

The doctrine of justification according to Augustine of Rome

(Favaroni) († 1443) *

D. — Preparation for Justification

ART. 1. THE CONCURRENCE OF FREE WILL.

'Immo cogniti estis a Deo' (dicit Apostolus) ut ostendat quod Deus prius se convertit ad eos, infundendo eis lumen cognitionis, quam ipsi se converterint ad Deum per acceptam cognitionem. Cum enim dicit Deus « convertimini ad me et Ego revertar ad vos » intelligendus est prius Deus converti ad eos prioritate causalitatis quam ipsi convertantur ad Deum ¹⁾. In these words Favaroni delineates in general the process of our justification, God's new relation to us, our return to God, and God is the cause of that change in us which founds the new relation.

The last chapter will deal more specifically with the supernatural element, in this present we shall treat of man's part in his own justification ; and precisely under three headings :

1. The fact — free will must co-operate.
2. Specification of the acts of free will.
3. Character of the acts and their relation to the state of justification.

This will give us sufficient background to form a general judgement on the futility of the pro-lutheran allegations in this question.

1. *Free will must co-operate.*

Catholic doctrine teaches that the meritorious cause of our

*) *Augustiniana* vii (1957), pp. 100-117; 349-366; 515-530.

¹⁾ *In ep. ad Gal.* A 64 129 vl.

justification is the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ ²⁾. The Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross was of such value as to be sufficient, nay superabundant, to merit all the graces of justification for the elect. Christ merited that grace should be bestowed on each one, so that each one receiving this grace might co-operate with it preparing his own soul for the reception of habitual justifying grace.

The so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century teach too that Christ is the meritorious cause of our justification, but with this difference that His merits are applied to us extrinsically and in no way intrinsically, since the self-same justice of Christ is our own formal justice. Preparation is therefore unnecessary, since our justice will always be something external to us and independent of our own will. Preparation is furthermore impossible, because any effectiveness that our works might have, would derogate to the merits of Christ.

This question of the relation of the merits of Christ to our justification is discussed by our theologian in his tract on the Apocalypse apropos of the lines « Christus lavavit nos in sanguine suo » ³⁾, and he gives us a fourfold efficacy of the death of Christ — it is a redemption for captives, a purification of vices, a defence of orphans, and a pledge of reward ⁴⁾. Each of these is then explained extensively. Briefly however, it is our redemption because it gained for us the remission of sin, it is purifying because it merited for us the grace of justification ⁵⁾, it is our defence because it helps us to persevere, it is our reward because it brings us to our end. Obviously we are here concerned only with the second.

How the Blood of Christ is the purification of our vices is the explained in the form of four conclusions:

Prima Conclusio: Sanguis Christi cunctis electis meruit primam gratiam iustificantem ⁶⁾.

²⁾ DENZ., *Ench. Sym.* 799.

³⁾ Apoc. i, 3.

⁴⁾ Sed si diligenti indagine sensus sacrorum codicum sanctorumque patrum solerter rimemur, proculdubio sacrosancti de quo agimus sanguinis circa electos quibus gratuito datur efficaciam invenimus habere quadruplicem: redemptivam captivorum ad perfectam libertatem, purgativam viciorum ad perfectam sanctitatem, defensivam pupillorum ad perfectam equitatem, lucrativam premiorum ad perfectam ubertatem. *In Apoc.* V 53 v2.

⁵⁾ Non ergo lavit nos Christus in sanguine suo satisfaciendo, verum etiam in suo sanguine promerendo nobis iustificationem. *Ibid.* V 55 r2.

⁶⁾ *Ibid.* V 55 r1.

Secunda Conclusio: Vires liberi arbitrii non sufficebant nobis ut a peccatis resurgeremus ⁷⁾).

Tertia Conclusio: Liberum arbitrium nostrum non excluditur a prima justificatione impii quin ipsum operetur ad primam iustificationem suiipsius, sed cum merito Christi co-operatur ad semet-ipsam iustificandam ⁸⁾).

Quarta Conclusio: Peccata electorum vel per originem ducta, vel propriis operationibus perpetrata, apud divinam iustitiam prohibebant gratiam eis de cetero iustificationis infundi et auxilium opportunum ad resurgendum divinitus impertiri ⁹⁾).

Without further comment it is absolutely clear that free will must concur to justification. It is not of itself sufficient to bring us to the state of justice, but in view of what it *receives* through Christ — cum merito Christi co-operatur — it is made apt to prepare man for the supernatural state. In this fact is well contained the idea of a grace which is simultaneously « *sanans et elevans* ». *Sanans*, inasmuch as it helps the will towards its own rehabilitation in a state of justice, and *elevans* by reason of the supernatural power proceeding from the death of Christ.

In this great truth he sees, after Augustine ¹⁰⁾, the greatest manifestation of the power and goodness of God ¹¹⁾. This is the work which the believers in Christ should do, greater than the works which Christ Himself had done. All the works narrated in the Holy Gospels Christ had done alone, and at most could be equiparated merely to creation; but here, man's will in conjunction with God's operates actively his own justification, which is a work greater even than the work of creation ¹²⁾.

It now remains proved that the acts of free will must concur to man's own justification. Grace is given through the merits of

⁷⁾ *Ibid.* V 55 v1.

⁸⁾ *Ibid.* V 55 v2.

⁹⁾ *Ibid.* V 56 r1.

¹⁰⁾ In Joannem, Tr. 72 nn. 2. 3. ML. 35, 1825.

¹¹⁾ Querit ergo beatus Augustinus que sint illa majora opera de numero eorum que Christus faciebat, que etiam credentes in Christo facient. Et respondit quod est iustificatio impii, quod etiam facit qui iustificatur. Ille namque qui iustificatur, concurrat simul cum Christo ad ejus iustificationem: concurrat enim active et operative ad suiipsius iustificationem, et hoc dicit beatus Augustinus esse majus opus quam sit creare coelum et terram. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641, 55 v2.

¹²⁾ Cf. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 171 r1 where further illustrations of this point given in the form of conclusions may be found.

Jesus Christ, and the co-operation of free will with this grace, far from derogating to the merits of Christ, serves to manifest more and more the goodness and mercy of God.

2. Specification of the acts of free will.

In the question of the order of justification he proceeds on the authority of St. Augustine¹³). He begins by quoting literally and completely the whole of the seventh chapter of « *De Doctrina Christiana* »¹⁴) where the Saint indicates the different grades to be gone through in the acquisition of wisdom, taking as his basis the inverse order of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost enumerated by Isaias¹⁵). From this Favaroni elaborates his own process for the complete purgation of the soul. He enumerates six grades, carefully, and even numerically, distinguishing one from the other. They are fear — which has two effects, the recession from evil and the extinction of concupiscence¹⁶) — piety, love of God and the neighbour, fortitude, purification of the tumultuating affections, and finally, the complete cutting off of all temporal affection¹⁷). We are interested only in the first three for, as we shall see later, charity essentially justifies. The others clearly pertain to mystical theology.

Of what nature is this fear from which justification starts ? For the Protestants it is a fear which consists in the terrors of conscience provoked by a consideration of the terrible punishments due to sin. According to them this fear only increases sin. For Favaroni, on the contrary, this fear is conducive to charity, therefore it must already be founded on charity¹⁸). Our question is

¹³) *Modum autem istius purgationis disponentis et preparantis ad lumen intelligentie veritatis, docet Augustinus 2º libro de Doctrina Christiana. In Apoc. V 13 r1.*

¹⁴) *ML. 34, 39.*

¹⁵) Cf. also: Unde a summo incipit Isaias narrare septem dona Spiritus Sancti incipiens a dono sapientie. In acquisitione tamen septem donorum prefatorum ordine retrogrado procedimus, incipientes a dono timoris et ascendentes ad donum pietatis. *In ep. ad Eph. A 641 53 r1.*

¹⁶) Igitur hec perfecta purgatio secundum Augustinum, (incipit) a gradu timoris domini quo recedit omnis a malo ... ideo est timor domini quoddam sapientie seminarium ... incentiva eciam viciorum timor domini, et illam terrene concupiscentie delectationem extinguit, qua solet mentis oculus miserabiliter caliginare. *In Apoc. V 13 r2.*

¹⁷) *Ibid. V 13 r2 - 14 r1.*

¹⁸) In the next chapter on the integral notion of Justice we shall show the existence of a fear founded on charity.

rather to avoid the excess of exaggerating the office of charity in this fear: if this fear is joined with charity it seems that it must already of itself justify, why then does Favaroni ascribe to it only the office of preparation?

To solve this question adequately we must consult his complete doctrine on fear. Fear, he tells us, has six acceptations¹⁹⁾. We can omit the first three kinds for they are irrelevant to our present consideration.

The fourth fear is servile fear. This fear avoids sin *simply and solely* because sin will not go unpunished²⁰⁾. If man could commit sin with impunity, then he would commit it — therefore, *ex solo timore pene vitat peccare*. This fear extols the temporal good of the creature above the Creator; it avoids sin only because sin induces a physical evil to the creature, therefore Favaroni well says that this fear is « in concupiscentia illicite rei » i. e. it is evil and has no influence on justification. *Timor serviliter servilis*.

The fifth kind of fear is precisely that of which we are treating, *timor inicialis*²¹⁾. This fear is not yet perfect charity, but it induces us to act partially from the fear of punishment, partially from the love of justice. It does avoid sin out of fear of punishment, without excluding the further notion of the offence of God, and in this it is good. *Timor simpliciter servilis*²²⁾.

The sixth kind of fear is that proper to the state of justification and divine adoption, *timor filialis*²³⁾. This urges us to observe the

¹⁹⁾ Advertendum quod timor in multiplici differentia reperitur. Est primo timor naturalis, quo omnia naturaliter timent et vitant interitum ... (f. 113 v1). Secundo est timor humanus quo timentur gravia carnis ... tertio est timor mundanus quo timetur dampna rerum extra carnem nostram ut divitiarum, bonorum, principatum, eorumque quorum ammissione dolore cruciamur. *In Apoc.* V 113 r1.

²⁰⁾ Quarto est timor servilis in concupiscentia illicite rei, de quo dicit Cicero « oderunt peccare boni iustitie amore, oderunt peccare mali formidine pene ». Qui enim ex eo non peccat quia impune non potest peccare, ex solo timore pene vitat peccare, et tunc timor servilis est. Serviliter ille facit que lex fieri iubet, non amans legem quia bona est, sed timens penam quia iusta est. De isto timore scribitur « timor non est in caritate » sed « perfecta caritas foras emmittit timorem ». *Ibid.* V 113 v2.

²¹⁾ Quinto est timor inicialis, quo partim timetur pena, partim amatur iustitia ut declinetur a malo, de quo scribitur « incipium sapientie timor domini ». *Ibid.* V 113 v2.

²²⁾ Cf. F. DIEKAMP, *Theologiae Dogmaticae Manuale*, Parisiis 1934, vol. IV, paragraph 47 (pp. 305 sqq.).

²³⁾ Sexto est timor filialis, quo solo amore iustitie, quo amatur inobliquibilis

law for its own sake and for the sake of pleasing God. This is holy, reverential fear, which it behoves any child to have towards its father.

Therefore *timor inicialis* or that fear which is the first step in our justification is indeed fear of punishment but not exclusively so. It is inspired by charity, but not as yet by perfect charity ²⁴).

But since charity indicates love of God, and we cannot love God without first knowing Him, so it comes that charity presupposes faith. Hence the very first gift infused is faith. It is at least 'natura prior' to the gift of charity, although it receives all its efficacy in the line of merit, from charity ²⁵).

In the next article of this chapter we shall have a more suitable occasion to enter into a full consideration of the efficacy of this faith. We shall now show that it has no relation, even in its nature to the fiducial faith of the Protestants.

The material object of faith is nowhere exhibited as a hope of justification, but is always a truth to which corresponds an assent of the intellect. Commenting on the classical text '*Est autem fides sperandarum substantia rerum*' ²⁶) he tells us that faith can be accepted in a twofold way, as a habit of the mind and as the object believed. Now the object is the complex of Catholic truth

rectitudo Voluntatis Divinae, vitatur et oditur peccatum. Dicitur autem timor filialis, eo quod filii sit amare patrem; amore autem timetur offensa, unde timor iste de (sancto ?) amore nascitur. *In Apoc.* V 113 v².

²⁴) Since any action to repel an evil (fuga) is of the same order as an action to acquire a corresponding good (desiderium) cf. I-II, 23, 4, his doctrine on the liceity of this fear well concords with his repeated assertions of the liceity of acting in view of eternal reward. Sed forte mercenarius es si diligis Deum et servis ei ut premium ab illo recipias ... dicunt hoc stulti quidam, et tam stulti ut seipsos non intelligant. *In Apoc.* V 30 r1; Ut illa vaniloquia cogitatio quorundam auferatur dicentium iustos et pios non debere Deum diligere intuitu hujus mercedis et hujus retributionis quam dicimus et vocamus vitam aeternam... *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 136 v2. Also *In ep. ad Gal.* A 641 23 v2 — ML. 44, 280.

²⁵) Fides enim est initium cujuslibet boni operis ... primum igitur donum nobis infusum est fides; precedit etiam in mente donum caritatis, nam quemadmodum dicit Apostolus ad Romanos 'quomodo invocabunt in quem non crediderunt' ... donum ergo fidei precedit donum caritatis in nobis; verum quod fides nisi ei associetur caritas, non erit meritoria, sed erit fides informis expectans formari per superadvenientem caritatem, quod etiam de quacumque alia noticia dicendum est. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 59 r1.

²⁶) Heb. xi, 1.

exhibited in the Athanasian Symbol²⁷⁾, which is a collection of revealed truths and not just the promise of one's own justification. Faith therefore, as opposed to infidelity is the firm assent to Catholic truth²⁸⁾. The assent of faith can be compared to the rational or scientific assent, and although in one sense it has eyes because it takes the truth on the authority of God, in another sense it is blind because it does not see the truth²⁹⁾.

We can however, apodictically exclude the doctrine of fiducial faith by the fact of the incertitude of salvation. Favaroni often goes to very diffuse and prolific explanations to prove the absolute certitude of salvation. But it is obvious that he is considering the matter from the objective point of view — or what theologians would call, in signo consequenti — for the individual can be certain of his predestination only after a particular revelation³⁰⁾.

²⁷⁾ Circa quod est advertendum quod fides dupliciter sumitur: uno modo pro illo habitu mentis quo credimus, alio modo pro illa veritate quam credimus et que est objectum fidei primo modo dicto ... alio vero modo sumitur pro illa veritate quam credimus, et que est objectum fidei que est habitus mentis, sicut cum dicitur 'fides autem catholica hec est ut Unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in Unitate veneremur' et cetera plura que ibi sequuntur: et tandem, in fine omnium iterum dicitur 'hec est fides catholica quam nisi quisquis firmiter fideliter que crediderit, salvus esse non poterit'. Illa namque que ibi narrantur et de quibus dicitur 'hec est fides catholica' sunt veritates credite, quas fideliter credimus. *In ep. ad Heb.* A 376 86 v2.

²⁸⁾ Est enim fides ut nunc de ea loquimur ut opponitur infidelitati, firmus assensus qua veritati catholice firmiter assentimus, et firmius atque constantius quam luce rationis in quacumque scientia humana. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 79 r1.

²⁹⁾ Duplex itaque est firmus assensus sine titubatione et formidine, scilicet, fidei, que est virtus theologica, et scientifica, rationis. Sed assensus fidei non videt quod credit: assensus autem rationis in luce vidit quod assertit. Et ideo, fides non alios oculos habet nisi quos habet cecus quibus certissime scit (se non ?) videre, sed propter firmum assensum circa veritatem divinam, cui infidelitas non assentit, dicitur habere oculos; sicut cecus sequens videntem et recte incedens dicitur habere oculos qui tamen sunt videntis (?) comitis ceci. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 79 r1.

³⁰⁾ ... et per hoc omnem abjicit nebulam titubationis ab oculis electorum qui scirent se esse electos, sicut ipse Paulus et ceteri apostoli, et multi sanctorum quibus revelata est eorum predestinatio et eterna electio. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 210 r1. This 'objective' point of view is very evident all through his treatment of predestination in his Commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians: v. g. Hoc dico ut excludem varias cogitationes multorum scholasticorum dicentium quod quem Deus in sua eternitate elegit et predestinavit potest numquam elegisse predestinasse aut adoptasse ... ut dicant quod quem Deus elegit et predestinavit ... potest numquam salvari propter liberum istius arbitrium, nescientes concordare liberum arbitrium cum predestinante gracia. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 47 v1.

3. Character of the Acts and their relation to the State of Justification.

Justification therefore begins with faith, dogmatic faith, which is vivified by initial charity, and both of these are divinely inspired gifts. Faith leads to fear, a simple servile fear, which averts the will from evil.

What is the relation or influence of these three acts, faith, charity and fear on the state of supernatural justification? Favaroni certainly proposes them as conditions under which man is justified; they are necessary motions of the free will on the part of man operating his own justification. But are they dispositions strictly speaking? The disposition is a positive aptitude induced in the subject for the reception of this form, and which precedes, *saltem natura*, the actual reception of the form. We could indeed further ask: do these acts entail in the subject any title of merit? Not only then would they induce a positive capacity and aptitude for the form, but also they should induce a title of congruency and expediency that the form should be communicated to the subject³¹). A clear cut answer to either of these questions is very difficult, but we shall put down what our theologian authorises.

Generally speaking, delicate questions do not appeal to Favaroni, and indeed nowhere will we find formal treatment of this particular problem. It is difficult enough to pin point the intimate relationship of preparatory acts to the state of justice in a theory making very evident the distinction of the two states by *emphasising* the entitative character of the supernatural state, as does the Thomistic theory. But as our next chapter on Justice will show, our justice is principally a justice of good works in the opinion of Favaroni — wherever we have acts of justice proceeding from an internal illumination, it could seem that there also is a state of justice. But the question is intelligible in any theory.

Favaroni records a difficulty proposed by some that even on account of works of natural virtue faith can be merited — which was Luther's allegation of the doctrine of the Scholastics!³²) — and to establish their contention they bring forward the case of

³¹) H. LENNERZ, *De Gratia Redemptoris* (Ad Usus Auditorum), Romae 1940, pp. 137-138.

³²) In *Ep. S. Pauli ad Galathas. Comment.* Opera Omnia (ed. Weimar) 40, 1, 220. Cf. H. LENNERZ, *De Gratia Redemptoris*, Romae 1940, p. 38.

Cornelius whose works were accepted unto justification even though done from natural motives ³³).

In response, our theologian flatly denies the assertion with the legitimacy of the deduction from the proposed example, and in conclusion makes a few remarks on the relation of works of natural virtue to the state of justification.

It is denied on the authority of the Apostle « Gratia enim estis salvati per fidem... non ex operibus ne quis gloriatur » ³⁴). The works of Cornelius were not purely natural but were inspired by faith. Faith begins as a remiss faith, and by the practice of good works can merit for itself an increase ³⁵). Elsewhere he tells us that the works of Cornelius were not done out of purely natural powers but with the help of grace, although they were works of the natural law ³⁶). And this indeed concords with his general principle that faith once given can merit its own increase through the practice of good works ³⁷).

³³) Clare hic loquitur Apostolus « non ex operibus ne quis gloriatur ». Fuerunt nonnulli qui dixerunt ex quibusdam bonis operibus secundum moralem bonitatem, puta ex naturali pietate cibare famelicum, operire nudum ... aliquis qui nondum sit fidelis potest mereri fidem ut fidelis fiat, et posset ad hoc favere exemplum Cornelli, de quo in Actibus Apostolorum, quod antequam esset fidelis faciens opera pietatis et orationes ad Deum habuit ab Angelo quod opera ejus accepta fuerant et orationes ejus exaudite. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 59 v1.

³⁴) Eph. ii, 8.

³⁵) Contra eos ergo, venit hec auctoritas apostolica « non ex operibus » inquit « ne quis gloriatur ». Ad illud autem quod de Cornelio inducitur dicendum est quod fides quedam incoata, licet non ad perfectum deducta, precesserat illa opera ex quibus iam nata fides meruit incrementum, quod factum est docente Petro. Multi namque, ad predicationes Petri et aliorum apostolorum concipiebant fidem quam postmodum bonis operibus imitebant, et ex ulteriori doctrina cum multiplicatis operibus ad perfectum deducebant. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 59 v1.

³⁶) Verumptamen non ad illos solum qui sub evangelio sunt, verum etiam ad illos trahenda sunt (verba Magistri) qui neque sub evangelio neque sub lege Moysi erant sicut de Cornelio dictum fuit, sicut etiam de Job dicendum esset ... valent ergo ad hoc ut cum dicit Apostolus « gentes que legem non habent, naturaliter ea que legis sunt faciunt » non intelliguntur ex solis viribus naturalibus absque adiutorio gracie illa facere: non enim excludit gratiam per hoc quod dicit 'naturaliter' illa facere; sed innuit legem naturalem naturaliter in mentibus dictantem, ut intelligantur non ex admonitione legis scripte, sed ex admonitione dictaminis rationis naturalis illa facere. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 142 r2.

³⁷) Unicuique enim fidelium Deus distribuit mensuram fidei, et ad ejus augmentum potest unusquisque propriis meritis se iuvare: precedit namque fides merita, sed et merita adaugent fidem, et iuxta etiam mensuram fidei unicuique Deus impartitur alia dona. *Ibid.* A 376 226 v1.

We can easily see therefore, the reason of his taking exception to a most exaggerated suggestion of Origen. Origen says that it appears to him from the Scriptures that no faith will be esteemed worthy of justice unless it equal the perfect faith of Abraham³⁸). Favaroni entirely disagrees with this but thinks that even a remiss faith will be sufficient to bring us to justice³⁹). Provided that man has the proper dispositions accompanying that faith — even though it is only an incipient faith — yet it will suffice for justification.

Works which precede faith have no title of merit whatsoever, but perhaps induce a certain disposition or « docility » towards receiving faith⁴⁰). This means only the curing of nature as a preparation and a greater facility in acquiring faith — evidently a merely negative disposition, of which we are not treating.

³⁸) 'Et certe si omni credenti fides reputetur ad iustitiam, sed cum ad scripturas redeo non omnibus credentibus invenio quod fides ad iustitiam reputetur. Denique scriptum est de filiis Israel « Crediderunt Deo et famulo suo Moysi »; nec tamen additur quod de Abraham scriptum est, quia reputatur illis ad iustitiam, et ob hoc arbitro quod non illis erat sicut in Abraham docuimus, ex multis partibus fidei in unum coacervata perfectio, que meretur ad iustitiam reputari'. *Ibid.* 163 vl.

³⁹) Non existimo sic intelligendum quod in nullo hominum fides ad iustitiam imputetur, nisi cuius fuerit in unum coacervata perfectio: quemadmodum est in aliquo sancto viro perfecta iustitia, in alio vero non perfecta sed incoata. ... sic et de fide arbitror esse sciendum si caritati jungatur ... Si quis, inquam, nondum ex hiis omnibus partibus coacervatam habeat perfectam caritatem (as indicated in I Cor. xiii, 4-9), habeat autem circa Deum pium affectum, debitam penitundinem peccatorum, propositum bonum non recidivandi, et quantum ei suppetunt vires, incoare opera iustitiae, non dicam hunc <non> iustificatum per fidem, et fidem ipsius non ad iustitiam reputari, licet ita incoata sit fides quemadmodum caritas.

The addition of « non » in the phrase « non dicam hunc iustificatum » is imperative in the text. Without it there is a contradiction between this phrase, which is the first dependent clause of « non dicam » and the next clause, or the second dependent clause of the same verb. To rectify the contradiction either we take away « non » from the second clause or add it to the first. If we take it away from the second phrase we have a contradiction in the context. Favaroni has expressly stated his position against Origen, whereas by omitting the « non » we get Origen's opinion, namely, that remiss faith is not sufficient for our justification. The only alternative then, is that we add « non » to the first phrase.

⁴⁰) Non est igitur cogitandum quod aliqua bona opera in infidelitate facta fidem mereantur, sed dispositionem facerent ad docilitatem et ad fidem facilius suscipiendam, qualis erat in Tiris et Sydonis, secundum beatum Augustinum, intantum quod si verba doctrine fuissent eis administrata et signa miraculorum exhibita, cito, ut dicit Salvator, penitentiam egissent in cinere et cilicio. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 59 v2.

The nearest we can come to a solution of the question on the relation of preparatory acts to the state of justification is that initial faith and charity which are only remiss, can merit their own increase. Undoubtedly a point of division between supernatural preparation (*timor servilis*) and the state itself (*timor filialis*) is insinuated, but a clear cut distinction between the two is quite impossible when we consider his own opinion on justice. Notwithstanding these ambiguities there remains the essential point that man's free will must co-operate in his own justification, and here again Favaroni shows a divergency from a most fundamental lutheran assumption.

ART. 2. THE INSTRUMENTAL CAUSE OF JUSTIFICATION.

Basing our method on the line commonly followed out in Catholic theology our main preoccupation for the present will be a consideration of our theologian's doctrine on Baptism for the '*justificatio prima*': to which we can conveniently add his doctrine on the sacrament of Penance for the '*justificatio tertia*'.

The venerable Council of Trent declares that the instrumental cause of our justification is the sacrament of Baptism, the sacrament of faith without which no one can come to justification — (*causa*) *instrumentalis* item *sacramentum baptismi*, quod est « *sacramentum fidei* », sine qua nulli umquam contigit iustificatio ⁴¹). In the canons on baptism it further specifies the nature and necessity of this sacrament, all of which is contained implicitly in the simple straightforward expression of chapter seven. Under these two headings of nature and necessity, we shall aim at presenting as completely and as objectively as we can, our theologian's doctrine on baptism.

1. *Nature of Baptism.*

He disagrees with the common distinction of « *baptism fluminis, flaminis et sanguinis* » merely for reasons of adaptability of terminology since they do not represent three distinct modes, and puts the distinction between *baptismus proprie dictus* and *baptismus improprie dictus* ⁴²). Baptism of the sword and baptism of the spirit are reduced to what he calls baptism improperly speaking.

⁴¹) DENZ., *Ench. Sym.* n. 799. Canons in nn. 857-870.

⁴²) Notandum itaque quod solet distingui triplex baptismus, videlicet baptismus

Baptism properly speaking is a sacrament of the Church, having its own matter, form and efficacy ⁴³). The matter of the sacrament is natural water, not artificial water such as wine or rose water ⁴⁴). This is what is commonly called the remote matter. The form of the Sacrament is the invocation of the Holy Trinity and, strange to say, immersion ⁴⁵). Immersion (aspersion or infusion) is usually called the proximate matter. The efficacy of the sacrament is the remittance of original sin, and, in adults, any actual sins which may be present ⁴⁶).

The sacrament of Penance he understands to remit only the debt of punishment: and so in accordance with this we consider that in adults baptism is intended for the remittal of the debt of punishment both of actual as well as of original sin ⁴⁷).

In the same context — a commentary on « an ignoratis quia quicumque baptizati sumus in Christo Jesu, in morte ipsius baptizati sumus » ⁴⁸) — but a little before his distinction of baptism, a more detailed account of the effects of baptism is given, putting it in comparison with the baptism of John and with Circumcision.

fluminis, flaminis, et sanguinis. Baptismus fluminis est que datur in aqua: baptismus sanguinis est effusio sanguinis pro Christi nomine: baptismus flaminis est interna devotio, sive Ipse Spiritus Sanctus intrinsecus mundans et lavans maculas criminum ... sed licet hec distinctio sit usitata, et a theologis et a Decretalistis, verumptamen non est conveniens: non enim debemus distinguere de triplici baptismo, sed de baptismo proprie accepto et non proprie sed pro suppleto. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 191 r2.

⁴³) Baptismus enim proprie est sacramentum ecclesiasticum, habens propriam materiam et propriam formam, et propriam efficaciam ad remissionem peccati originalis. *Ibid.* 190 r2.

⁴⁴) Materia ejus est aqua naturalis abstersiva corporalium sordium: dico autem naturalis, ita quod non sit artificialis ut aqua vitis vel rosacea, aut aliarum herbarum. *Ibid.* 191 r1.

⁴⁵) Propria forma hujus sacramenti est invocatio sancte Trinitatis et immercio. *Ibid.* 191 r1.

⁴⁶) Propria efficacia est remissio originalis peccati: remittit quidem et alia peccata, sed non est propter alia institutum, sed solum propter istum quod per nullum aliud (192 v2) ecclesiasticum sacramentum remittitur. *Ibid.* 192 r1.

⁴⁷) Cf. Secundum vero reatum (i. e. reatum pene) non remittit Deus per actum iustificationis impii, sed per actum sacramentalem qui exercetur sub potestate clavium, vel per sacramentum regenerationis ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto. Sed quoniam infantes, in infantili etate nondum sunt capaces actus iustificationis impii per quem in adultis remittitur reatus culpe, ideo in baptismo reatus culpe remittitur. *De Peccato* V 209 v1.

⁴⁸) Rom. vi, 3.

The first superiority is that the baptism of Christ cancels out all sins both original and actual, whereas the baptism of John did not remit sins at all. The baptism of John only prefigured the baptism of Christ, but in itself, it had no value at all ⁴⁹).

Circumcision remitted original sin, so that under this aspect it equalled the baptism of Christ. But the baptism of Christ excels circumcision under two other aspects for it remits actual sins and confers grace « ad extinctionem concupiscentie » ⁵⁰). In Favaroni's theory sin is remitted by the infusion of justifying grace, as we shall point out in our next chapter. Therefore this other grace « ad extinctionem concupiscentie » must be understood as sacramental grace, whose precise scope is to help us to gain the victory in the fight against concupiscence ⁵¹).

Thirdly in the baptism of Christ there is the impression of the baptismal character on the soul, which is an indelible sign in the soul ⁵²). The signification of this impression is to characterise those who profess the Christian faith ⁵³).

Having seen in complex, the effects of the sacrament of baptism, there is still a question we would like to treat a little more diffusely, and it is the question of the justification of children.

⁴⁹) Notandum autem quod de duplici baptismo legimus in scriptura: sunt enim baptismus Joannis et baptismus Christi. Baptismus quidem Joannis non dabatur in remissionem peccatorum, non enim (191 r2) fiebat in eo ablutio sordium, non extinctio viciorum, non auferebatur in eo chyrographum decreti quod erat contrarium nobis, i. e. non remittebatur reatus et debita penarum; ideo baptizati baptismo Joannis erant baptizandi baptismo Christi; figurabat enim baptismus Joannis baptismum Christi, ideo fuit sacramentum, non tamen ad sacramenta nove legis pertinuit, sed ad sacramenta veteris legis. In baptismo autem Christi plena fit extinctio peccatorum i. e. hic morimur et configuramur Christo in morte. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 191 r1.

⁵⁰) Notandum iterum quod in baptismo Christi, non solum fit remissio omnium peccatorum per quod excedit circumcisionem in qua sola remissio fiebat originalis peccati, actualium autem non; verum etiam infusio fit gracie ad extinctionem concupiscentie quod proprie pertinet ad hanc mortem: non tamen quod prorsus extinguatur sed debilitatur et paulatim mortificatur, quod nec in circumcisione nec in baptismo Joannis fiebat. *Ibid.* 191 r2.

⁵¹) Cf. S. Th., III, q. 69, a. 3.

⁵²) Fit etiam impressio characteris, que est indelibile signum in anima, quod nec in circumcisione, nec in baptismo Joannis fiebat. *Ibid.* A 376 191 r2.

⁵³) ... et quoniam in baptismo imprimitur character, quod est signum indelibile ad discernendum professos in christiana religione. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 75 v1. With this can be associated ... fit insuper incorporatio ecclesie, et professio christiane religionis. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 191 r2.

Children being incapable of eliciting an act of perfect contrition through which adults receive sanctifying grace, receive the infusion of grace and the remission of the punishment solely in virtue of the sacrament ⁵⁴).

One passage however, in his Commentary on the epistle to the Colossians seems to provide a difficulty. In it he convincingly asserts that children in baptism receive the remission of sin, but proposes as doubtful whether they receive the infusion of the « gratie et virtutes » ⁵⁵). This text, considered alone, savours very much not only of the doctrine which proposes as a possibility the remittance of sin without the infusion of grace « secundum voluntatem Dei absolutam », but also the actual remittance of sin without the infusion of grace. Such an assertion would certainly note a high degree of temerity.

First of all we may note that for Favaroni grace and virtue are the same. Our question then resolves itself to this: does Favaroni here assert that in the baptism of infants, sin is remitted without its being certain that charity or sanctifying grace is infused ?

Speaking on the intimate nature of evangelical justice we shall note a question to which our theologian alludes in express terms, namely whether or not the moral virtues are infused to children in baptism and he holds that they are not. It is possibly the same question to which he here alludes ? It is our opinion that it is.

For in his Commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians, written the year before his commentary on the epistle to the Colossians, he expressly asserts the infusion of charity to children in baptism ⁵⁶).

⁵⁴) ... sed quoniam infantes in infantili etate nondum sunt capaces actus iustificationis impii per quem in adulti remittitur reatus culpe, ideo in baptismo etiam reatus culpe remittitur. *De Peccato* V 209 v1.

⁵⁵) Omnes baptizatos in Christo Jesu Apostolus vocabat sanctos quoniam in baptismo sanctificantur, saltem per remissionem peccatorum: quod dico propter parvulos qui nondum habent usum liberi arbitrii, de quibus adhuc dubium est an in eis gratie et virtutes infundantur cum baptizantur. De adultis autem devote et pie suscipientibus sacramentum baptismatis certius est quod virtute[s] sacramenti, eis specialis gratia conferatur. *In ep. ad Coloss.* A 641 111 v2.

⁵⁶) Notandum est igitur quod in baptismo datur parvulis qui baptizantur, Spiritus Sanctus cum donis principalibus ad salutem, puta cum fide, cum spe, et cum caritate: non quidem quod pro tunc possint esse in usu, sed cum venerunt (venerint ?) ad etatem discretionis et ad usum rationis, tunc poterunt esse in usu. In adultis autem hoc idem fit si ex debita devotione veniant. Et sic isti et illi signantur in Spiritu Sancto Dei, quin ymo, ipso Spiritu Sancto, et sic Apostolus

It is then necessary to sustain that he held that children receive the supernatural theological virtue of charity in baptism. Therefore the « gratie et virtutes » of the commentary to the Colossians is to be understood of the infusion of the moral virtues to children in baptism. If this interpretation is not accepted, then for the sake of one obscure text we must admit an open contradiction not only with the text of the commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians, but also indirectly with his whole doctrine on the incompatibility of sin and grace in the same subject.

This will suffice on the nature of baptism and its effects. With the exception perhaps of the efficacy of the sacrament being restricted to the remission of the debt of punishment — which shall be examined and criticised in dealing with the sacrament of penance — the rest of the doctrine is quite orthodox.

2. Necessity of Baptism.

A summary of the general theory of the instrumental cause of justification provides us with a teaching of three means of justification. We can be justified — or, to use the exact words of the text, « we can put on the Lord Jesus Christ — either by the sacrament of baptism as children, or by faith alone as was the good thief, or by faith and works ⁵⁷). Are these means to be understood disjunctively one from the other, so that man may freely choose the means he prefers ? Or must we understand them as being an enumeration of all possible means of justification, both ordinary and extraordinary, so that in an absolute sense it is true that all three are means of justification, but only in certain cases will faith alone or faith with good works justify, and even then they require their subordination to the sacrament ?

intelligit hic eos signatos, quoniam presupponit eos sanctificatos in baptismo. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 75 v2.

⁵⁷) Tripliciter igitur contingit induere Dominum Jesum Christum; vel per solum sacramentum sicut parvuli per baptismum ... vel per fidem Jesu Christi et devotionem ad Ipsum, sicut latro qui in fine suo salvatus est per solam fidem et devotionem absque operibus; vel tertio, per fidem et opera fidei, sicut Augustinus ante baptismi gratiam, et alii catechumeni qui ante susceptum sacramentum baptismatis bene vivunt secundum ecclesiasticam legem, nam et ipsi iustificantur per fidem Jesu Christi etiam ante baptismum, habentes namque fidem que per dilectionem operatur; per fidem et opera induunt utique Dominum Jesum Christum. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 233 v2. How well would this text have served A. V. Mueller if he had discovered it!

We shall begin by investigating what does Favaroni understand by the term « faith alone ».

He puts himself the question as to why S. Paul in almost the whole of chapters three and four of the epistle to the Romans, abrogates the works of the law, and constitutes man's justification by faith alone, when elsewhere he commends only that faith that worketh by charity, and active faith is so commended by our Divine Lord and by St. James ⁵⁸). He answers that St. Paul does not mean to exclude evangelical works, but only the works of the Mosaic law ⁵⁹), and then offers two possible interpretations of the text. Firstly then, faith alone does not exclude the works of the New Law.

Secondly, charity and other internal dispositions are always mentioned when he is speaking of « faith alone ». We need only recall to mind his diverse formulae on the justification of the good thief who, he asserts, was justified by « faith alone » — « per fidem et dilectionem justificari » ⁶⁰). « per fidem Jesu Christi et devotionem in ipso sicut latro » ⁶¹), « per solam fidem et devotionem absque operibus » ⁶²), « per fidem formatam caritate » ⁶³). Not incongruously then, might « absque operibus » be understood as exterior works to which one is not obliged in the case of impossibility ⁶⁴).

⁵⁸) Sed iterum circa intentionem Apostoli in toto fere isto textu non immerito dubitatur, quomodo Apostolus opera legis abroget, et per solam fidem constituat iustitiam hominis, cum alibi non commendat fidem nisi que per dilectionem operatur, et Jacobus in canonica sua dicat « fides sine operibus mortua est », quod si mortua est non potest vivificare ... et Dominus in evangelio « si diligitis me, mandata mea servate » ... et tota fere scriptura, eciam novi testamenti, de operibus admonet. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 163 r1.

⁵⁹) Ad hoc autem dicendum quod doctrina, que hic tradit Apostolus, non ad hoc est ut opera evangelica negligamus, nec loquitur solum in articulo mortis, aut in alia necessitate, in qua aliquis constitutus non valet operari, quemadmodum videbatur habere exemplum de latrone, sed duo admonet Apostolus in istis locis... *Ibid.* A 376 163 r2.

⁶⁰) *Ibid.* A 376 163 v2.

⁶¹) *Ibid.* A 376 233 v2. supra n. 57.

⁶²) *Ibid.* A 376 233 v2. supra n. 57.

⁶³) Cum ergo dicit Apostolus « gratia estis salvati per fidem » non quamcumque fidem intelligit, sed fidem formatam per caritatem. *In ep. ad Eph.* A 641 59 r1.

⁶⁴) Non fides illa mortua ... cum iustitia vita sit anime: ideo in omnibus locis in quibus Apostolus commendat fidem, intelligenda est fides que per dilectionem operatur et (circa) tria sunt videlicet, credere, et credendo diligere, et diligendo bene operare; sed si non datur facultas operandi opera exteriora, fides diligens et dilectio credens sufficit. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 217 v1.

But we have not yet excluded the contentions of Luther and official Protestantism when they speak of justification by faith alone without good works. For they allow that faith alone without some accompanying intellectual disposition such as hope or charity, is impossible, but with manifold distinctions they try to exclude these accompanying acts from all influence on justification and attribute the real causal element to faith alone ⁶⁵).

And here again, in the kernel of the question, we see the discrepancy between Favaroni and Luther. For our theologian, justice is essentially charity, not only in the sense that the state or permanent possession of charity is the state of justice, but it is charity that justifies ⁶⁶), evidently even from the start. And he explicitly tells us that faith justifies through the medium of charity ⁶⁷). Faith is the beginning of justification, but it is charity that effects justification.

Hence we can truly say that the expression « justification by faith alone without good works » exhibits in Favaroni a really orthodox signification, although it may be considered dangerous on account of how the lutherans afterwards abused it. By this expression St. Paul wishes to exclude the Mosaic law ⁶⁸), and perhaps, also exterior works in the case where they are impossible, but certainly does not exclude interior acts, and least of all does he wish to exclude charity, to which the real efficacy of justification is constantly attributed.

Regarding their efficacy for justification « faith alone » and

⁶⁵) F. PRAT, *The Theology of St. Paul*, London 1927, ii, 233 sqq., Appndx. V.

⁶⁶) Quarta Conclusio: Sola caritas in homine est, per essentiam suam, vera iustitia, per quam homo iustificatur et iuste vivit coram Deo. *De Merito Christi*. V 225 vl.

⁶⁷) ... non, inquam, hec fides excludit hec precepta legis (i. e. praecepta moralia), sed ipsam introducit, quoniam per hanc fidem diffunditur caritas Dei in cordibus nostris, et IPSA MEDIANTE iustificat. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 174 r1.

⁶⁸) In commenting on Rom. iii, 28 « Arbitramur etc. » he first says that St. Paul does not here wish to exclude the New Law (cf. supra n. 59) and continues: Sed duo admonet Apostolus in istis locis: unum est quod opera legis mosayce numquam efficacia fuerunt ad iustificandum eciam cum fide Jesu Christi... Secundum quod hic advertit Apostolus est quod hec opera que jubet evangelium praequirunt et exigunt iustificationem in spiritu, que fit per fidem Jesu Christi ... Omnes autem christianos primo docet per fidem et dilectionem iustificari, deinde opera exhibere, quoniam iustitia que est per fidem Jesu Christi iustificabit et opera, ut et ipsa iusta sint et gloriam habeant apud Deum. *Ibid.* A 376 163 r2.

« faith and good works » coincide, for charity is the active element of justification in both of them. Both can be reduced to « baptismus flaminis » or « interna devotio sive Ipse Spiritus Sanctus intrinsecus mundans et lavans maculas criminum » ⁶⁹⁾.

Our central question of the necessity of baptism may therefore, be reduced to this: does baptismus flaminis include the « votum sacramenti » or not, so as to effect justification ? Is it, or is it not, subordinated to the sacrament ? Or, to frame the question in the terminology of Favaroni: does baptismus improprie dictus, of which he mentions two kinds, martyrdom and contrition ⁷⁰⁾, necessarily entail a subordination to the baptismus proprie dictus ?

Martyrdom and contrition are not called baptism because in themselves they have not the efficacy of remitting sin. Sin is remitted by the direct intervention of God, when the reception of the Sacrament is rendered impossible by circumstance ⁷¹⁾.

Martyrdom does not remit sin but postulates its remission. But in order to do this it must include the desire of baptism ⁷²⁾. The reason for this is the simple fact that baptism was instituted. By the institution of baptism as a sacrament all other means coming under the name of baptism were subordinated to it, nor will these secondary means suffice as long as the sacrament can be had. In the case of impossibility God, by direct intervention, supplies for it — baptismus pro suppleto ⁷³⁾.

⁶⁹⁾ In ep. ad Rom. A 376 191 r2. cf. supra n. 57.

⁷⁰⁾ Effusio vero sanguinis, sive passio vel martirium pro Christi nomine, aut assertione fidei, aut iustitie defensione aut observantia, non est proprie baptismus, sed est ibi suppletum quando sacramentum illud haberi non potest... 191 v2. De baptismo vero flaminis hoc idem dicendum est... Ibid. A 376 191 v1.

⁷¹⁾ Non est ergo quod passio ipsa vel martirium habeat vim et efficaciam baptismi ad remittendum peccatum, sed supplet ibi, ut dictum est, omnipotentis benignitas: alioquin multo plures essent baptismi quam tres... Ibid. A 376 191 v1.

⁷²⁾ Est ergo hic diligenter considerandum quod omnis passio que pro Christo, aut pro confessione fidei, pro defensione iustitie, aut cujuscumque alterius pie cause, similiter omnis fructuosa penitentia, omnis similiter bona vita et meritoria presupponit sacramentum baptismatis, aut in re, sicut est communis usus ecclesie, aut in desiderio habendi, ut in martiribus nondum baptizatis, si habere non possunt sacramentum hoc saltem in desiderio habeant, aut in fide qua credunt se habuisse, sicut si aliquis non fuit baptizatus, credat tamen se fuisse baptizatum, sicut habetur casus de presbytero non baptizato in capitulo « Apostolicam Sedem ». Ibid. A 376 191 v1.

⁷³⁾ Ex quo istud sacramentum institutum fuit presupponitur altero dictorum

The same is true of baptismus flaminis. When in an adult there is « fides et devotio sacramenti » — which comprehends, as we already know, « fides absque operibus » — but the actual reception of the sacrament is impossible, the mercy of God supplies the want ⁷⁴).

It seems therefore quite conclusive that Favaroni explicitly asserts the dependence and subordination of the auxiliary means of justification to the sacrament, nor will these secondary means suffice as long as the sacrament can be received.

There remains for us solely to consider the accusation that Favaroni teaches that the efficacy of the sacrament is due, not to the sign of the sacrament, but to the « fides sacramenti » just as Luther taught ⁷⁵). It is pitiable to read this accusation in A. V. Mueller and in the theologian he so unjustly condemns. He accuses Favaroni of teaching that penance does not remit sin; in this he is wrong for Favaroni teaches the efficacy of the sacrament to remit the punishment due to sin. Secondly he asserts that this theory is based on the distinction between « fides sacramenti » and « sacramentum fidei » there is not even one expression to warrant this assertion. A brief consideration of the text and context of the phrases alleged by Mueller will suffice to dissipate this stupid objection.

The context is the commentary on « arbitramur hominem justificari per fidem sine operibus legis » ⁷⁶). Favaroni begins by recording how Origen exemplifies this in the New Law ⁷⁷), bringing forward

modo, nec remittitur originale peccatum donec perdurat tempus quo possit haberi. Cum vero tempus expiraverit et non hujus negligentia sed impossibilitas habendi fuit in causa, tunc supplet ibi Omnipotentis benignitas, sicut de actualibus peccatis dixi... *Ibid.* A 376 191 v1.

⁷⁴) De baptismo vero flaminis hoc idem dicendum est; quecumque enim vera contritio, quecumque bona devotio antecedere debet baptismum in homine adulto iudeo vel gentili, vel fidem hujus sacramenti, neque enim per solam contritionem, aut devotionem aut fidem sacramenti remittitur originale peccatum sed per superadveniēns (ms. is incomplete) inveniret remissa esse originale peccatum, quod falsum est. Requiritur ergo contritio propter actualia peccata delenda, devotio vero et fides propter usum rationis quam habet adultus, cujus carentia excusatur parvulus a devotione et fide, sed sufficit ei fides offerentium vel parentum: in adulto ergo si adest fides et devotio sacramenti, et ipsum sacramentum haberi non possit, supplet vicem sacramenti Omnipotentis benignitas. *Ibid.* A 376 191 v2.

⁷⁵) A. V. MUELLER, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁷⁶) Rom. iii, 28. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 160 r1 sqq.

⁷⁷) ... Quod pulchre ostendit Origenes exemplificari in novo Testamento. *Ibid.* A 376 160 r1.

the case of the good thief ⁷⁸⁾, and the sinner in the city ⁷⁹⁾. « Sine operibus legis » would therefore be « sine operibus legis evangelicae » or even « sine sacramentis ecclesiae ». And as further possible exemplification he himself adduces — as he explicitly reminds us — certain cases from the « Decretales » in which the suscipient was considered by the Roman Curia to have been saved even though the sacrament was invalidly conferred. But he refuses to allow a general rule on salvation by faith alone from these examples.

The first case is « Debitum de baptismo et ejus effectu » ⁸⁰⁾. A Jew, in the impossibility of having the sacrament of baptism at the hour of death flung himself into a river saying « ego me baptizo » and as the text of the decretals says « si talis continuo discessisset ad coelestem patriam protinus evolasset, propter sacramenti fidem etsi non propter fidei sacramentum ». But in spite of this Favaroni denies the legitimacy of concluding to a general rule ⁸¹⁾.

The second case, « Apostolicam Sedem » ⁸²⁾, is that of a priest who, though reputedly baptised, in reality was not. Nevertheless « quia in Sancte Matris Ecclesiae fide et Christi nominis confessione perseveraverit » he can be believed to be saved.

The third case, « A nobis est saepe quaesitum » ⁸³⁾ is referred to by Favaroni, but without comment.

And once again he denies that we can deduct from this example a universal rule. « Sine operibus legis » for Favaroni excludes only the works of the Mosaic Law ⁸⁴⁾. Even though in certain particular cases man was justified and came to salvation by faith in the sacrament, Favaroni does *not* accept this as an explanation of the general and universal assertion of the Apostle. Far then from minimising the necessity of baptism he confirms it ; and no other con-

⁷⁸⁾ Lk. xxiii, 39-44.

⁷⁹⁾ Lk. vii, 36-50.

⁸⁰⁾ C. 4, Greg. IX, L. 111, T. 42.

⁸¹⁾ Non tamen ex hoc dicere debemus, iustificari hominem per solam fidem sine sacramentis ecclesie, et operibus evangelice legis. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 160 r2.

⁸²⁾ C. 2, Greg. IX, L. 111, T. 43. Cf. DENZ., *Ench. Sym.* n. 388.

⁸³⁾ C. 28, Greg. IX, L. V, T. 39.

⁸⁴⁾ Non tamen propter hoc et similia exempla dicere debemus arbitrari nos salvari hominem sine operibus evangelice legis et sine sacramentis ecclesie. Videntum est ergo quid hic pretendit Apostolus, ut ita hoc dicat de operibus legis Mosayce, ut non velit ea intelligi de operibus legis evangelice et de sacramentis ecclesie; et tamen sit primo hominem intrinsecus iustificari per fidem quam opera acceptabilia faciat et sacramenta ad salutem accipiat. *Ibid.* A 376 160 v1.

tention will stand the test of an objective and unprejudiced inquiry.

In order that those interested may be able to see for themselves that Favaroni faithfully, as we have said, relates the case from the Decretales, we give here for reference, his own complete text:

Nam si aliquis iudeus aut gentilis bene disponatur per fidem Jesu Christi, ut recipiat utique fidem Jesu Christi, et in articulo mortis constitutus, solam fidem habens sacramentorum, preventus morte non posset sibi subveniri, in sola fide sacramentorum salvetur, sicut patet per diversas decretales: et primo per capitulum « debitum de baptismo et ejus effectu » ubi habetur casus quod quidam iudeus fidem reciperet Jesu Christi et incorporari volebat ecclesie atque baptizari; quod sentientes alii iudei volebant ipsum interficere. Ipse vero, fugiens a facie persequentium, et perveniens ad quamdam aquam, semetipsum immisit expectans mori dicens « ego me baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti ». Queritur hic a Patribus annon fuerit vere baptizatus, et respondent Patres quod non; quoniam quemadmodum in generatione carnali, alius est qui generat, alius qui generatur, sic in regeneratione spirituali, alius debet esse qui baptizat, alius qui baptizatur: verumptamen ille, si interfectus fuisset, utique salvus fuisset, non quidem propter sacramentum quod non veraciter habebat, sed propter fidem sacramenti. *In ep. ad Rom. A 376 160 r2.*

3. The Sacrament of Penance.

In the question of the efficacy of the sacrament of Penance he records two opinions. The first, which he ascribes to Peter Lombard, maintains that the Priest does not absolve the sinner but only declares him to be absolved⁸⁵). In this case there can scarcely be question of « efficacy » because the virtue of the sacrament terminates neither at the guilt of sin nor at the punishment for sin, but would be a mere declaration of what grace alone had accomplished.

The second opinion he attributes to Hugo of St. Victor⁸⁶), which allows more ample power to the priest. Sin causes two effects,

⁸⁵) Magister Sententiarum in quarto libro dicit quod sacerdos, auctoritate clavium non absolvit peccatorem sed ostendit absolutum; dicit enim quod peccata remittuntur per solam contritionem pro quo adducit... *In ep. ad Rom. A 376 159 bis r2.* Cf. Petri Lombardi IV Sent. D. 18, c. 5. 6.

⁸⁶) Cf. De Sacramentis II, p. XIV, c. 8. ML. 176, 565.

the incurrance of a debt of justice and the incurrance of a debt of punishment; from the first, God alone absolves by the infusion of contrition, from the second the ministers of the Church absolve⁸⁷⁾. Lazarus — a figure of the sinner — was doubly bound viz. in death and by his shroud: Christ alone rose him from the dead, but He delivered him to the Apostles to be released from the bindings⁸⁸⁾. So it is with the sinner, dead because deprived of the life of grace, and bound because obliged to punishment⁸⁹⁾. God alone raises him from the dead by the infusion of grace, but he commits him to the ministers of the Church to solve him from the debt of punishment. This position constitutes a real power of absolution in the strict sense as regards the debt of punishment, while allowing only a declarative power as regards the debt of guilt.

In the present context our theologian opts for neither of these opinions, but remits us to his tract on original sin — *sicut diffusius tractavi et ostendi in tractatu de peccato originali* — where indeed he speaks quite decisively.

Here he expressly teaches the double release corresponding to the double debt. From the debt of justice God alone can absolve who alone can justify the unjust. From the second debt, the debt of punishment God absolves by means of the sacraments, either baptism or penance, as the case may be⁹⁰⁾. The debt of justice

⁸⁷⁾ Cf. Heinrich WEISWEILER, S. J., *Die Wirksamkeit der Sakramente nach Hugo von St. Viktor*, Freiburg (Breis.) 1932.

⁸⁸⁾ Dicit enim Hugo quod utique sacerdos absolvit a penis debitum pro peccatis quemadmodum Apostoli vere absolverunt Lazarum ligatum quem Christus resuscitaverat. Dicit enim et bene quod peccator figurabatur in Lazaro; circa quem duo considerare debemus scilicet quod mortuus erat et ligatus: a morte quidem solus Christus resuscitavit, ligatum vero solvendum tradidit Apostolis. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 159 bis r2.

⁸⁹⁾ ... quemadmodum peccatorem quem considerare debemus mortuum et ligatum; mortuum quidem quia privatum vita gratie et ligatum quia obligatum ad penas. A morte quidem solus Christus resuscitavit per infusionem gratie quod fit in contritione peccatoris sed solvendus a penis committitur ministris ecclesie. *Ibid.* 159 bis r2.

⁹⁰⁾ Duos igitur reatus contraxit ex actu adulterii (209 v1) perpetrati reatum videlicet culpe qui est debitum habende iustitie et reatum pene qui est debitum luende miserie. A primo reatu solus Deus absolvit qui solus est qui iustificat impium et in ipso actu iustificationis absolvit ipsum quoniam per actum iustificationis remittitur talis reatus in adultis... Secundum vero reatum non remittit Deus per actum iustificationis impii sed per actum sacramentalem qui exercetur

must already be cancelled out before receiving the sacrament ⁹¹⁾ and this contention, he thinks, is supported by the statement of St. Augustine that one ought to approach the sacraments « correctus et emendatus » ⁹²⁾.

We may be allowed to recall that baptism in children cancels the debt of justice ⁹³⁾ since children cannot elicit an act of contrition. This contrast between the justification of adults and the justification of children is of itself, an apodictic proof of intrinsic justice.

Would it follow from this doctrine that one in the state of justice could be condemned to eternal damnation? For if with the help of grace but through his own acts, man can come to be justified without thereby the debt of punishment being remitted, then it would seem possible for him to die in the state of grace but with the debt of punishment? To answer this question we must distinguish clearly the mode of justification.

Favaroni is quite explicit in the affirmation that man could receive gratuitously at birth the state of justice but nevertheless incur the liability to eternal damnation ⁹⁴⁾, and for such a one the sacrament of baptism would be necessary ⁹⁵⁾. Nay more, this state of affairs was actually realised in those sanctified in their mothers' womb ⁹⁶⁾. To these justice was restored out of the pure liberality

sub potestate clavium vel per sacramentum regenerationis ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto. *De Peccato* V 209 r2.

⁹¹⁾ Non enim ipsa culpa vel obliquitas in opere operato contra beneplacitum divine voluntatis lavatur per lavacrum aliquod ecclesiasticum sed per lavacrum potius quod est ipse Spiritus Sanctus vel gratia per Ipsum diffusa (188 r1) in cordibus nostris dirigens affectum internum et intentionem operantis: hoc namque peccatum debet prius esse deletum per infusionem gratie antequam ad aliquod ecclesiasticum lavacrum accedamus quoniam correctus et emendatus debet accedere ad ecclesiastica sacramenta ut per ea abluatur a peccato quod est reatus pene. *De Perfecta Iustitia* V 187 v2.

⁹²⁾ Contra Julianum vi 19 ML. 44, 860.

⁹³⁾ Cf. supra n. 54.

⁹⁴⁾ Prima (sub-conclusio) est ista: Stat aliquem concipi in originali iustitia et tamen contrahere per originem reatum eterne damnationis. *De Peccato* V 211 r2.

⁹⁵⁾ Secunda (sub-conclusio): Stat aliquem infantem concipi et nasci cum originali iustitia et tamen opus habere deferri ad sacramentum baptismatis. *Ibid.* V 211 r2.

⁹⁶⁾ Staret certe quod aliquis nasceretur originem trahens ab Adam cum ipsa originali iustitia et tamen contraheret originale peccatum... (181 r1) quinyomo

of God — supremely independent in the distribution of His own gifts — without their being liberated from the debt of punishment. They had to undergo the ordinary means instituted to be freed from this debt.

If however we consider the case of one justified through his own personal acts then it is not possible that he die in the state of justice and yet be condemned to eternal death. For by rising from mortal sin to the state of grace and meriting thereby the beatific vision, he merits also the liberation of the debt of punishment as incompatible with the beatific vision ⁹⁷). This also was the position of Hugo ⁹⁸).

In connection with this last point it would be of interest to see if Favaroni inficiates the necessity of the sacrament of penance, and in this would be a forerunner of the lutherans. If justifying contrition is necessarily bound up with the *votum sacramenti* then the necessity of the sacrament remains intact, for the desire of the sacrament implies a recurrence to the power of the keys, and so the remission of the sin is subordinated to the power of the keys. If however it does not include the intention of having the sacrament, then we might justly conclude that it is to be considered disjunctively from the power of the keys, and so would inficiate the necessity of the sacrament.

Hugo of St. Victor, the source from which this doctrine is taken, retains intact the absolute necessity of the sacrament of Penance ⁹⁹). Certainly baptism is necessary with that necessity which Catholics hold ¹⁰⁰), and regarding the remission of the debt of punishment

quisquis in ventre sanctificati sunt sicut Samson et Jeremias et Joannis Baptista et quisque fuerint alii simul sanctificati, erant et subditi peccato originali nam adhuc obligabantur ad circumcisionem per quod delebatur in eis originale peccatum. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 180 v2.

⁹⁷) Quinta conclusio: quelibet creatura rationalis resurgens a culpa mortali et de cetero Deum amans perseveranter quam de condigno meretur premium beatificum tam de condigno meretur liberari ab utraque pena prefata ... quoniam non stat ipsam creaturam pati penam illam (i. e. aeternam) et consequi beatificum premium. *De Merito Christi* V 236 vl.

⁹⁸) Heinrich WEISWEILER, S. J., *Die Wirksamkeit der Sakramente nach Hugo von St. Viktor*, Freiburg (Br.) 1932.

⁹⁹) Amadée TEETAERT O. M. Cap., *La Confession aux laïques dans l'Eglise Latine depuis le VIII^e jusqu'au XIV^e siècle*, Paris 1926, pp. 124-125.

¹⁰⁰) DENZ., *Ench. Sym.* (ed. 23) 796. 861.

usually baptism and penance are equiparated by Favaroni ¹⁰¹). Baptism, although it remits actual sins is instituted only on account of original sin ¹⁰²), and is therefore necessary for the remission of original sin. It seems legitimate to conclude that a corresponding necessity is concomitant with that sacrament which was instituted for the debt due to actual sin.

Examining this theory from an historical point of view we can immediately see how far away it is from the doctrines of Wicliff or Luther, both of whom taught the absolute futility of confession ¹⁰³). For Favaroni there is a real utility in confession, namely, the remission of the debt of punishment ; and all the presumption is on his side — in the absence of adequate testimony for a really decisive verdict — that he taught the absolute necessity of the sacrament.

From a dogmatic point of view however, the theory is unsustainable for other reasons. And first of all, the Council of Florence identifies the « res » of the sacrament with the remission of sin ¹⁰⁴): we cannot interpret this as the remission of punishment only, as the Council should have said so... Nor would it be sufficient to say that in the sacrament contrition is contained by which the guilt is remitted: for this would mean that remission could not be attributed to the whole sacrament, nay, not to the sacrament at all since the remission would not be accomplished « virtute formae », which nevertheless, the Council teaches ¹⁰⁵). The Council of Trent is clearer e. g. in Sess. XIV, c. 3, it says « Sane vero res et effectus hujus sacramenti quantum ad ejus vim et efficaciam pertinet, reconciliatio est cum Deo » ¹⁰⁶). There also we are told that it is in the form that

¹⁰¹) Secundum vero reatum non remittit Deus per actum iustificationis impii sed per actum sacramentalem qui exercetur *sub potestate clavium* vel per sacramentum regenerationis ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto. *De Peccato* V 209 v1.

¹⁰²) Baptismus enim proprie est sacramentum ecclesiasticum habens propriam materiam et propriam formam et propriam efficaciam ad remissionem peccati originalis ... propria efficacia est remissio peccati originalis; remittit quidem et alia peccata sed non est propter alia institutum sed solum propter istud quod per nullum aliud (192 v1) ecclesiasticum sacramentum remittitur. *In ep. ad Rom.* A 376 192 r2.

¹⁰³) DENZ., *Ench. Sym.* (ed. 23) 587. 670. 744-755.

¹⁰⁴) DENZ., *ibid.*, 699.

¹⁰⁵) DENZ., *ibid.*, 695. 699.

¹⁰⁶) DENZ., *ibid.*, 896.

the power of the sacrament principally resides ¹⁰⁷). In the next chapter the Council teaches that although attrition is not, of itself, sufficient for the remission of sin, yet it is sufficient with the sacrament for grace ¹⁰⁸). In chapter six it is laid down that the office of the priest is not merely to declare that sin is remitted, but that his power is truly judicial ¹⁰⁹). And again the impossibility imposes itself of interpreting « judicial » as being restricted to the punishment of sin.

Hence this theory of Favaroni, although it has no lutheran tendencies, is nevertheless to be rejected.

Nicolaus TONER, O. E. S. A.

(To be continued).

¹⁰⁷) Docet praeterea Sancta Synodus sacramenti poenitentiae formam, in qua praecipue ipsius vis sita est ... DENZ., *ibid.*, 896.

¹⁰⁸) DENZ., *ibid.*, 898.

¹⁰⁹) DENZ., *ibid.*, 902.