

WHAT PRICE INDULGENCES? TRENT AND TODAY

Pope Paul VI believed it useful to promote the practice of indulgences. Indulgences, the Pope says, aid the individual in his own personal conversion and further the reconciliation of all men.¹ Today, when the practice has very largely disappeared, one can well ask if the practice can really be so meaningful for our modern Church. Also, is it not with mixed feelings that an ecumenist has to look at a practice that Luther and the Reform found so repugnant?

To understand what an indulgence is and can mean for the modern Church, this paper offers a survey of attitudes manifested in Tridentine debate on the matter. This small contribution is significant, I believe, because it reveals the theology out of which came the Catholic Church's most authoritative position on indulgences.² And I find that the understanding gleaned from scanning this debate lends support to the interpretation given to an indulgence by Poschmann and Rahner.³

QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE AT TRENT

Shortly after promulgating its decree on sacraments in general (March 3, 1547), the Council of Trent convened for a time at Bologna (March 25, 1547 to Sept. 13, 1549). On June 19, 1547, the papal legates handed several questions to the congregation of consultant theologians (these consultant

¹ Cf. Paul VI, AAS 59 (1967) 5-24; AAS 65 (1973) 322-25, 615; 66 (1974) 289-307. Corresponding translation in *The Pope Speaks* 12 (1967) 124-35; 18 (1973) 5-7; 19 (1974) 148-61.

² The decree on indulgences, *Concilium Tridentinum diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatum nova collectio*, ed. Societas Goerresiana (Freiburg, 1901 ff.) Vol. IX, p. 1105, lines 25-42 (hereafter written *CT IX*, 1105.25-42, etc.). The bishops put forward these two main points of doctrine. They took debate on indulgences no further than where the conciliar theologians' work at Bologna had left it. The decree, however, went on to condemn the existing abuses. For example, it demanded the eradication of trafficking in indulgence alms. In 1567 Pius V suppressed all indulgence alms, and on Jan. 2, 1569 he excommunicated all who trafficked in indulgences. See E. Magnin, "Indulgences," *DTC* 7 (Paris, 1936) col. 1620. Prior to Trent the Church had had to reprehend preachers for making exaggerated claims for indulgences, as well as to condemn indulgence-alms collectors for their venality (Magnin, *ibid.* 1614-20).

³ For the history of indulgences, see B. Poschmann, *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick* (New York: Herder, 1964); *Der Ablass im Sicht der Bussgeschichte* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1948); Magnin, "Indulgences," 1594-23; K. Rahner, "Remarks on the Theology of Indulgences," *Theological Investigations* 2 (Baltimore: Helicon, 1963) 175-201; "Indulgences," *Sacramentum mundi* (New York: Herder, 1969) 3, 123-29; A. Lepicier, *Indulgences: Their Origin, Nature and Development* (New York: Benziger, 1906); E. Iserloh, *The Theses Were Not Posted* (London: Chapman, 1968); Robert E. McNally, S.J., "The Ninety-five Theses of Martin Luther," *TS* 28 (1967) 439-80; Jared Wicks, S.J., "Martin Luther's Treatise on Indulgences," *TS* 28 (1967) 481-518; Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "A Lutheran Theologian Looks at the Ninety-five Theses in 1967," *TS* 28 (1967) 519-30.

theologians' assemblies were held prior to the general congregations of voting prelates and delegates). The legates wanted to discuss certain problematical statements in the Reformers' writings on purgatory and indulgences. On the subject of indulgences seven questions were put to the theologians. (1-2) Does an indulgence remit either sin itself or the punishment due to sin, and would this punishment in question be eternal or temporal? (3) Which temporal punishment is meant here: one that canon law or penitential practice might impose, or one that God Himself could exact? (4) Whose merits go to make up the treasury that funds the indulgences? How could the saints' merits be also in this treasury? Are not the saints, too, wholly in debt to God for whatever good they did or could do, as is the case with all the just? (5) If one has contritely confessed and received absolution, has one now to expect a new application of the justice of Christ? And if so, just how can an indulgence apply anew the merit of Christ? (6) Does an indulgence depend on some person's determination to grant it under conditions he may choose? If so, when would he do this properly, and what ought be his motives? (7) Can one through means of an indulgence bring aid to those in purgatory, and how can this be done? (See *CT VI*, 224.1-11.)

DO INDULGENCES COMMUTE PENANCES FORMERLY IMPOSED?

Marcello Cervini (later Pope Marcellus II), one of the papal legates who put these questions to the theologians, presided at these conciliar discussions. It was not that Cervini did not believe in the practice, but he wanted to understand it and showed he was ready to discuss what indulgences could mean. For example, eight days after the theologians had concluded their discussion, which ended on July 15, 1547, he put his own theory on the matter to the renowned Augustinian theologian Girolamo Seripando (himself later papal legate to the Council). Cervini had tried to explain the reference to imposed penances, "de iniunctis poenitentiis," which was present in the formula that the Church used when granting an indulgence. The formula, he thought, seemed to address itself directly to the severe penances which in practice were no longer used. And if an indulgence intended to lessen the heavy load of such penances that in fact no longer existed, what meaning did an indulgence have after all?

Ancient penance, he answered, was intended not only to safeguard church discipline, but also to satisfy God's justice. And although church discipline no longer sufficed as a motive for indulgences, these were nonetheless needed in order to aid one to fulfil the stiff ancient penances which could meet the demands of divine justice. He was arguing that these penances should still be imposed, at least implicitly. Indulgences, therefore, intend to lighten the burden of these penances and, insofar as

they can do this, indulgences satisfy the justice of God. Seripando, however, disagreed. He politely but firmly rejected Cervini's theory. If the Church, he countered in a letter of reply to Cervini, had let go the old canonical penances and yet continued to grant indulgences, then the Church must intend indulgences to do something else than to relax those penances which it no longer imposes and which in fact no longer exist. Rather, Seripando explained, indulgences can be given as a subsidy to man's labor of satisfaction that is a part of penance (*CT XI*, 227,231-33).

REFORMERS' ATTITUDE TO INDULGENCES

As this exchange between two leading figures at Trent shows, the theology of indulgences was not yet fully enough elaborated. And the Reformers were now forcing further explanation. The theologians, we noted, were facing up to questions that were formulated off collections of excerpts taken from the Reformers' writings. Seripando had made one of these collections. As he surveyed the writings of Luther and Melancthon in particular, Seripando found that they had repudiated indulgences on six counts:

1) No one, the Reformers alleged, can merit an indulgence for another; one cannot even do as much for oneself, since one cannot with one's own efforts meet the demands of divine justice. (2) The metaphor of the treasury of the Church refers only to the human power of the keys; a treasury or fund of Christ or of the saints simply does not exist. (3) Indulgences cannot do away with punishment as if to bring the sinner back to a baptismal innocence. (4) Indulgences intend only to remit canonical penalty that public crime once warranted, and so indulgences are now meaningless, and obviously all the more so where the departed are concerned. (5) Even if a temporal punishment were to remain after forgiveness of sin, the keys are powerless in the face of such punishment. (6) Finally, all in all, indulgences just perpetrate one big lie (*CT VI*, 224-25). Seripando's summary of the Reformers' objections illustrates the points of view to which the Council would address itself. These six points may be reduced to three areas of inquiry. First, can an indulgence remit a debt of punishment that the just God is exacting of the sinner? Second, can we indeed draw upon Christ's merit and that of the saints, as it were to draw upon a limitless fund at our disposal, without thereby taking control and insulting the sovereignty of God? Lastly, does the authority of pope or bishop extend so far as to enable them to enjoy divine guarantee by which they can bring people into contact with God's favor and mercy? Conciliar discussion grappled with these questions.

INDULGENCES DO NOT REMIT SIN

Luther, it seems, held that God, in answer to prayer, can so illumine the mind and so inflame the will of man that concupiscence will die, and

that, as one struggles with the traces of one's past sin, one but battles with concupiscence, and concupiscence was to be held as something sinful.⁴ For the bishops and their consultant theologians at Bologna, however, the case was different. According to the Council's decree earlier that year, the forgiven penitent not only has to struggle with concupiscence, which the decree disallowed to be something sinful (*CT V*, 183-97; 219.13-14; 239; 245), but also he has to make good a debt of temporal punishment still hanging over him.⁵ But does God (and with this question the legates brought into focus the basis for an indulgence) really want the penitent to pay such a debt, and to pay it in full either now or in the hereafter? This alleged need to meet such a debt, as those at Bologna were fully aware, particularly irked the Reformers. Yet the theologians' congregation could see no way of bypassing the need in question; in fact, the congregation unanimously affirmed it (*CT VI*, 10 ff.; 224-25; 297.1-11).

One thing the consultant theologians wished to make quite clear was this: an indulgence can be no substitute for formed contrition. That is, an indulgence can do nothing for the impenitent: it does not bring to the sinner the gift of God's love and justice, but only aims to cancel a debt of temporal punishment that generally remains after sin has been forgiven (*CT VI*, 296.38-40; 297.31-36, etc). Indulgences, the Reformers believed, were undermining the spirit of true penance. Indeed the practice, Luther claimed, taught people to flee the punishment of sin but not the sin itself.⁶ But an indulgence, the theologians now affirmed, can benefit only him who by God's gift is already contrite and justified, and who from within that new life, so graciously given to him, acts in the spirit of true penance along the lines set by the indulgence. As one Dominican put it, even in the case of one whose deep sorrow itself already wipes out all debt of temporal punishment, such a one can still benefit from an indulgence: it can deepen his conversion, because it brings him to grow further in his new life of love and grace, while, too, the indulgence can help set him free from evil habit and inclination that serious sin begot in him (*CT VI*, 271.4-7). This theologian put clearly what all at Bologna held, namely, that an indulgence is one way in which one can carry out the labor of penance that Trent termed satisfaction. The Church, so Trent in its decree on penance would say, had never known a more effective way than this laborious atonement, born of the just man's sorrow, to stay the imminent punishment that sin had brought upon itself. And none at Trent understood that the penitent, in this atonement of satisfaction, would then be acting outside the power of Christ. Rather,

⁴ See Iserloh, *The Theses Were Not Posted* 40-51.

⁵ For an understanding of this Tridentine dogma, see my article "Trent's Temporal Punishment and Today's Renewal of Penance," *TS* 35 (1974) 467-81.

⁶ Cf. Iserloh, *The Theses Were Not Posted* 30; McNally, "The Ninety-five Theses" 495 ff.

so Trent hinted, as the penitent prayed, or gave alms, or fasted, or made pilgrimage, etc., it was all the time Christ who was bringing the penitent to do these things. Certainly Christ's satisfaction is unique but—and this is also Trent's position—he redeems us into his own life in which we join with him as he labors (“compatimur”), in order to bring forth a new and glorious creation with and in him (*CT VII*, 354.12).

INDULGENCES: A COMMUNITY AID TO THE PENITENT

The consultant theologians accepted the notion of a limitless treasury of merit that belonged to the Church and upon which the Church could draw in order to fund the penitent's satisfaction. Holy men and women of the Church, who are free of debt of sin's punishment, contribute to this treasury by their life of intense love, which redounds to the credit of their fellow members in need. One example is Paul, who underwent hardship on behalf of the Corinthians, and this labor was making good their debt of temporal punishment. Paul could say that he was putting up with all he had to for their sake, and so in his own body he was making up for what was still wanting in the passion of Christ (*CT VII*, 281.7-17). In fact, operative throughout the conciliar debate on indulgences was this notion, namely, that by responding to the love of God in Christ, the saint's life and labor within that unrestricted love so pleases the Father that He then brings the less generous members of Christ to be more loving. That is, as they explained this treasury of merit, the theologians would point to a certain dependence: yes, the contrite penitent *depends* on the meritorious prayer and labor of Christ and of his saints, which enable the penitent's sorrow and love to reach the pitch that past sin has excluded (*CT VI*, 297.12-30); but it is a dependence (which Trent in its debate and decree on satisfaction was to bring out clearly) within which the penitent must act freely, responsibly, and lovingly.⁷ In the light of this understanding, then, the treasury is but the vital communion of the members of Christ's Body who now, under the inspiration of the Head, Christ himself, and together with him and in him, direct the redeeming love and sorrow of that Body for the support of the labor of satisfaction that the indulgence requires of the penitent.

NO DIRECT REMISSION OF TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT DUE TO SIN

Just as the Church, one theologian at Bologna actually suggested, in the sacrament of penance remits what is greater, that is, sin itself, so the Church can directly wipe out what is less, namely, temporal punishment due to sin (*CT VI*, 255.14-18). But this claim was an extraordinary one in that debate, and it met with no support. Nor did any theologian give to

⁷ Cf. the Decree on Penance, *CT VII*, 354.6-12; see my “Trent's Temporal Punishment” 476, 478-79.

an indulgence the *ex opere operato* efficacy that the Council in its decree just four months earlier recognized as belonging to the seven sacraments. In fact, the phrase *ex opere operato* was not mentioned in the debate on indulgences. All the theologians agreed that when the pope is granting an indulgence no sacrament is being conferred. Rather, as they said, he is but using his "key of jurisdiction." Indeed, an indulgence depends radically on the disposition of the recipient: an indulgence is of no avail unless God with His gift of sorrow and love has already disposed the recipient (*CT VI*, 296.38-40; 297.31-6). Also, one theologian observed, an indulgence is dependent on the proper disposition of the one granting it, since the latter has to be exercising his apostolic authority responsibly. He ought, for example, only grant a greater indulgence when he asks more labor of the recipient (*CT VI*, 297.37-41). An indulgence, therefore, is no sign established by Christ in which he infallibly offers his gift independently of the quality of disposition of his minister and recipient. The gaining of an indulgence is a form of the laborious atonement or satisfaction which the Council would decree to be part of penance. And in the granting of an indulgence, one theologian explained, the pope does not absolve as a priest absolves from sin, nor is the pope simply handing out a sheer gratuity from the Church's treasury; rather, the pope is acting in the manner of commuting a penance (*CT VI*, 285.4-10).

RECIPIENT'S DISPOSITION MEASURES BENEFIT INDULGENCE OFFERS

It follows, therefore, that because of his sorrow and love (formed contrition) given by the indwelling Spirit a penitent is able to gain an indulgence. He is to perform the activity that the indulgence stipulated, and the very quality or intensity of his sorrow and love will the better enable him to benefit from the indulgence. Again, the activity required is a meritorious act of satisfaction. In the conciliar debates on justification, purgatory, indulgences, and penance, it was evident that all held that the time for meriting and for making satisfaction is only on this side of the grave (cf. *CT VI*, 226.35-6).⁸ Yet, they believed, those in purgatory do benefit from an indulgence which the penitent gains here on earth, and which the penitent offers in prayer on behalf of those in purgatory. This prayerful application or transference of an indulgence that one gained for those in purgatory was said to be made for them "per modum suffragii," whereas the one performing the indulgenced work gains the indulgence "per modum absolutionis" (*DS* 1448). These two technical phrases in the conciliar discussion, it is worth noting, were not intended to contrast an automatic, infallible, immediate efficacy as against one that is uncertain

⁸ Fransen explains the expiation that is satisfaction as an *active* purification, whereas the expiation in purgatory is *passive*, i.e., that by which one does not merit ("The Doctrine of Purgatory," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 13 [1959] 106).

and indirect.⁹ Therefore, the understanding that obtained throughout the conciliar discussion was that the disposition of the one gaining the indulgence is paramount: according to its quality does one receive benefit from the indulgence, and it is the benefit so qualified by that very disposition which is offered for the departed.

MEDIATORY ROLE OF EPISCOPAL OFFICE

The theologians found that the Reformers, in their rejection of indulgences, had come to strike at the very roots of that church authority which the theologians recognized. The authority so brought into question was not simply that of the pope, but the authority that had been manifest in papal, conciliar, and episcopal teaching and regulation from time immemorial. Those at Bologna might see how the Reformers, in their writing, bypassed directives from previous conciliar decisions—the decrees, say, of the Councils of Lyons and Florence. But the Tridentine theologians manifested a different methodology: these would, as a rule, refer not only to Scripture but also to the liturgy, to Church practice, and to the Church's teaching, conciliar and papal, which had dealt with the particular matter under discussion (cf. *CT VI*, 294.36–37; 295.1–40). This methodology (common to all at the Council) made it quite clear why Trent came to defend the practice of indulgences. The legates in this debate had not, as they had done for the discussion on purgatory, asked the theologians to furnish witness of the practice of indulgences from Scripture (*CT VI*, 223.11,15; 224.1–11). And so we come upon a clear case where, in dialectic with the Reform, fundamentally diverging positions appear between Reform and Council. How could one expect the Reform to concede a practice that enjoyed no explicit foundation in Scripture? But for Trent, living tradition could also provide warrant for a practice that would be acceptable to God. The practice of indulgences had crystallized only during the Middle Ages. It was as recently as the year

⁹ It has not been shown that traditional theology (prescinding from any excess popular preaching may have reached), while asserting the Church to have a direct juridic power over the treasury, went on further to claim that this power of jurisdiction could remit directly the debt of punishment outstanding. St. Thomas did not take this further step: in gaining an indulgence, he said, one is not being absolved from temporal punishment, but one is receiving the means to pay his debt of satisfaction (*Sum. theol. suppl.* 25, 1, ad 2). Just prior to St. Thomas, Robert de Courçon had explicitly denied that an indulgence achieved its effect automatically; the determining factor, he said, is the degree of devotion with which one gains the indulgence—a factor known only to God (see Magnin, "Indulgences" 1616). Neither did the theologians at Bologna, products of all the great theological schools of that time, propose this further step. And nothing in Sixtus IV's pronouncement allowed for such a disregard of the recipient's disposition. At any rate, in regard to Trent's understanding of the two phrases in question, if one takes them as intending to contrast automatic infallible efficacy as against the lack of such, one then simply misinterprets what went on in conciliar debate, and misrepresents the Council's position.

1476 that the pope first officially proposed that indulgences be applied to those in purgatory.¹⁰ Conciliar discussion now isolated the real bone of contention: Have the pope and bishops authority from Christ in matters of salvation, and indeed an authority beyond that of conferring sacraments? To the case in point, has the episcopacy divine right to aid the penitent (with indulgences, all knew, no eighth sacrament was being conferred) in order to free him from debt of punishment before God? In other words, if Trent were to accept even the practice of indulgences, it would in fact be accepting a mediating role in matters of salvation for the episcopal office in the Church.

In the case of sacraments, the Reformers recognized those to which Scripture more clearly witnessed. Even so, Trent found, the Reform seemed to propose that the public action of the Church's minister plays no essential role in mediating the offer of grace in sacrament. And earlier that year, on March 3, 1547, because of this apparent rejection on the part of the Reform, the Council had believed it necessary to reaffirm that the offer of grace in sacrament comes in some true sense dependently upon the public action of the minister. God unfailingly offers salvation, the Council understood, in those seven communal official actions of the Church's ministers, because Christ makes these actions his very own; and precisely because they are also his actions, which are independent of the quality of disposition in both minister and recipient, the offer of grace is made *ex opere operato* (CT V, 995.19-26, 32-36).¹¹ But indulgences, the theologians' assembly took for granted, do not enjoy the rank of sacrament. In this practice of indulgences, therefore, the claim to authority on the part of the Church's episcopacy stood more clearly revealed than even in the case of *ex opere operato* efficacy; for here was a human office asserting that it could mediate divine power and gift, and indeed do so in an activity that was not even a sacrament. An indulgence, declared the theologian Salmerón, helps man to gain once again that baptismal innocence and vitality lost through sin—an opinion that was commonly held by all present, and operative in forming the conciliar decree (CT VI, 280.1-3; 240.4-6; etc.). With the aid of an indulgence, the assembly of theologians agreed, the Church both brings man to free himself from divine punishment and also enables him to set fellow members free from similar punishment either on this side of the grave or beyond it (CT VI, 297.1-11,42; 224.3,11; etc.). If, then, in regard to sacraments one might prescind from the alleged mediatory role of the episcopacy, one could now no longer bypass the question of such a role. Quite clearly, the consultant theologians understood that one gains an indulgence *depend-*

¹⁰ Poschmann, *Penance* 228; Magnin, "Indulgences" 1616.

¹¹ On the phrase *ex opere operato*, cf. E. Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963) 89.

ently on the exercise of what they termed the key of jurisdiction: only because of this jurisdictional intervention, they affirmed, is the treasury of Christ's merit available by way of indulgences (*CT VI*, 297.1-11, 34-36, 40-41; 246.2-6).

POSCHMANN'S POSITION REFINED

This study of Tridentine debate brings me to put more emphasis than Poschmann does on the key of jurisdiction operative in the granting and obtaining of an indulgence. Poschmann found that at one time an indulgence comprised an act of jurisdiction inasmuch as it commuted or regulated a penance that had been imposed. But with indulgences properly speaking the case is different, he says, because those granting an indulgence pray in the name of the Church. This prayer, he explains, is a calling on the intercession and merits of the Church triumphant, which can be done because of the communion of saints.¹² My study leads me to develop this most helpful insight. Rahner asks if Poschmann's theory fully explains the metaphor of a treasury of the Church.¹³ Rahner (as does this present investigation) agrees with Poschmann that an indulgence operates *ex opere operantis* and not *ex opere operato*. Yet the Tridentine insistence on the apostolic "key of jurisdiction" operative in the granting of an indulgence leads me to agree with Rahner in thinking that the traditional metaphor of a treasury of the Church needs fuller explanation. The historical context which Tridentine debate reflected brought into sharp focus this main question: Is there a valid exercise of apostolic authority in the episcopal dispensation of indulgences? Trent in its debate and decree pointed to an answer in the affirmative. So I would clarify Poschmann's position: Is it not because the one who "prays in the name of the Church" (Poschmann) is exercising episcopal office, which is endowed with apostolic authority, that the calling "on the intercession and merits of the Church triumphant" is efficacious? Is it not precisely because the call comes *officially* from the flock of Christ *in this way* that a particular grant is made from the treasury on behalf of one gaining the indulgence?

Again, let it be emphasized that a thorough examination of Tridentine debate yields no evidence for episcopal jurisdiction to achieve the fruit of an indulgence independently of the recipient's disposition; rather, such an examination finds it essential that the recipient be properly disposed. Disregard for this proper disposition was encouraged by abuse in the preaching and practice of indulgences at the time of the Reformation, which Luther properly lampooned: "when in the box the coin does ring, the soul from out the fire will spring."¹⁴ At one time Paul Galtier took a

¹² Poschmann, *Penance* 231. Cf. Clement VI (DS 1026).

¹³ Rahner, "Remarks on the Theology of Indulgences" 199.

¹⁴ See Poschmann, *Penance* 229; Magnin, "Indulgences" 1619.

position that could have allowed for such a misunderstanding: what punishment is remitted, he said, depends on how much he who grants the indulgence wishes the remission to be. This view, Rahner notes, in fact conflicts with what Galtier says shortly afterwards when he leans to Poschmann's view. The Church, Galtier then says, with an act of jurisdiction makes available to the penitent the treasury of Christ's satisfaction, without knowing if and in what measure God remits the punishment. This jurisdictional process, Rahner argues, of placing the treasury of the Church at the disposal of the faithful has exactly the same value as an authoritative prayer of the Church.¹⁵ Finally, Paul VI teaches that in granting indulgences the Church authoritatively dispenses of the treasury of satisfaction of Christ and his saints, but the role of the recipient's love and sorrow and desire of union with Christ's expiation is decisive. Indeed, one benefits from an indulgence exactly in proportion to the quality of such disposition. Further, Pope Paul says that one cannot receive the effect of a plenary indulgence unless one is free from all attachment to venial sin.¹⁶ And this teaching manifests once again that the proper disposition is of essential importance.

A PASTORAL SUGGESTION

What I glean from the Tridentine discussion responding to the Reformers' objections are these two emphases: (1) a certain quality of disposition in the recipient is essential for gaining an indulgence; (2) the apostolic authority exercised in the episcopal office can grant, even though not as a sacrament, aid favorable with God for the penitent to meet divine requirements for the full expiation of sin.

Accordingly, I believe present Church praxis would benefit if the granting of an indulgence were restricted to a special public ceremony of penitential readings, prayers, etc., at which the bishop in person would bless those wishing to gain the indulgence, after praying over them. It would be helpful, too, if the ceremony were linked to the Eucharistic celebration. In this way the recipient would more likely *feel* that the full authority of the Body of Christ is supporting him as he carries out the indulgenced work. Has not modern man lost this feeling? And without it, even with all due respect to the recent reforms in indulgence grants, I cannot see how the practice of indulgences will revive.

Union Theological Institute
Hunters Hill, N.S.W.

PETER J. BEER, S.J.

¹⁵ P. Galtier, *De poenitentia* (Rome, 1950) no. 610. Cf. Rahner, "Remarks" 192-93; Galtier, no. 613.

¹⁶ See Paul VI, *Constitutio apostolica* (AAS 59 [1967] 10-16, 19, 21-22). Accordingly, an indulgence, I suggest, may be called "plenary" if the work stipulated calls for a high degree of contrition and generosity in the recipient, who through this work promotes his deep union with the paschal mystery and notably furthers the union and welfare of the Church.