

**The Thomas More Institute for Adult Education  
Montreal, Canada**

**The Redemption**

by

**Bernard Lonergan S. J.**

This is the recording of his lecture, in the course *The God of Christian Teaching* at the Thomas More Institute, Montreal, 1958-59. The lecture was given September 25, 1958.

It is impossible to cover adequately such a topic as the Redemption in a single lecture, and I don't know just how far I will be able to take the subject in the time at my disposal. To indicate very summarily its magnitude, I would like to give a few bibliographical indications.

J. Rivière devoted his life to the question of the Redemption. He published his doctoral thesis about 1905, and he kept writing on it until about 1949 when he died. He wrote the article on the Redemption in Volume 13 of the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*\*, and at its end in fine print you will find several pages of bibliography up to 1937.

Supplementary bibliography you will find in Rivière's "*Le Dogme de la Rédemption dans la Théologie Contemporaine*" published at Albi in 1948, which adds further bibliography for the next ten years.

Anglican theologians particularly, and in general non-Catholic theologians in England, have written extensively on the Redemption. There is a book of this decade by T.H. Hughes, a non-catholic, "*The Redemption in Recent Theology*". At the end there are about 60 titles of books on the Redemption written by non-catholic authors, in England. English-speaking Catholics have a very low production in the field of theology, nothing compared with France and Germany.

In recent thinking on the Redemption, an outstanding figure is Stanislas Lyonnet, who, for the past fifteen years at least, has been professor at the Biblical Institute in Rome and publishing in "*Verbum Domini*". It is a periodical. The articles are mainly in Latin, articles written by himself and also by his doctoral students (for example Father Stanley's study on Romans 4,25 was done under Father Lyonnet) giving the exegesis, the study of the main scriptural texts relevant to the Redemption, and the history of the exegesis of those texts: mainly the history of what has been said in the Church by the Fathers and the theologians and the exegetes during the whole history of the Church.

If you want books after 1947, there is a Spaniard by the name of Xiberta, who published in 1957 a two volume "*De Verbo Incarnato*" and he has about ten pages of bibliography of the last decade. There is also a book in Italian by a man by the name of Moraldi: mainly a discussion in Italian of Hebrew words and customs. His thesis is that the notion of expiatory substitution does not occur in the Book of Leviticus. Charles Novel has written a doctoral thesis published in 1954 - it is simply mimeographed - on the development of the notion of Redemption in the Old Testament. It is in French, a doctoral thesis at the Catholic Institute of Lyons. I would also like to mention the existence in French, for those who can read French, of Pirot-Clamer; you have probably heard of it in any biblical courses you have had; which is an edition of the bible, vulgate latin and French translation about two lines per page, the rest is foot-notes, and you have first-class exegesis all the way through. The best results of scriptural studies are pretty well there, though you haven't got the very latest stuff. And on the Epistle to the Hebrews, as a whole aspect of the Redemption, there is the first-class commentary by Spicq in two volumes, one as an introductory volume and the other as exegesis on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

\* This is a fundamental work in all Catholic theology, composed mainly by professors in the five Instituts Catholiques in France: Paris, Lyons, Lille, Toulouse, Angers - Rivière taught at Strasburg where the German system of Catholic University Faculty holds.

The Redemption is the outstanding expression of God to man. "The Word was made flesh" was the Incarnation. The words of St. John refer primarily to the Incarnation, to the fact that one person is both God and man. But it was not simply the fact of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity assuming human nature, it was an act of communication. We express ourselves, we communicate, through the flesh, through words and gestures, the unnoticed movements of the countenance, pauses, all the manners in which, as Newman says, "Cor ad cor loquitur", the heart speaks unto the heart. And the Incarnation and the Redemption are the supreme instance of God communicating to us in this life. In heaven we shall know as we are known, but now our chief means of knowing God is through the fact of the Incarnation and the act of the Redemption. And it is not only God communicating with us, it is God giving Himself to us. The gospels repeatedly affirm that the motive of Christ's coming was love.

In Msgr. Knox's translation, the first epistle of St. John, Chapter 4, verse 9 and following, reads: "What has revealed the love of God, where we are concerned, is that he has sent his only-begotten Son into the world, so that we might have life through him." The sending of the Son is the revelation of the love of God. "That love resides, not in our shewing any love for God, but in his shewing love for us first, when he sent out his Son to be an atonement for our sins." And St. John immediately goes on to the practical application: "Beloved, if God has shewn such love to us, we too must love one another". In II Corinthians, Chapter 5, verses 18 and 19, we read: "Everything has become new. This, as always, is God's doing; it is he who, through Christ, has reconciled us to himself, and allowed us to minister this reconciliation of his to others. Yes God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, establishing in our hearts his message of reconciliation, instead of holding men to account for their sins." The sending of the Son is God's act in which he reconciles the world to him, reconciles us to him. Several similar emphases upon the love of God, you will find in such notable texts as Romans 5, 6-10 and Ephesians 2, 4. St. Augustine remarks in his De Trinitate, "even when we were God's enemies, even when we were sinners, God loved us." It is not a matter of Christ earning God's love for us, God's love for us was the prime cause and mover in the redemption.

Now that act that is found in the incarnation and in the death and resurrection of Christ is, above all, a personal communication. It is something directed to each individual soul. It is an object of his meditation, his contemplation. And each one must take from it his own fruit. As St. Ignatius in the spiritual exercises urges, the retreatant in contemplating the mysteries of the life of our Lord is to do his own thinking on each mystery and to take from the mystery the fruit that suits him, the thoughts that come to him, the affections aroused in his heart, the acts of will that arise, that are presented as possibilities to his freedom. The redemption is above all something that is accessible to everyone, no matter what his natural talents or opportunities, his cultural, intellectual or spiritual development. It is an act of human communication performed by a divine person. It is a fundamental mistake to think of some theory, some analysis, some study of the redemption as mediating between Christ's act and the individual soul. Moreover, that act of Christ's was above all a deed, something that can be seen, imagined, recalled, thought upon. It is not any abstract proposition but a deed accomplished, for each of us. St. Paul remarks incidentally talking of scandal, "Would you

scandalize your brother for whom Christ died?". St. Paul insists - he does so a couple of times - on the relevance to each individual of the redemption.

It remains that the individual apprehension and appreciation of the word of Christ is apt to be an incomplete view. It isn't wrong, mistaken, because it is incomplete. It becomes mistaken or wrong only insofar as it tends to be exclusive, as it tends to narrow down and to become fixed and static instead of growing and developing and becoming complete. And the utility of theology or of theological consideration, particularly in such a topic as this, is that it attempts to offer something of a total view, not for the purpose of replacing what one has already but for the purpose of indicating further possibilities.

A view of the Redemption is some act of mind, some act of understanding, and technically what is grasped when one understands is named an intelligibility. I wish to indicate first of all certain general aspects of the intelligibility of the Redemption, because it is a mystery and a mystery that is particularly complex. It involves things that profoundly trouble the mind of man: suffering and death and sin, forgiveness and law and so on.

The first point to be noted is that while the Redemption is an intelligibility, it is not to be thought of as a necessity. The early Protestants, the orthodox Lutherans and the orthodox Calvinists, mainly the thinkers who succeeded the first reformers, flatly affirmed that God in his justice could not possibly forgive sin, forgive the sins of mankind, unless Christ became man and suffered and died. Calvin had even gone further. He was not content with the sufferings that Christ endured at the hands of the soldiers and of Pilate, but also required that the phrase in the creed "He descended into hell" be taken to mean that Christ also suffered the punishment of the damned. The doctrine-- not Calvin's, but the doctrine that suffering is a necessary condition limiting God's goodness -- can be in some way attributed to St. Anselm. He frequently seems to be offering a theory that would explain why Christ's suffering and death was necessary. On the other hand he also qualifies what he means by necessary. And it requires very nuanced interpretive efforts to determine what precisely St. Anselm thought. As a matter of fact, his thinking at the end of the 11th century, that is in the 1,000's, was prior to any developed systematic distinction between philosophy and theology, or any systematic attempt at determining the precise nature of theological thinking and the intelligibility that theology can grasp. And the Catholic tradition on this matter is clear and uniform. St. Augustine flatly stated that there were many other ways in which God could redeem man apart from the suffering and death of Christ. The same view was repeated by Peter Lombard, whose Sentences were the basic text in theology for about three or four centuries. It was repeated by St. Thomas and Scotus and subsequently by all the theologians. And so, while there is something to be understood in connection with the redemption, that understanding is not grasping a necessity. It is not like understanding that  $2 \times 2$  must be 4. It is like understanding the law of gravitation, which is a constant acceleration, but might be some other mathematical formula without any contradiction. Intelligibility then is not the same as necessity.

In the second place, that intelligibility is not static but dynamic, not a matter of deductive but rather of dialectical thought. Its fundamental element is a reversal of roles. In the book of Genesis, we read that God said to Adam when forbidding him to eat of the fruit of the

tree, "On whatever day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die". Death is presented in the book of Genesis, in the book of Wisdom, as the penalty for sin. The same doctrine is repeated by St. Paul in Romans 5, 12, "By one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death". And again in Chapter 6, verses 21 to 23, "The wages of sin are death". Yet death is not simply and solely the wages of sin. It is by the death of Christ that we are saved. And our salvation through the death of Christ is reaffirmed continuously throughout the new testament. As St. Paul says in I Corinthians 15, 21 "a man has brought us death, and a man should bring us resurrection from the dead; just as all have died with Adam, so with Christ all will be brought to life". The theme of death and resurrection takes many forms and is constantly returning in St. Paul. And the meaning of that recurrence is that death is swallowed up in victory, the words in I Corinthians 15, 54; that what was the consequence of sin became the means of salvation. That transformation of a penalty into a means of salvation is to be understood, I think, as the antithesis of the apocalyptic, eschatological, messianic expectations that were current in Jewry at the time of Christ. They were awaiting a messias that would transform, in the twinkling of an eye, the whole human situation. The wicked would be punished and the just would triumph, in this world. But the messias that came did nothing startling to transform the world. He himself submitted to the evils of this world, to the injustice of the leaders of the Jewish religion, and to the injustice of the Roman Procurator in Jerusalem. And as you no doubt have heard, "sanguis martyrum, semen ecclesiae", the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church. There is in the death and resurrection of Christ a fundamental intelligibility that is not something like a deductive process but rather like a dialectical process: that sin leads to death and death through Christ becomes the means of salvation. That means that conditions in this world continue despite the advent of the messias, but their very continuance becomes the means by which we proceed to eternal life.

Again, the intelligibility to be reached in considering the redemption is not an abstract but an incarnate intelligibility. It exploits all the subtle relations that hold between body and mind, between flesh and spirit. Christ crucified is a symbol of endless meaning, and it is not merely a symbol but also a real death. It is again in the concrete, in the flesh of Christ, in his blood and in his death that punishment is transformed into satisfaction. And, as you no doubt are aware, the notion of punishment is an extremely difficult notion to philosophize upon. The notion of the satisfaction of Christ contains all those difficulties and the transformation of them. I would like, in connection with that notion of satisfaction, to indicate a passage in St. Thomas in the "Contra Gentiles", Book III, Chapter 158. It occurs in the context of his treatment of grace, of the necessity of grace for liberation from sin. And St. Thomas asks how man is freed from sin? And after pointing out that punishment follows upon sin by its nature, he goes on to say, in the last two paragraphs of that chapter, "one must consider that when the mind, the soul, has turned away from sin, its displeasure in sin may be so vehement and the mind's clinging to God so firm, that there may remain no obligation to any penalty. For, as may be gathered from what has already been said about penalties, a penalty suffered after the forgiveness of sin is needed that the mind cling more firmly to the good and also that the order of justice be maintained. But the love of God suffices to fix firmly a man's mind in good, particularly when that love is vehement. And one's displeasure in one's own past sins can cause the greatest sorrow. Consequently through the vehemence of one's love of God and of one's hatred of one's past sins, there can be excluded the necessity of any satisfying or purgating

penalty. And even if the love of God and the displeasure of sin does not attain that vehemence, at least it reduces the penalty required." "And, he goes on, "further, since what we can do through our friends we somehow can do ourselves because friendship makes two people one in affection and particularly when the affection is charity, so just as one can satisfy for one's own sins, so can one satisfy to God for another's. For the pain which a friend endures for another is taken, considered, by the other as though he himself were suffering. For your friend to suffer is for you to suffer. So, for a friend, a friend's sufferings are his own. And consequently the sufferings of Christ, contemplated by the sinner, who is moved by charity, are at once an incentive to his love of God and the cause of the greatest sorrow for his own sins". I think in that passage of St. Thomas, one finds clues that solve not a few of the many difficulties that can be raised in connection with the notion of satisfaction. And it illustrates what I meant when I said that the intelligibility of the redemption is not an abstract but an incarnate intelligibility. One's suffering because of the sufferings of one's own friend, is something that is intelligible and yet it is something that can be seen by us to occur only when flesh and spirit are united in a single being.

Again, the redemption is not a simple but a complex intelligibility; and I use the word 'complex' in the sense that the mathematician speaks of 'complex numbers'. The mathematician uses not only rational but also irrational numbers, not only real numbers but also imaginary numbers. And everything goes well provided he does not mix them up, provided he does not consider that they are all numbers in exactly the same sense and manner. Similarly with regard to the redemption, we must not think of it as something that will fall into a single intelligible pattern. There is in this world the unintelligibility of sin. Sin is not something that is understood. It is not something for which you can give a reason. Why did the angels sin? Why did our first parents sin? Strictly, if there were a reason why, not simply a pretence or an excuse, it wouldn't have been a sin. Sin represents a surd. It is the irrationality of a rational creature. It is not something that arises because God wants it to arise. To think of it that way is to think of it as though it were something intelligible, that admitted an explanation. Everything that is, everything that is intelligible, has an explanation. But sin is not something that is, it is a failure. And it is not something that is intelligible, it is an irrational. And so St. Thomas can say that God in no manner whatever wills the evil of guilt, i. e., the pure element that is simply sin and nothing more. God in no manner whatever wills sin and only indirectly does God will the evil of natural defects or of penalties, punishments. The Divine Will regards the good. The Divine Will permits sin. The Divine Will, as a consequence of willing an orderly universe, indirectly wills the accidents of natural defect and the natural consequences of sin. Consequently, in thinking about the redemption, one must make an effort, and it requires an effort, to avoid the tendency to think that an explanation casts everything one can think of into a single intelligible pattern. It does that insofar as what one is considering is intelligible, has a reason. But the redemption regards sin, it presupposes sin. It is the transformation of the situation created by sin. And consequently in a consideration of the redemption one has to have in mind the existence not of a simple intelligibility, but of the transcendent intelligibility of God meeting the unintelligibility of sin.

Finally the intelligibility to be reached in the consideration of the redemption, is not a single but a multiple intelligibility. It is not something that is going to be fitted into some single formula, some neat

reason. St. Anselm's "Cur Deus Homo" does illustrate the tendency to try to reduce everything to a single formula. But it was followed by a much less celebrated work about a century and a half later, about the beginning or the first quarter of the 13th century, by William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris, and its title was not "Cur Deus Homo", Why a God man?, but "De causis cur Deus Homo", on the causes or the reasons why God was made man. What William wanted to put forward was that the redemption is not a matter of some single reason but of many reasons. And William represents one of the first notable attempts to introduce Anselmian thought into the theological tradition. Peter Lombard, writing about 1150, most probably knew about St. Anselm's "Cur Deus Homo" but he wrote on the redemption without any mention of it or of the theories it contains. William of Auvergne belongs to the period when Anselm's work was beginning to influence the theological schools. St. Thomas, in the third part of the Summa Theologiae, question I, article 2, after enumerating reasons for the incarnation, about 5 or 6 from 3 or 4 different points of view, ends off the main body of the article by saying that "there are many other reasons also which transcend human comprehension." And when he treats of the nature of the redemption in the same third part, question 48, articles 1 to 5, he doesn't try to express the intelligibility of the redemption in a single formula, but he selects five different aspects. He asks whether Christ saved us by way of merit, and whether he saved us by way of satisfaction, and whether he saved us by way of redemption, and whether he saved us by way of sacrifice, and whether he saved us by way of efficiency, efficient causality.

Such, then are the general characteristics, the precautions, that one must I think take in seeking a total view of the redemption. There is an intelligibility to be grasped but that intelligibility is not a necessity. It is an expression of what God thought wise, what God thought good, and that is intelligible, but it is not an expression of what simply had to be. It is like an empirical law, not like a mathematical theory. In the second place, it is not a static but a dynamic intelligibility. It has to do with the reversal of roles: that death that is the consequence of sin becomes the means of salvation. In the third place, it is not an abstract but an incarnate intelligibility. It resides in the love Christ manifested to us and the effects of that love on us. It is not a simple but a complex intelligibility, it includes the surd. There are elements to it, namely sin, that are simply non-intelligible and there are consequences to sin that have, as it were, a devaluated intelligibility. And finally it is not an intelligibility that can be put in a single formula but exhibits many aspects.

Now I shall have something to say on the traditional five aspects enumerated by St. Thomas. Obviously I can't handle them completely. Each one could occupy several lectures. And I shall do so more rapidly for a further reason, that I wish to ask the question of how the many aspects can be brought into a single view.

First of all the death of Christ is conceived as a sacrifice. That conception occurs recurrently in St. Paul, "Christ our Pasch has been sacrificed", *etythe* (ἐτύθη). Again "Christ offered himself up as a sacrifice of sweet odor", Ephesians 5,2. It occurs implicitly at least in the statements in the synoptic gospels and in I Corinthians, on the institution of the Eucharist: "This is my body which is given for you. This is my blood which is to be shed for you for the remission of sin". But above all it is in the epistle to the Hebrews that the death of Christ is presented as a sacrifice. Chapters 1 to 3 are devoted to presenting the new mediator between God and man. And a contrast is set up with Moses who gave the

old law. Chapters 5 and 7 are concerned with the new priesthood; Chapter 8 with the new covenant, the new testament. Chapters 9 and 10 with the sacrifice of the new law, which is the sacrifice of the death of Christ and the perpetual intercession of Christ for us before God. To go into details of the conception of the death of Christ as a sacrifice would be an enormous task. I couldn't even begin to enumerate the texts of the scripture relevant to it. But it is a conception of which no doubt whatever can be entertained by a Catholic.

However, the precise sense in which there is a sacrifice raises a question that has to do with the meaning of the Greek word *hiláskesthai* (ἱλάσασθαι). On the meaning of that word, C.H. Dodd, a professor at Cambridge, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, about 1931, drew attention to the fact that the usage of the word in classical Greek was quite different from that in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint. The root of the word permitted two different meanings. The one meaning was used uniformly in the Septuagint and the other in classical Greek. In classical Greek the word *hiláskesthai* is to placate the gods, to avert their anger or vengeance. In the Septuagint *hiláskesthai* conveys the meaning of something that removes sin, that puts aside a barrier, that prevents man's access to God. As you can see, the nuance in the different meanings of *hiláskesthai* has considerable difference of implications for religious thought and religious feeling. The implications for the interpretation of the new testament in some aspects are quite certain in others less so. A clear example of *hiláskesthai* used in the sense of the removal of sins occurs in Hebrews 2, 17, where it is stated that Christ became priest in order to 'hiláskesthai' the sins of the people, and in the Vulgate "propitiaret delicta populi", *hiláskesthai* is an action exercised upon sin. And that is the Septuagint meaning of the word. It is not an action exercised upon the feelings of a God as in the rites of pagan Greece.

Another point to be noted about the interpretation, the understanding of the redemption, the death and resurrection of Christ in terms of sacrifice, is that on the one hand, the connection of sacrifice with liturgy, with prayer, with the piety of the people of God, makes it an extremely helpful mode of thought, an aspect of the intelligibility of the death and resurrection of Christ. On the other hand, because sacrifice is not traditionally, not in any but the most barbarous religions, human sacrifice - but the sacrifice of Christ is in his own blood - clearly the notion of sacrifice is not an intelligibility that exhausts the meaning of the redemption. A ritual meaning such as is connoted, a liturgical meaning such as is suggested by the name sacrifice, does not, while it conveys enormously the aspect of personal relations between the sinner and God, still does not exhaust the meaning of the reality, insofar as Christ's sacrifice was not simply a ritual act, but his own suffering and death and glorious resurrection.

A second aspect of the redemption is connected with the word redemption itself. And in the new testament, there are a variety of words employed to state that meaning. In Mark 10, 45 and Matthew 20, 28, Christ speaks of the Son of Man coming not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give himself in redemption for many. And the word *lytron* (λύτρον) is employed. And it denotes a ransom, a means of ransom. Again in I Timothy 2, 6 the word, *antilytron* (ἀντίλυτρον), a ransom in exchange, is used of the death of Christ. The verb *lytróusthai* (λυτρούσθαι) and the nouns *lýtrosis* (λύτρωσις) and *apolytrosis*, (ἀπολύτρωσις) occur repeatedly in the new testament. *Apolytrosis* is employed in a two-fold



sense, first of all of an immediate effect of the remission of sin, but also of a final effect. St. Paul, in Romans 8, 23, says we look forward to the redemption of our bodies. He means the resurrection of the body. The complete redemption is eschatological. It occurs not in this world but in the world to come. Besides, apart from *lytron*, *lytrois*, *lytrousthai*, there occur in the new testament other words from the marketplace. "You are bought with a price", "praetio redempti estis" *agorázesthai* (*ἀγοράζεσθαι*) bought in the marketplace and *exagorázesthai* (*ἐξαγοράζεσθαι*). The word price occurs: *timé* (*τιμῆ*). In connection with those frequent modes of expression and the meaning of the death of Christ in terms of the redemption, it has been noted that there are two possibilities of interpretation. The first is derived from old testament usage and the usage of Septuagint Greek. There are three Hebrew words mainly connected with the redemption. The first *pada* occurs frequently in the text of the liberation of the people of Israel from Egypt. The second *ga'al* is used predominantly in connection with their liberation from Babylon. And the third *kippur* is employed principally in connection with liberation from sin. Hebrew tradition on the meaning of the word redemption is primarily one of liberation, deliverance. It is not primarily a meaning in terms of a financial transaction. The meaning of redemption, you will find from the Hebrew viewpoint expressed in the canticle of Zachary.\* Zachary, when he recovers his speech sets forth the anticipation of deliverance and employs in that context the word redemption. And it is a fundamental mode of interpretation of what the word redemption means. "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel; he has visited his people, and wrought their redemption. He has raised up a sceptre of salvation for us among the posterity of his servant David, according to the promise which he made by the lips of holy men that have been his prophets from the beginning, salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all those who hate us. So he would carry out his merciful design towards our fathers, by remembering his holy covenant. He had sworn an oath to our father Abraham, that he would enable us to live without fear in his service, delivered from the hand of our enemies, passing all our days in holiness, and approved in his sight." The expectation of pious Jews for a redemption included the very practical matter of being liberated from the hands of their enemies. But the purpose of that liberation was tranquility so that they could pass "all our days in holiness, and approved in his sight". "And thou, my child, wilt be known for a prophet of the most High, going before the Lord, to clear his way for him; thou wilt make known to his people the salvation that is to release them from their sins. Such is the merciful kindness of our God, which has bidden him come to us, like a dawning from on high, to give light to those who live in darkness, in the shadow of death, and to guide our feet into the way of peace."

Besides the Hebrew tradition on the meaning of the word redemption, which is in terms of deliverance - deliverance for the sake of holiness - there is also a context, an interpretation, that according to Father Lyonnet, is taken from the pagan market place and the ancient practice of buying and selling slaves and captives. And in the Christian tradition, that has taken two forms. There is the form it took beginning with Origen, who conceived the death of Christ as liberating man from the devil. And that view has been attacked as highly mythical, and not all the manners in which it was expressed among the Fathers are perhaps defensible. But at least that view has this quality, that it attributes to the devil his role; that it does not make it God the Father demanding the sufferings and death of Christ, but the devil. And in that it is true to the fundamental picture presented in the new testament: that it was the chief

\*Luke 1, 68-79.

priests and Pharisees, that it was Judas and Pilate and Herod, that in the presentation of John it was the evil-doer's hatred of the light, that led to the death of Christ; and what caused the resurrection was the Father. And insofar as the Origenist interpretation or theory of the redemption in terms of the second context, namely that of buying and selling, is involved, at least it has that merit, that the sufferings and death of Christ are thought of primarily as the work of the devil. And that is also the new testament view, and it squares, it expresses as it were in terms of images and persons, the fundamental truth that redemption is concerned with sin, and sin is not intelligible. The medieval reaction against the Origenist view was begun by Abelard in France, and Anselm of Canterbury. Of course, discussions that concern Anselm are a thing that involve volumes, and Anselm is not guilty of all the crimes attributed to him. But by the fact that he is presenting his view as just a single strand - in other words, he does not present his view as one element among many, although he does not deny it - there is perhaps a weakness in his presentation, that it contains a suggestion that God wants suffering and death as a means of forgiveness of sin, when in fact in the redemption, God is making issue with wickedness and transforming sin and its effects into the forgiveness of sin and recovery.

.....

We have considered two of the five aspects of the redemption that St. Thomas singles out in the *Summa theologiae*, third part, question 89, namely sacrifice and redemption, there remain three on which I would like to make a few remarks.

The third of the five is the notion of vicarious satisfaction. I think it is well to divide it in two steps, first the vicarious suffering and second the vicarious satisfaction. The notion of vicarious suffering is very clear in the new testament. Christ not only acted on our behalf, he also suffered on our behalf. "He suffered and died for us" is the type of expression, especially "died for us" that occurs repeatedly. A person is a vicar, an agent, an attorney when he acts for another. But Christ not only acts for another but he also suffers and dies for others. In this connection, the fundamental text occurs in the old testament in Isaias, chapter 53. There are a sequence of passages beginning in chapter 42, that are known as the songs of the servant, the Ebed Yahweh but it is particularly in chapter 53 and also the last four verses of chapter 52 that there is set forth the vision of the suffering servant that in Christian tradition has been applied to Christ. I might mention that a translation in French, based upon an extreme amount of study of the text, was recently published by Father Cazelles in "*Recherches de Sciences Religieuses*" in 1955. The exegesis of the passage is a matter on which not only volumes have been written, but within this decade a bibliographical volume has been written on the works that have studied this text and been published in the last century and a half. The idea then may be taken most briefly by turning to the first epistle of St. Peter 2, 19-25: "If you do wrong and are punished for it, your patience is nothing to boast of; it is the patience of the innocent sufferer that wins credit in God's sight. Indeed you are engaged to this by the call of Christ; he suffered for our sakes, and left you his own example; you were to follow in his footsteps. He did no wrong, no treachery was found on his lips; he was ill spoken of, and spoke no evil in return, suffered, and did not threaten vengeance, gave himself up into the hands of injustice. So, on the cross, his own body took the weight of our sins; we were to become dead to our sins, and live for holiness; it was his wounds that healed you.

Till then, you had been like sheep going astray; now, you have been brought back to him, your shepherd, who keeps watch over your souls." In that passage of St. Peter, there recur expressions from Isaias 53: "He did no wrong, no treachery was found on his lips" and "His own body took the weight of our sins" and "It was his wounds that healed you", with verbal differences, minor differences, they are found in Isaias. And a similar notion is also found very briefly at the end of the fourth chapter of Romans: "He died for our iniquities and rose again for our justification".

The vicarious suffering of Christ, particularly through the influence of St. Anselm is interpreted in the church as the vicarious satisfaction of Christ. The word, satisfaction, was employed in the church in regard to the personal sins, the penance of the sinner after absolution, from about the third century. But, with the possible exception of certain Spanish liturgical works, it was not applied to the sufferings of Christ until St. Anselm wrote his "Cur Deus Homo" at the end of the 11th century. And the word 'vicarious' was first applied to the satisfaction of Christ during the 19th century, the last century. So the expression 'vicarious satisfaction' is not coeval with the life of the church itself. The word 'satisfaction' in Latin has a variety of meanings and there is a dictionary article of about twenty pages by Father Deneffe in the "Zeitschrift für katholisches Theologie" of 1921. Perhaps an influence that would prevent the word, satisfaction, being applied to a Christian interpretation of the death of Christ may be found in St. Mark's gospel, chapter 15, 15, in which it is said that Pilate wishing to satisfy the people, liberated Barabbas and has Jesus scourged and condemned to death. The idea of satisfying the people is satisfaction in an evil sense and to turn its meaning over to apply it to the sufferings of Christ before God on our behalf required time. The doctrine is implicitly Catholic doctrine. It occurs in the Council of Trent, in the sixth session on justification in Denzinger, (Denzinger-Bannwart is a handbook that contains all the symbols and pronouncements of the Councils and the Roman Pontiffs.) No. 799, in which it is stated "Christ by his most holy passion merited our salvation and satisfied for our sins". And further on in the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent on the sacrament of penance, we are given a clue to the meaning of satisfaction in the minds of the "Fathers of Trent," when the Council states, "When in satisfying we suffer for our sins, we are made similar, we are conformed to Jesus Christ who satisfied for our sins". The Council is thinking of the satisfaction of the sinner whose sins have been absolved and forgiven and nonetheless must do penance. The Lutherans particularly, in their denial of good works, deny satisfaction for sin after the remission of sin. And the Council, reaffirming the doctrine of satisfaction, suggests that there is a similarity between the satisfaction of Christ for our sins and our own satisfaction for our sins. It puts the word, satisfaction, in the context of contrition and confession; in other words, the three parts of the penitent in the sacrament of penance are contrition, confession and satisfaction. And the occurrence of the word satisfaction, the use of the analogy of the satisfaction of Christ by the Council of Trent, provides a solid basis for an interpretation of what Catholic doctrine on satisfaction is.

In Romans 8, 3, "There was something the law could not do, because flesh and blood could not lend it the power; and this God has done, by sending us his own Son, in the fashion of our guilty nature, to make amends for our guilt. He has signed the death-warrant of sin in our nature, so that we should be fully quit of the law's claim, we, who follow

the ways of the spirit, not the ways of flesh and blood". In the Vulgate and the Greek, what Msgr. Knox translates as "he has signed the death-warrant of sin in our nature", the words read literally that God has condemned sin in the flesh of Christ. The sufferings of Christ, then, are the expression of God's detestation of sin. They are also the expression of Christ's own detestation of sin. Contrition is, as you know, a matter of the detestation of sin, sorrow for sin, and purpose of amendment. And the Word was made flesh as he loved his Father above all things according to the precept that thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and thy whole soul and all thy mind and all thy strength. So also he loved us to whom he came. And that placed him in a divided position. We had offended God. We were turned away from God. We were not friends but enemies of God and Christ loved both his Father and his Father's enemies. His love of us did not in the least, and could not, lessen his detestation of sin. On the contrary, his detestation of sin, combined with his love of us caused in him the greatest sorrow that we had sinned. He was sorry for our sins because of his love for us in a manner that we can hardly be sorry, because we do not possess his knowledge of God and his love of God. Christ, the Son of God, because of his perfect knowledge and love of his Father, could detest sin as sin is to be detested and because of his love of us could feel a sorrow such as no sorrow can equal. It is the combination of love and deepest regret involved in a single situation and about the same persons. And that detestation of our sins and sorrow for them were not only acts that occur in the mind of Christ. Man not only thinks and wills, he also feels and acts. And Christ accepted his sufferings and death. He did not ask his Father for twelve legions of angels to protect him from Caiphas, and Pilate and Herod, but accepted his sufferings, because they provided an opportunity for him to communicate to us at once his love of us and his detestation of sin and his sorrow for our sins. And that interpretation of what is meant by the satisfaction of Christ is just one aspect of the matter. But I mention it particularly because it fits in so well with the passage I have already quoted to you from St. Thomas in which the sufferings of our friend can cause in us a sorrow, greater perhaps than any other suffering we could have.

Now this on satisfaction, that I am saying so briefly is the sort of thing that is batted around for weeks in theological classes and not ended off as quickly as that. I am just giving you a few leading ideas on the subject.

A fourth aspect is the merit of Christ. The merit of Christ is affirmed in the documents of the church, the pronouncements of the Councils, more emphatically perhaps than any other. The Council of Trent in the section on original sin, states that "against original sin, there is no remedy save the merit of Jesus Christ". And it reaffirms the merit of Christ again in the treatise on justification in Denzinger, Nos. 792 and 799. St. Paul in the fifth chapter of Romans, verse 19 "As by the disobedience of one man, all died, so by the obedience of one man, all are saved". Christ's obedience is also Christ's merit. A merit is a good act worthy of a recompense. And when St. Paul says that by Christ's obedience we are saved, by a very close implication one can conclude that there is an element of merit in the relationship of Christ's free act and our salvation. The freedom of Christ in dying is affirmed emphatically in St. John 10, 17. And the merit of Christ, not for us but for himself, appears in Philipians 2, 7 and Hebrews 5, 8 and also 2, 9.

Finally there is the efficiency of the death and resurrection of

Christ. Efficiency means something more than intercession. Intercession suggests what the man Jesus asks God to do for us. Efficiency is what he himself does. There are two aspects to it: what he does reigning in heaven and what he has done as an historical person, who founded a church, and down the ages has exerted an influence upon the lives of countless millions, more intimate and more profound than any other historical figure.

Now I have been speaking of redemption in terms of particular aspects: merit and efficiency, redemption and sacrifice, and vicarious satisfaction. I would like briefly to suggest how one moves towards a total view. And I think that the fundamental category is the word mystery not in the theologian's sense of a truth that we cannot adequately understand in this life, nor in the sense of Christian piety that speaks of the mysteries of the life of Christ and meditates upon the mysteries of the rosary, but in the sense of the new testament, where it refers to the secret counsel of God, the plan of God. In St. Mark 4, 11 & 12, it is stated that the apostles had been given the mystery of the kingdom of God. In Romans, at the end of chapter 16, St. Paul says, "a gospel which reveals the mystery, hidden from us through countless ages, but now made plain, through what the prophets have written; and published, at the eternal God's command, to all the nations, so as to win the homage of their faith." The mystery, hidden through all the ages and now made plain, is mystery in the sense of 'secret counsel'. A Greek word has been used to translate a Hebrew conception of Persian origin, as is clear from the old testament and from the recent findings at Qumran. There are articles on this by Vogt and by Prumm in *Biblica* of 1956; and there is also an article of Prumm in the "Supplement du dictionnaire de la bible", s.v. *Mystère*. Mystery means the secret counsel of a king, and it's in that sense fundamentally that it is employed in the new testament. When St. Paul speaks of the revelation of the mystery that is now made plain, (as he does in Ephesians and I Corinthians, chapters 1 and 2, and in the last chapter of Romans, and in reciting the hymn in I Timothy 3, 16) we have to do with God's counsel, God's plan, God's ideas, that is the divine wisdom itself, "the *polypōikilos* (*πολυποῖκιλος*), the incredibly complex, wisdom of God", it is said in Ephesians 3, 11; and again, "that in Christ all the mysteries of wisdom are hidden," in Colossians 2, 3.

That divine plan is presented in the New Testament in a variety of ways. It is spoken of as the kingdom of God, the kingdom of heaven, in Mark and Matthew particularly, also in Luke. And there are countless parables to illustrate what the kingdom of God is. After his baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, it is narrated in Mark 1, 14 and 15, that Jesus came into Galilee announcing that the time is fulfilled, and that the kingdom of God is at hand, repent and believe. This theme of the kingdom of God goes back to what lies at the origins, perhaps, of Jewish messianic expectation. You know the kingdom was introduced under Samuel to end the theocracy, the direct rule of God over his people. And when the kings were introduced, God said to Samuel — Samuel the prophet did not like this and he complained and God said to him, — "It is not you they are rejecting, it is I". Consequently to that introduction of the kings, there developed the notion of the messias, the anointed one of God, who was to come and be the king and establish God's own kingdom, so that the notion of the kingdom and of the theocracy would be as it were coincident. And when Christ announces the kingdom of God, he is drawing upon a rich background of Jewish memories and traditions. The exposition of what the kingdom is and means, and so on, occupies the

greater part of the synoptic gospels, for example the parables of the kingdom in Matthew 13. Now the same notion in Colossians 1,11, you have a reference to the kingdom;"... God our Father . . . . . for rescuing us from the power of darkness, and transferring us to the kingdom of his beloved Son".

The same theme of the kingdom takes another form in the new testament: of the body of Christ, which has a fundamental statement in Romans 12, 4 and 5; a fuller statement, I Corinthians, chapter 12 and Ephesians, chapter 2. And the body of Christ is also the church of Christ.

The structure of this mystery, whether spoken of as the kingdom, the inauguration of the kingdom, the Body of Christ, the foundation of the church, is set forth in the new testament in terms of antitheses.

There is the antithesis of the old law, which is recurrent particularly in Galatians and Romans, where law and sin and wrath and death, are contrasted with the promise made to Abraham and justice and grace and life. It is the presentation of our life in Christ Jesus in terms of an antithesis to the old law. It is a theme that is constant in Galatians, and particularly the first three chapters of Romans, also to some extent the fourth, and again in chapters 6, 7 and 8 (of Romans).

It is also set forth in the antithesis of the first and second Adam. And there the contrast is not between the kingdom of Christ, the body of Christ and the old law, but between redeemed humanity and humanity without redemption. That you will find particularly in such passages as I Corinthians 15, 21 and 45-49; and Romans 5, 12-21.

The same general antithesis that St. Paul expresses in terms of the first and second Adam is found in St. John between the world and darkness and law and sin and, on the other hand, life and truth and grace and light. And to enlarge upon those themes would be to go through the whole new testament.

The new testament above all is a document of salvation. The gospel is the good news and the good news is the kingdom of God, the body of Christ, his Church, the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham, the gift of justice and grace and life in opposition to law, sin, wrath and death. Christ is a new Adam and again Christ is light and truth and grace and life and that theme runs through the whole of St. John. Within this general antithesis running through the whole new testament, there is to be found its concrete application, illustration, realization, in the theme of death and resurrection. Illustration: symbolic sense, sacramental sense, dying in the death of Christ. Application: mortify. Actual aspect: Christ really died; we shall die and rise again.

Suffering as retribution has its place in the new testament, but retribution is far from being the only or the practical meaning of suffering. We have already read the passage from the first epistle of St. Peter, chapter two, where St. Peter says that there is nothing to boast about when you suffer justly for your own offences, it is the innocent sufferer that means something before God. That in the Sermon on the Mount is the doctrine of Christ. "You have heard that it was said" verses 43 to 48, "thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thy enemy. But I tell you, Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, pray for those who persecute and insult you, that so you may be true sons of your Father in heaven, who makes his sun rise on the evil and equally on the good, his

rain fall on the just and equally on the unjust. If you love those who love you, what title have you to a reward? Will not the publicans do as much? If you greet none but your brethren, what are you doing more than others? Will not the very heathen do as much? But you are to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect". And earlier in the same chapter, "Blessed are you, when men revile you, and persecute you, and speak all manner of evil against you falsely, because of me. Be glad and light-hearted, for a rich reward awaits you in heaven; so it was they persecuted the prophets who went before you"; and again "You have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But I tell you that you should not offer resistance to injury, if a man strikes thee on thy right cheek, turn the other cheek also towards him; if he is ready to go to law with thee over thy coat, let him have it and thy cloak with it;". Again, in the fundamental passage in which Christ speaks of giving his soul in redemption for many, giving his life in redemption for many - giving his soul is a Hebraism - we have to note the context. The context is when the mother of the two sons of Zebedee asked that James and John sit at the right and left hand of Jesus when he came into his kingdom. And when the other apostles heard of this, they were angry. It reads, "The ten others were angry with the two brethren when they heard it; but Jesus called them to him, and said, You know that, among the Gentiles, those who bear rule lord it over them, and great men vaunt their power over them; with you it must be otherwise; whoever would be a great man among you, must be your servant, and whoever has a mind to be first among you must be your slave. So it is that the Son of Man did not come to have service done him, he came to serve others and to give his life as a ransom for the lives of many."

The new testament, I think, in such a passage and in many others provides the clue to the intelligibility of the redemption. It is the victory of suffering, of accepting the consequences of sin, the evils of this world in the spirit that animated Christ. It is the transformation of the world that arises when evil is transformed into good by the Christian spirit. Christ refused the strict justice of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. He imposed upon his followers a command of patience and submission under wrong, because impatience usually creates only more wrong. And the meaning of his own words is fundamentally the transformation of evil into good. In the words of St. Paul, in chapter 12 of Romans in the last verse: "Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good". What was Christ doing dying and rising again? He was overcoming in himself and, also, through his followers, all the evils in the world, and overcoming them to rise again, that by his resurrection, we might know and realize and act upon those words of St. Paul in Romans, chapter 8, verse 29, "To those that love God, all things conspire unto the good."

I thank you.