam, notaendum est illa verba indicare magis directe Christi libertatem a coactione, quatenus non coactus a Judæis opus Redemptionis implevit. Proinde, credimus conclusionem P. Rayé esse ultra sensum verborum Augustini et supponere Sanctum præ oculis habuisse libertatem Christi respectu voluntatis Patris.

Libertas Christi, primum datum nostræ problematis, in multis aliis textibus statuitur ab Augustino; sufficiat pauca verba referre ne sacietas generetur (15):

(13) Rayé, Op. Cit., p. 727. — August. Serm. V ad Populum, n. 3; PL, XXXVIII, 54.

(14) Serm. V, n. 3; PL. XXXVIII, 54.

(15) In Joan. Tract. XLVII, c. X, n. 11; PL. XXXV, 1739.

Omnis enim homines moriuntur, ponunt animam; sed non omnes pro Christo ponunt. Et nemo habet potestatem sumere quod posuerit; Christus autem et pro nobis posuit et quando voluit posuit.

Et commentando ipsum factum mortis Christi ait (16):

Et inclinato capite, reddidit spiritum. Videote potestatem moriendi... Posteaquam complete sunt, dixit: Perfectum est; et abscessit potestate, quia non venerat necessitate. Ideo quidam plus mirati sunt istam potestatem moriendi, quam potestatem miracula faciendi... Nec hora cogebatur mori; sed horam exspectabat, qua opportune fieri voluntas, non quia inviti impleretur necessitas.

Et respectu diaboli temptationum dicit (17):

Nam et tentari dignatus est a diabolo, a quo utique si nollet non tentaretur, quemadmodum si nollet non pateretur.

Clare igitur Augustinus, commentando Quartum Evangelium, et libertatem Christi in morte, et potestatem eligendi horam passionis, affirmit. Nec minus clare et peremptorie hoc asserit in Enarratione in Psalmos. Sie verbi causa (18):

Dormivi, inquit, conturbatus... Magna humilitas perturbari, magna potestas dormiendi. De qua potestate veniebat quod dormivit? De quo ipse dicit: Potestatem habeo ponendi animam meam... Et in alio Psalmo manifestat hoc, ubi ait: Ego dormivi et somnum cepi: Ibi expressit potestatem suam... quid est autem Ego dormivi? Id quia volui dormivi... mea voluntate dormivi.

Sommum a Psalmista narratum, passim interpretatur Augustinus de libera et voluntaria morte Christi. En duos similes textus (19):

Ego dormivi et somnum cepi. Ego, ad significandum quod sua voluntate mortem sustinuit... non ergo, inquit, vos me tamquam invitum cepistis et occidistis, sed ego dormivi et somnum cepi.

Numquid qui dormit non adjicet ut resurgat? Quando vos exultastis occidisse eum, ille dormivit; dicit enim in alio psalmo: Ego dormivi. Nam si noluissem, nec dormissem.

Alii textus nobis praesto sunt, sed isti sufficiant ad primum punctum firmiter stabiliendum: Augustinum, nempe, libertatem Christi in morte eligenda et subeunda clarissime

(16) Ibid., c. VII; PL, Ibid., 1639.

(17) Ibid. Tract. LII, c. XII, n. 3; PL, Ibid., 1770.

(18) Enar. in Ps. LXV, n. 11; PL, Ibid., 668.

(19) Enar. in Ps. XL, n. 9; PL, Ibid., 461.

affirmare; nec solum quoad actus substantiam, sed etiam quoad ejus circumstantias; unde clare apparet sententiam Lugonis nequaquam auctoritate Doctoris Hipponensis gaudere.

2 — *Sub quo speciali adspectu soleat Augustinus affirmare de Christo hanc libertatem.* Nulla in parte negat Augustinus Christum ut hominem, id est secundum suam humanam naturam, habuisse libertatem in morte eligenda et subeunda; immo vero, ex aliquibus textibus antea allatis, vel ex aliis, forsitan deduci posset Augustinum egresso expresse de hac humana Christi libertate. Tamen, cum Augustinus direete determinat de qua natura Christi agat cum affirmat hanc absolutam potentiam et libertatem Christi quæ excludere videtur rigorosum præceptum, non humanam sed divinam naturam indicat. Sic exempli causa, post illa verba superius relata: «Christus autem et pro nobis posuit et quando voluit posuit», sequitur Augustinus (20):

Quando Christus animam posuit? Quando Verbum voluit. Principatum eoim in Verbo erat: ibi potestas erat quando poneret caro animam et quando sumeret.

Nec minus clare aliquantulum inferius (21):

Pono animam meam, et iterum sumo eam. Ponit eam caro, sed ex potestate Verbi; sumit eam caro, sed ex potestate Verbi.

Eamdem igitur potestatem habuit Christus ad ponendam animam suam quam ad iterum eam sumendam, et proinde ad divinam Christi naturam hanc omnimodam potentiam tribuit Sanctus Augustinus. Hoc præ oculis habendum est, ne plus valoris illis textibus sub numero 1º positis demus quam in generali contextu habere videntur.

3 — *Obedientia Christi et mandatum Patris.* Cognitio naturæ obedientiæ Christi in scriptis Sancti Augustini juvabit fortasse ad problema solvendum de quo in præsentiarum. Liber XIV Civitatis Dei impense agit de inobedientia Adæ et malis ex ea profluentibus; frequenter ibi contraponit Augustinus inobedientiam Primi Adæ obedientiæ Secundi, statuens, vel saltem præsupponens utramque esse ejusdem natu-

(20) In Joan. Tract. XLVII, c. V, n. 11; PL, XXXV, 1739.

(21) Ibid. c. X, n. 13; PL, loc. cit.

ræ, scilicet inobedientiam et obedientiam alicui strieto præcepto. Quædam videamus (22):

Sicut enim Abrahæ non immerito magna obedientia prædicatur, quia ut occideret filium, res difficillima est imperata: ita in paradyso tanto major inobedientia fuit, quanto id quod præceptum est, nullius difficultas fuit. Et sicut obedientia secundi hominis eo prædicabilior, quo factus est obediens usque ad mortem: ita inobedientia primi hominis eo detestabilior, quo factus est inobediens usque ad mortem. Ubi enim magna est inobedientiæ poena proposita, et res a Creatore facilis imperata, quisnam satis explicet, quantum malum sit, non obediens in re facili, et tantæ potestatis imperio, et tanto terrenti suppicio?

Præceptum impositum Adæ fuit circa rem valde facilem, et sic ejus inobedientia tanto fuit detestabilior quanto præceptum fuit facilius. Præceptum Abrahæ fuit difficilior, et sic valde laudanda ejus obedientiæ promptitudo; obedientia vero Christi fuit usque ad mortem, id est, præceptum ei impositum fuit de subeunda morte, et inde quod adeo sit prædicabilis ejus obedientia. In tribus easibus agitur æqualiter de aliquo præcepto imposito a Deo in conscientia obliganti.

Sed jam ipsam vocem præceptum vel mandatum aggrediamur ut tandem e completam habeamus doctrinam Augustini. Sæpenumero Patres Græci, qui negarent verum præceptum moriendi (præter Chrysostomum), vocem mandatum in aliquibus textibus Evangeliorum, cogitabant significare illud divinum æternumque colloquium inter Patrem et suum Verbum in sinu Trinitatis. Augustinus vero, adhuc ulteriore gressum in eadem doctrina faciens, dicit mandatum esse ipsum Verbum, illudque probat sua consueta ingenii acuitate (23):

Intendite, fratres, quod dico: «Scio quia mandatum ejus vita æterna est». Et legimus apud ipsum Joannem de Christo, «Ipse est verus Deus et vita æterna». Si mandatum Patris vita æterna est, et Christus Filius ipse est vita æterna: mandatum Patris ipse Filius est.

Hoc autem dicit Augustinus de voce «mandatum» cum illa non specificet ad mortem Christi refertur; illum sensum usurpare ad hunc casum, credimus esse vini inferre menti Augustini, nam adsunt textus non solum circa obedientiam, ut vidimus, sed circa ipsum præceptum mortis, ubi hoc præ-

(22) *De Civ. Dei*, e. XV, n. 1; PL, XLI, 425.

(23) *In Joan. Tract.* LXXIX, 2; PL, XXXV, 1838.

ceptum in sensu obvio et humano, et proinde obligans in conscientia, videtur affirmari.

In celebri contione vel sermone Arianorum, dicebat auctor Arianus ignotus (24), *Filiū «voluntate et praecepto» Patris constitutum fuisse ante sēcula, ereavisse mundum, descedisse de cœlo, passionem et mortem subiisse, surrexisse a mortuis, ascendisse ad cœlum, sedisse ad dexteram Patris, et in ultima die venturum esse ad judicandum homines.*

Augustinus vero in ceteris omnibus præterquam in morte Christi denegat illud præceptum Patris, et dicit illud tantummodo significare conformitatem Patris et Filii voluntatem, vel ut ipse Augustinus amat dieere: «*Jussio vel mandatum Patris, non est nisi Verbum Patris per quod facta sunt omnia*» (25). Cum autem p̄venit ad præceptum Patris circa mortem Christi, non rejicit strictum præceptum Patris nec obedientiam Filii, sed ait illa dieta esse» secundum formam servi». En aliqua ejus verba (26):

Item si quæramus, quisnam sit factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis; rectissime respondeatur, Ille, qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est esse æqualis Deo. Ergo et ista humilitas illius divinitatis nomen accepit. Apparet tamen idem ipse Christus, geminæ gigas substantia, secundum quid obediens, secundum quid æqualis Deo; secundum quid Filius hominis, secundum quid Filius Dei.

Cum hæc implieita acceptatione præcepti moriendi, consonat altera magis explicita et clara; commentatus Augustinus Ultimam Cœnam hoc modo (27):

Et tamquam ei diceretur, Cur ergo moreris, si non habes peccatum cui debeatur mortis supplicium? Continuo subjecit, Sed ut cognoscat mundus quia diligo Patrem, et sicut mandatum dedit mihi Pater, sic facio: surgite, eamus hinc. Discumbens enim discubentibus loquebatur. «Eamus» autem dixit, quo, nisi ad illum locum unde fuerat tradendus ad mortem, qui nullum habebat meritum mortis? Sed habebat ut moretur mandatum Patris, tamquam ille de quo prædictum erat, quæ non rapui tunc exsolvebam.

Unica ratio ab Augustino assignata ut Christus mortem amplecteretur quam nullo pacto merebat, est quia «habebat ut moreretur mandatum Patris».

(24) Sermo Arianorum, PL, XLII, 678-684.

(25) Contra Serm. Arian. a. III; PL, XLII, 685.

(26) Ibid., a. VIII; PL, Ibid.

(27) In Joan. Tract. LXXIX, 2; PL, XXXV, 1838.

4 — Conclusiones. Ex omnibus huensque allatis hæc possunt erui conclusiones: 1) Clare statuit Augustinus libertatem Christi in morte eligenda et subeunda, sed præcipue et magis direete affirmat de Christo hanc absolutam libertatem prout Verbum Dei est. 2) Agnoscit veram et strictam obedientiam in Christo, nec distinctam a nostra humana obedientia. 3) Cum vocem «mandatum» refert ad Verbum Dei, illud mandatum identificat eum ipso Verbo; cum autem refertur ad præceptum moriendi, nullam limitationem nec attemperacionem apponit huic præcepto Christo imposito quia «formam servi accepit».

Unde immerito invocatur auctoritas Augustini pro sententia de præcepto non obliganti; immo, adversarius huic theoriæ habendus est si totam ejus doctrinam examinamus, non unum alterumve textum a foto contextu segregatum.

CAPUT TERTIUM

SANCTUS ANSELMUS CANTUARIENSIS

Testimonium Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi citatur ut absolute certum et indubitate ab omnibus qui præceptum mortis Christi autem non rigorosum fuisse; sed econtra, non desunt auctores et quidem magni nominis ut P. Franciscus Suarez qui mentem Anselmi interpretantur in opposito sensu, uti inferius considerabimus.

Siquidem Sanctus Anselmus primus fuit auctor, ut opinor, qui nostrum problema proposuit sub eodem adspectu quo hodie statuitur, et illud ample tractavit, novasque vias ad illud solvendum invenit, ejus mentem proprius sequi curabimus, et aliquando in ejus consideratione curabimus immorari. Fortasse non alienum a nostro proposito judicetur in memoriam adducere Anselmum non ad ætatem patristicam ut ea communiter hodie computatur, pertinere, et potius Patrem Scholasticæ posse quidem appellari. Tamen, saltem in haec quæstione, ab auctoribus sæpe inter Patres connumerratur.

Perfuse et abuude considerat Anselmus problema libertatis Christi mortis in suo tractatu *Cur Deus Homo*, et in

Meditatione Undecima, et leviter tangit eamdem quæstionem in aliis ex suis multis operibus. Credimus nos non debere examinare famosum «Libellum», nam nondum evadit certa thesis P. Druwé, S. J., affirmans talem Libellum non solum Saneto Anselmo esse adscribendum, sed constituere primam redactionem tractatus *Cur Deus Homo* (28). Videamus porro quid in tractatu *Cur Deus Homo*, ad nostram quæstionem pertinens, contineatur.

1—Cur Deus Homo. Sanctus Anselmus elegit ut programma pro sua vita intellectuali, penetrare lumine rationis quoadusque posset veritates a Fide propositas. Suum lemma «*Fidens quærens intellectum*», bene applicatur in hoc tractatu, in quo Anselmus intendit aliquomodo explicare «quæ scilicet ratione vel necessitate deus homo factus sit, et morte sua, sicut eredimus et confitemur, mundo vitam reddiderit» (29). Secundum investigationes Patrum Benedictinorum Wilmart et Schmitt, primarum auctoritatum in studiis anselmianis, sanctus incepit hoc opus circa annum 1094, et illud finivit anno 1098 (30). De ejus authenticitate nequit dubitari; thema evolvitur in forma dialogi inter Bosonem, juvenem monachum Monasterii Bee qui partes agit discipuli, et ipsum Anselmum qui dubia solvit ingeniosi et curiosi Bosonis.

In capite octavo primi libri, incepit Anselmus tractare libertatem Christi; problema quod ipse solvere intendit in hoc capite versatur circa modum conciliandi justitiam et sapientiam Patris cum morte Filii innocentis. Hoe problema ut ab Anselmo proponitur in *Cur Deus Homo* absolute differt ab illo proposito a Patribus, vindicandi scilicet libertatem Christi in sua morte contra Arianos, ut divinitas Christi in

(28) P. Druwé prænuntiavit suam hanc inventionem in articulo: «La première rédaction du *Cur Deus homo* de S. Anselme», *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XX (1930), 162. Tribus annis post, edidit ipsum Libellum, multis munitionis argumentis pro authenticitate. Contra hanc thesim P. Druwé scripsit J. Rivière in *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 1934, p. 329, et ei respondit P. Druwé in *Revue de Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 1935, p. 501.

(29) In citationibus hujus tractatus sequemur textum optimè editionis criticæ P. Schmitt. Commoditatis causa dabimus simul referentias ad PL. Postremum bellum interruppsit publicationes operis P. Schmitt, et proinde ceteros tractatus debemus citare ex Patrologia Migne.

(30) D. Franc. Salesius Schmitt, O. S. B., «Zur Chronologie der Werke des Hl. Anselms» *Revue Benedictine*, XLIV (1932), 322.

tuto poneretur, et differt etiam a nostro, conciliandi nimirum Christi humanam libertatem cum Patris præcepto. Ut responsum inveniat suo problemati, investigat Anselmus quoque se protendat vis præcepti paterni et qualis sit natura obedientiae Christi in morte. Quærit Boso (31) :

Nam si aliter peccatores salvare no potuit quam justum damnandum: ubi est ejus omnipotentia? Si vero potuit sed non voluit: quomodo defendemus sapientiam ejus atque justitiam? — Anselmus: Deus pater non, quemadmodum videris intelligere, hominem illum tractavit aut innocentem pro nocente morti tradidit. Non enim eum invitum ad mortem ille coegit aut occidi permisit, sed idem sponte sua mortem sustinuit, ut homines salvaret.

Anselmi respondendi modus iustificat Patrem et salvat Christi libertatem; ille æquivalet effatui moralistarum: Scienti et volenti non fit injuria. Boso tamen objectionem invenit in Scriptura ubi affirmatur præceptum moriendi et obedientia Christi huic paterno mandato; totum caput nonum dedicat Anselmus ad solutionem hujus difficultatis, quin tamen satis clare appareat mens Sancti Doctoris, nam aliquæ suæ propositiones videntur mutuo sese excludere, et sic eas adhibitæ fuerunt separatæ ad oppositas sententias sustentandas. Quid igitur in hoc capite vere dicatur extricare conemur.

Et primo, Anselmus distinguit quod fecit Christus «exigente obedientia», ab illo quod ipse solum «sustinuit non exigente obedientia»; Christus, nempe, debebat ut omnis rationalis creatura justitiam adimplere veritatemque usque ad mortem defendere. Hoc est unicum præceptum Patris, non quidem exclusivum Christo nec directe ad mortem relatum, sed commune omnibus hominibus qui justitiam usque ad mortem sectare tenentur. Sic evolvitur dialogus (32) :

B — Veritatem et justitiam vivendo et loquendo indeclinabiliter tenebat. — Hoc puto deus ab omni rationali creatura exigit, et hoc illa per obedientiam deo debet... Hanc igitur obedientiam debebat homo ille patri, et hanc ab illo exigebat pater... Ecce habes quid fecit exigente obedientia.

Hoc igitur fecit Christus «exigente obedientia»; sed quomodo mortem sustinuit «non exigente obedientia»? Christus, respondet Anselmus, carebat unica causa ob quam Pater ei

(31) Sch. p. 60; PL, CLVIII, 369.

(32) Sch. p. 61; PL, Ibid. 370.

imponere præceptum moriendi potuisset: peccato. Audiamus aliqua (33):

B — Patet qua, si non peccasset homo, non deberet ab eo deus mortem exigere. A — Non ergo coegit deus Christum mori, in quo nullum fuit peccatum; sed ipse sponte sustinuit mortem, non per obedientiam desideri vitam, sed propter obedientiam servandi justitiam, in qua tam fortiter perseveraverit, ut inde mortem incurreret.

Ecce jam nodus problematis et solutio ab Anselmo excoigitata ut eum expeditat. Secundum hanc solutionem, Pater: a) exigit a Filio ut implete justitiam et veritatem defendat; b) eximit eum a præcepto vel obligatione moriendi, morte morieris», in quantum est pena peccati; c) prævidet et permittit —hoc est verbum quod melius explicat ideam Sancti Anselmi— mortem Christi, prout est effectus observantiae et defensionis justitiae et veritatis. Filius autem: a) striete paret præcepto Patris circa defensionem et impletionem veritatis et justitiae; b) libere acceptat mortem ex hac adimplitione profluentem.

Deinde considerat Anselmus textus Scripturæ in quibus de præcepto Patris circa mortem Christi et de obedientia Christi agitur. In hac explicatione illa verba inveniuntur: «Potest etiam dici quia præcepit illi pater mori, cum hoc præcepit unde incurrit mortem» (34). Hæc verba extra proprium contextum sumpserunt aliqui theologi ut dicerent Anselmum utique admississe strictum moriendi præceptum inclusum in illo alio; sed non possumus oblivisci quanta cum sollertia distinguunt Anselmus inter quod Christus «sustinuit» et quidem «exigente obedientia» ex una parte, et quod «fecit» Christus «non exigente obedientia».

Quod attinet autem ad textus Scripturæ, illos evolvit Anselmus, in conexione cum sua doctrina de Satisfactione Vicaria Christi (35):

Sic igitur voluit pater mortem filii, quia non aliter voluit mundum salvari, nisi homo tam magnum aliquid faceret, ut dixi. Quod filio volenti salutem hominis tantudem valuit —quoniam aliis hoc facere non valebat—, quantum si illi mori præciperet. Unde ille sicut mandatum dedit illi pater, sic fecit, et calicem quem dedit ei pater, biberit obediens usque ad mortem.

(33) Sch. p. 62; PL, Ibid. 371.

(34) Loc. cit.

(35) Sch. p. 64; PL, Ibid. 373.

Pro Christo igitur, tantum valuit voluntas Patris quantum si illi mori præcipere; et sic sunt intelligenda verba Sacrae Scripturæ circa mandatum mortis; clare appareat in hoc textu desiderium Anselmi explicandi mortem Christi quin fuerit imperata a Patre.

Sed Anselmus, magnus philosophus et theologus, novas vias investigat ut mysterium aliquomodo declareret, si illud declarari potest. En quomodo prosequitur in sequenti capite (36):

Potest etiam recte intellegi, quia per illam piam voluntatem, qua voluit filius pro salute mundi mori, dedit illi pater, non tamen cogendo, mandatum et calicem passionem, et non pepercit illi, sed pro nobis tradidit illum et mortem illius voluit; et quia ipse filius obediens fuit usque ad mortem et didicit ex iis quæ passus est obedientiam. Quemadmodum enim secundum humanitatem non habebat a se voluntatem juste vivendi, sed a patre, ita et voluntatem illam qua, ut tantum bonum faceret, mori voluit, non potuit habere nisi a patre lumen a quo est omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum. Et sicut pater trahere dando voluntatem dicitur, ita non incongrue fit, si impellere asseritur... Quoniam namque voluntate quisque ad id quod indeclinabiliter vult trahitur vel impellitur, non inconvenienter trahere aut impellere Deus, cum talem dat voluntatem affirmatur. In quo tractatu vel impulsu nulla intelligitur violentiae necessitas, sed acceptæ bonæ voluntatis spontanea et amata tenacitas.

Duo animadvertenda sunt in hoc textu: primum, quam absolute et emphatice rejiciat denominationem et ideam præcepti rigorosi Sanctus Anselmus: «Non tamen cogendo... in quo tractu vel impulsu nulla intelligitur violentiæ necessitas, sed acceptæ bonæ voluntatis spontanea et amata tenacitas»; secundum, quomodo Sanctus Anselmus novam viam aperiat ad problema solvendum: Pater lumen Christi mentem illuminat eique dat solvendum: Pater lumen Christi mentem illuminat eique dat voluntatem motumque ad mortem acceptandam. Hanc alteram explicationem, præscindendo ab explicatione mandati, admittent postea Suarez, Pesch, Galtier, multique alii moderni auctores ut veram solutionem problematis.

Inter philosophicas et theologicas quæstiones quæ magis Sancti Anselmi mentem instigarunt, ea de libero arbitrio voluntatis Dei, angeli et hominis, recensenda est. Ut textus allatos aliosque similes plene intelligere valeamus, præ oculis

(36) Sch. pp. 64-65; PL, Ibid. 373-374.

habere debemus fundamentalem thesim Anselmi in hae quæstione, quæ asserit eo perfectiorem esse libertatem alienus voluntatis, quo minorem libertatem habeat peccandi: «Nec libertas, nec pars libertatis est potestas peccandi... Liberius igitur est voluntas quæ a rectitudine non peccandi declinare nequit, quam quæ illam potest deserere» (37). Secundum anselmianam theoriam de libertate humanæ voluntatis, non facile determinatur utrum ipse putaret libertatem humanam Christi salvam esse, etiamsi Christus nequirit non sequi lucees et motiones Patris. Ob confusionem in aliquibus textibus Anselmi inter actum voluntarium et liberum, abusi sunt ejus scriptis Lutherani et Baiani.

Quod certo constat nobis est Sanctum Anselmum denuo in hoc capite excludere præceptum rigorosum et insinuare novam solutionem de illuminationibus et motionibus Patris luminum in Christi intellectum et voluntatem; adhuc addit alias esse possibles vias ad hoc problema solvendum (38).

Anselmus intendit proinde in hoc tractatu Cur Deus Homo, libertatem Christi mortis in tuto ponere, nam ita justitia et misericordia Patris circa mortem Filii innocentis justificantur; ad salvandam vero libertatem Christi excludit omne rigorosum præceptum, omnemque «eogenitum obedientiam»; possumus judicare conatus Anselmi ad apparentes contradictiones solvendas plus vel minus felices, sed non possumus negare suam apertam intentionem excludendi strictum præceptum. Liceat jam nobis ad Meditationem Undecimam transire, ubi fortasse clarus et distinctius inveniamus mentem Sancti Arechepiscopi Cantuariensis.

2 — Meditatio de Redemptione humana. De authenticitate hujus undecimæ meditationis ambigi nequit, cum ea inveniatur in omnibus veteribus manuscriptis, ejusque stili sit aperte anselmianus. Etiam ipse Castell qui solummodo admittit tres meditationes ut authenticas, de hæc undecima non dubitat (38). Scripta fuit post tractatum Cur Deus Homo, inter annos 1099 et 1100 (39).

(37) Sch. p. 64; PL, Ibid. 373.

(38) D. A. Castell, *Méditations et prières de S. Anselme, Abbaye de Maredsous*, 1923. Aliae duæ *Meditationes admissæ ut authenticæ ab hoc auctore sunt secunda et tertia*.

(39) D. Franc. Sal. Schmitt, O. S. B. Art. cit.

Post alias pias considerationes, ingreditur Anselmus tractare libertatem Dei in humana redemptione facienda; et ut primum impedimentum libertatem removet Sanctus quemcumque divinam obligationem erga diabolum; passim refutat Anselmus hanc erroneam conceptionem Redemptionem quae usque ad medium ævum fuit ab aliquibus sustentatam; nervose dicit Anselmus: «Sed certe diabolo nec Deus dehebat aliquid nisi pœnam; nec homo nisi vicem» (40). Necessitas Redemptionis, præterea, non erat ex parte Dei, sed ex parte hominis, et quidem laboriosæ et cruentæ Redemptionis: «Non egebat Deus ut tam laboriosæ pateretur, sed indigebat homo ut sic Deo reconciliaretur» (41). Progrediens in hæc via libertatis, excludit deinde Anselmus obligationem Christi mortem sustinendi: «Hanc vitam homo iste, cum ex debito mori non deberet, quoniam peccator non erat, sponte dedit de suo ad honorem Patris» (42). Sic igitur annolitur Anselmus tres causas quæ poterant obligatoriæ facere mortem Christi: debitum Christi Deo quatenus Christus pertinebat ad humanum genus morte damnatum. Restat tamen una causa: præceptum Patris impositum Filio suo.

Hoc modo hanc ultimam causam tractat Anselmus (43):

Nec humana natura in isto hemine passa est aliquid ulla necessitate sed sola libera voluntate. Nec alicui violentiæ succubuit, sed spontanea bonitate ad honorem Dei et utilitatem aliorum hominum, quæ illi mala voluntate sunt illata, laudabiliter et misericorditer sustinuit; nec ulla cogente obedientia, sed potenti disponente sapientia. Non enim illi homini Pater ut moreretur cogendo præcepit; sed ille quod Patri placitum et hominibus profuturum intellectus, hoc sponte fecit... Sic itaque Patri liberam obedientiam exhibuit cum hoc, quod Patri placitum scivit, sponte facere voluit... Hæc est enim perfecta et liberrima humanæ naturæ obedientia, cum voluntatem suam liberam sponte voluntati Dei subdit, et cum acceptam bonam voluntatem sine omni exactione, spontanea libertate opere perficit.

Post hæc adeo peremptoria verba Sancti Anselmi, arbitramur non posse rationabiliter ad dubium revocare cum velle excludere strictum præceptum.

Valde digna notatu est doctrina Anselmi circa obedientiam; in præcedentibus Patribus, cum eorum mens apparebat

(40) PL, CLVIII, 764 B.

(41) Ibid. 765 A.

(42) Ibid. 765 C.

(43) Ibid. 766 B. C.

dubia circa naturam præcepti mortis Christi, videamus quid ipsi dicerent de Christi obedientia, nam obedientia et præceptum semper apparebant ut correlativa: vera obedientia censebatur versari circa verum præceptum, ne quid in contrarium ullenus dicebatur. Et ideo Chrysostomus qui non strictum præceptum admittebat in Christo, nec plenitudinem humanæ obedientiæ censebat esse in ejus morte, sed «amicalem obedientiam».

Sanctus Anselmus, autem, loquitur passim de «eogente obedientia» sub stricto præcepto, hanc removens a Christo ut imperfectam, et de «perfecta et liberrima obedientia» sine ulla exactione vel obligatione perficiens bonam voluntatem Dei. Sanctus Thomas aliquomodo videtur huic opinioni Anselmi assentiri eum dicit: «Obedientia tanto videtur promptior, quanto expressum præceptum obediendo prævenit, voluntate superioris intellecta» (44). Sed tamen notandum est, Sanctum Thomam præsupponere dandum esse præceptum. Suarez ait clarius: «Propria et vera obedientia non est nisi ubi intervenit præceptum» (45).

Nunc autem si tractatum Cur Deus Homo cum hac Meditatione comparamus quoad rem nostram, animadvertisimus mentem Sancti esse in illo confusorem et problema quod solendum proponit esse magis generale et intrinecatum. In Meditatione de Redemptione humana magis directe nostrum problema agit, et firmius suam sententiam proponit. Probabile est Sanctum Anselmum profundius studuisse huic quæsitioni post scriptum Cur Deus Homo.

Sed non finem imponamus huic capiti, quin pauca dicamus circa interpretationem quam facit Suarez de doctrina Sancti Anselmi. Suarez, scilicet, habens præ oculis summum tractatum Cur Deus Homo, nec ullum verbum faciens circa Meditationem, dicit Anselmum defendisse præceptum obligatorium contentum in præcepto generali observandi iustitiam: «Propter quod aliqui imponunt Anselmo quod negavit hoc præceptum» (46). Hanc interpretationem arbitramur non veram mentem Anselmi ostendere, nam firmam intentionem Sancti, non obstantibus aliquibus obscuritatibus, appa-

(44) Sum. Theol. II-II, q. 104, a. 1.

(45) De Incarnat. q. XX, disp. 83, sect. 3.

(46) Ibid.

ret esse a Christo removere strictum præceptum mortis, et cogitamus non imponi Sancto quod ipse tam firmiter declaravit in Cur Deus Homo, et deinde magis explicite in Meditatione Undecima, quam Suarez ignoravit vel neglexit.

CONCLUSIO

Duae rationes præcipue nos moverunt ad hanc patristicam inquisitionem faciendam: prima, momentum et theologia transcedentia problematis conciliationis libertatis Christi cum ejus impeccabilitate et visione beatifica; et secunda, insufficiens attentio huusque præbita ad genuinam mentem Sanctorum Patrum detegendam circa ea quæ ad hanc quæstionem pertinent.

Inter christologica problemata quæ magis in ultimis sæculis a theologis agitantur, hoc nostrum ennumerari debet; hoc demonstrant ingentes eonatus ad illud solvendum, multique solutionis modi propositi. Sed notandum est quomodo dum aliae solutiones intactam relinquunt obviam et acceptam notionem obedientiæ in morte Christi, una tantum theoria (Petavii-Billot) hanc obviam notionem non parum mutare videatur. Hæc sententia habet contra se, scribit P. Galtier «quod nullum admittit in Christo actum obedientiæ propriæ dictæ, siquidem ex ipso D. Thoma, quem invocat, executio rei quæ non est præcepta, non constituit nisi obedientiam «large acceptam» dum ad obedientiam «proprie acceptam» requiritur quod quis adimpleat præceptum proprie dictum» (1).

In nostra Introductione leviter adumbravimus implicationem quam habet in tota doctrina Redemptionis, hæc notio obedientiæ Christi, ad quam hæc theoria de præcepto non rigoroso naturaliter conduceit. Ob momentum proinde quod habet hoc problema arbitrati sumus valde utile fore mentem Patrum circa illud accurate investigare; illud patristicum argumentum amplius esse deberet: quid, nimirum, Patres cogitaverint circa obligationem Christi moriendi. Nos autem, ob temporis angustiam, solum partem hujus argumenti sumpsimus: an illi Patres, scilicet, qui a defensoribus theoræ

(1) Galtier, Op. cit., p. 322.

præcepti non rigorosi solent citari, revera solidum fundamen-tum pro hac theoria præbeant.

Ratio dubitandi circa mentem eorum Patrum plane appa-ret eum sint magni nominis Auctores qui eos pro vel contra hanc theoriā esse dicant. Sed omnes fere unum vel duos textus inconnexos eorum Patrum solent afferre, et sic eos festi-nate judicant. Ut pro modulo nostro lucem aliquam in ta-lēm controversiam afferremus, studium magis complectum eorum Patrum doctrinæ circa hoc punetum aggressi sumus. Objectivitatem et sufficientiam curavimus fuisse notas hujus investigationis in qua tot laboris horas consumpsimus. Nunc igitur, non nisi summatim redigere conclusiones ad quas per-venimus nobis restare videtur.

1 — Ex Patribus Graecis qui pro sententia præcepti non rigorosi citari solent, unicus qui positivum et solidum fun-damentum præbet est Sanctus Joannes Chrysostomus. Tes-timonia ceterorum Patrum, si ea in generali complexu eorum doctrinæ et adjuncrorum considerantur et mutue conferuntur, appareat non strictum præceptum moriendi de Christo homine negare.

2 — Tres Patres Latini qui citari solent pro hac theoria, Leo Magnus, Ambrosius et Augustinus, nobis videntur non jure appellati; eam nimirum nec aperte docent, nec clare insinuант. Præsertim Augustinus clare habere contrariam sen-tentiam videtur.

Duo facta explicant sufficienter quædam dicta eorum Patrum, qæ disjuncta huic theoriæ præcepti non rigorosi favere videntur: primum et præcipuum, cautelæ Patrum con-tra Arianos sensu vocis «mandatum» abutentes contra Verbi consubstantialitatem; secundum, conatus Patrum vitandi quasdam anthropomorphicas expressiones; unde quædam dicta Patrum circa Dei mandatum, ut «distinetum a manda-to humano», «non ore prolatum», qæ recte et sub vera luce intelligi debent ne nos decipient (2).

3 — Sanctus Anselmus non proprie ad ætatem patristi-cam adscribendus est; eum tamen ejus testimonium ut præ-cipuum inter Patrum invocetur, hæc nobis de ejus mente di-

(2) Sic frequenter Basilius, Cyrus et alii, ut in secunda parte notavimus.

cenda videntur: A — Alias solutiones admittit ut probabiles ad conciliandas libertatem et impeccabilitatem Christi. B — Fiemus tamen et ut propriam amplectitur explicacionem de mandato non rigoroso et de obedientia circa voluntatem non praeceptivam. Recte «Pater» talis theoriæ dici potest, nam eam directe evolvit et philosophice explanavit.

Proinde, ex decem Patribus —incluso Anselmo— qui pro hac theoria citantur, solummodo Chrysostomus et Anselmus legitime invocari possunt. De aliis octo saltem dici debet eos non favere huic theoriæ.

Præterea debet præ oculis haberi, nos non respicere in hoc studio nisi Patres qui citantur pro hae theoria ab ejus defensoribus. Ex ceteris aliis, fortasse sint alii qui hanc quæstionem tractantes contra theoriam præcepti non rigorosi sint; certe, plurimi citantur ab impugnatoribus talis theoriæ, sed ab omnibus eis prescindere debuimus in hoc studio.

Iis igitur omnibus perpensis, legitime concludere possumus, theoriam de præcepto non rigoroso circa mortem Christi, solido argumento patristico carere.

BIBLIOGRAPHIA

N. B. Inter generales tractatus de Verbo Incarnato, solummodo pauci citantur in hac Bibliographia, inter eos qui magis evolvunt argumentum patristicum circa nostrum problema.

Billot, Ludovicus, S. J. *De Verbo Incarnato*. 7^a Edit; Romæ: Univ. Gregoriana, 1922.

Franzelin, Joannes Bapt., S. J. *Tractatus de Verbo Incarnato*. 3^a Edit.; Romæ: Typographia Poliglotta S. C. de Prop. Fidei, 1881.

Galtier, Paul, S. J. «Obéissant jusqu'à la mort». *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, I (1920), 113-49.

....., *De Incarnatione ac Redemptione*. Parisiis: Beauchesne, 1926.

Kopf, Georges, (Abbé). «La liberté de l'acte de charité dans le Christ». *Revue Thomiste*, XXXIX-1 (1934), 353-69.

Lugo, Joannes de, S. J., *Disputationes Scholasticæ et Morales*. 8 Volumina; Volumen III, De Incarnatione. Parisiis: Ludovicus Vives, 1868.

Muncunill, Joannes, S. J., *Tractatus de Verbi Divini Incarnatione*. Matriti: Sáenz de Jubera, 1905.

Parente, Petrus, *De Verbo Incarnato*. Romæ: Institutum Graphicum Tiberinum, 1939.

Pesch, Christianus, S. J., *Prælectiones Dogmaticæ*. 9 Volumina; Volumen IV, De Verbo Incarnato, 7^a Edit. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1924.

Petavius, Dionysius, S. J., *Opus de Theologicis Dogmaticis*. T. V. De Incarnato Verbi. Venetiis: Poleti, 1745.

Rayé, Nicolaus, S. J., *Theses Theologicae contra rigorosum Christi Præceptum*. Insertæ in Thesauro Theologico, Socii Aead. Eccl. Tom. IX, Opus. 8^a

- Riviere, Jean, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption, étude théologique.* 4^e Edit.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1933.
-, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption chez Saint Augustin.* 3^e Edit.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1938.
- Schmitt, Franciscus Salesius, O. S. B., *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia.* 4 Volumina; Secovii, 1938.
- Socius Academiarum Ecclesiasticarum, *Thesaurus Theologicus.* 11 Volumina; Volumen IX, De Divini Verbi Incarnatione. Vetiis: Nicolaus Pezzana, 1752.
- Stentrup, Ferdinandus Aloysius, S. J., *Prælectiones Dogmaticæ de Verbo Incarnato.* 2 Volumina. Empont: Felicia-nus Rauch, 1882.
- Suarez, Franciscus, S. J., *Opera Omnia,* 24 Volumina, Volumen XVII, De Incarnatione. Parisiis: Ludovicus Vives, 1856.
- Taille, Mauritius de la, S. J., *Mysterium Fidei,* 3^e Edit. Parisiis: Beauchesne, 1921.
- Vandemberghe, A., «De Libertate Christi quoad mandatum moriendi». *Collationes Brugienses,* XXXIV (1934), 113-18.
- Vasquez, Gabrielis, S. J., *Commentarium In Summam.* 9 Volumina. Compluti: Joannes Gratiani, 1708.

