Cajetan: A Thomist Reformer?*

DENIS JANZ

TO the humanists of the sixteenth century as well as to Luther, the phrase "Thomist Reformer" in the title of this paper would have seemed like a contradiction in terms. The prevailing image of the Thomist in the Reformation era was that of the reactionary attempting vainly to stem the tide of change by returning to the centuries-old teaching of Thomas Aquinas. This prevailing image, which persists even today, is perhaps partially justifiable. But the time has come to set it aside so we may take a fresh look. Perhaps the one who most deserves such a fresh look is Cardinal Cajetan, commonly acknowledged to be the greatest Thomist of the Reformation era.

Born in Gaeta, Italy in 1468, Tommaso de Vio entered the Dominican Order at the age of sixteen and pursued his academic career at the Universities of Naples, Bologna, Pavia, Padua and Milan.¹ Between the years 1507 and 1520, Cajetan wrote the work for which he is best known – the famous commentary on the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas. Already Master General of his Order, Cajetan became a Cardinal in 1517 and was then quickly appointed Papal Legate to Germany in the following year. In 1518 Cajetan, in accordance with his official duties, summoned Luther to Augsburg and demanded his submission to the Church. Upon Luther's refusal to submit, Cajetan initiated the proceedings that eventually resulted in Leo X's bulls "Exsurge Domine" and "Decet Romanum Pontificem" (1521).² But the struggle between Luther and Cajetan did not end there. What had begun as a personal confrontation in 1518 became a literary struggle that occupied Cajetan until his death in 1534.³ In numerous *opuscula* Cajetan attacked the Lutheran "error," and in his biblical commentaries he set out to demonstrate the Scriptural foundations of the Church's teaching.

If the historic confrontation at Augsburg marks a turning point in the Reformation movement, it also marks the beginning of a gradual transition in Cajetan himself. From a Renaissance humanist's point of view, the early Cajetan represents scholasticism at its worst. His commentary on the

*An earlier version of this paper was presented to the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies in Montreal, May 30, 1980.

Summa, for instance, is a turgid leviathan in which the scholastic method is pushed to the extreme. Where Thomas makes one distinction, it is typical for Cajetan to make four further distinctions of his own. The result is a work of immense complexity, which, according to some at least, did more to obscure than to clarify the teaching of Thomas. A popular aphorism among young seminarians in Rome who began to read Cajetan's work was, "If you want to understand Cajetan, read Thomas."⁴ The ultimate sterility of the late medieval practice of commenting on commentaries and theologizing on theologies was painfully obvious here, and one can scarcely fault the humanists for their contemptuous attitude.

But after Cajetan's confrontation with Luther at Augsburg in 1518, one begins to notice a remarkable change in Cajetan, both in his general approach and in the positions he takes on various issues. I call this change remarkable, not only because Cajetan was fifty years old at the time, but also because of the dogmatic intractability one generally associates with Thomists in the Reformation era. Perhaps in response to the changing needs of his time, perhaps in direct response to Luther and the other reformers, Cajetan became something of a reformer himself.⁵

To document this gradual transition in Cajetan, one has only to look at the kinds of things Cajetan wrote after 1518. To be sure, the change was neither immediate nor revolutionary: Cajetan continued writing his commentary on the *Tertia Pars* of the *Summa* until 1520. But even here one now finds Cajetan going to some lengths to find areas of agreement between Catholic theology and the Reform movement. (Unfortunately, these conciliatory passages were suppressed by Pius V in 1570.)⁶ In the 1520's one finds Cajetan less and less preoccupied with commenting on Aristotle or defending Thomas Aquinas. Rather one finds in him in this period a new emphasis on the importance of Scripture – an emphasis that resulted in his extensive and, in some ways, remarkable biblical commentaries. According to Cajetan now, it is not Aristotle or Thomas, but the Scriptures that are "the arms of the Christian with which he fights and conquers."⁷

The importance of the biblical commentaries within Cajetan's corpus has rarely been given its due among Cajetan scholars.⁸ Cajetan is the first major representative of the Thomist school to write extensive commentaries on Scripture. In fact, the range of his Scripture commentaries rivals that of Thomas himself. Cajetan's commentaries reflect an interest in Scripture and an emphasis on its importance that make him stand out in the late medieval Thomist school. In this respect at least, one can say Cajetan was more true to the spirit of St. Thomas than were his Thomist predecessors.⁹ And in his emphasis on the importance of Scripture, Cajetan was surely more perceptive than his Thomist contemporaries in their struggle with a foe that took the *sola scriptura* principle as its watchword.¹⁰ It is perhaps this emphasis on the importance of Scripture that makes Cajetan the greatest Thomist of the

Reformation era. In him, at least, Luther's demand to be shown *form Scripture* that he was in error did not go unheeded.

Cajetan's entire exegetical project was fundamentally an attempt to "take away" the Scripture from Luther and put it back into the hands of the Roman Church.¹¹ To do this, Cajetan employed the latest exegetical tools and methods. Using the Hebrew and Greek biblical texts, Cajetan concentrated almost exclusively on the literal and historical sense.¹² Although his purpose throughout was to show that the literal sense supports the traditional teaching of the Church, there were some that found the results of Cajetan's exegetical project disconcerting. He questioned, for instance, the Pauline authorship of Hebrews.¹³ Like Luther, he had doubts about the apostolic origin of James.¹⁴ And whereas in 1512 he was quite confident in his interpretation of John's Apocalypse,¹⁵ he now refused to comment on it because, he said, the literal sense totally escaped him.¹⁶ But the main cause of offense, to some at least, was his use of the Greek and Hebrew texts; it was this that prompted the theological faculty at Paris to issue a letter censuring his "errors."¹⁷ In a spirited reply, Cajetan took nothing back.¹⁸ Already here in his Scripture commentaries, one sees strong evidence of Cajetan's transformation after 1518 into what might be called a "Thomist reformer."

Besides such major shifts in emphasis, one finds further evidence of development in Cajetan's thought. For instance, Cajetan's early view on the rational demonstrability of the soul's immortality was reversed in his Scripture commentaries.¹⁹ Likewise his views on the moral and theological propriety of crusades underwent a radical change. Cajetan had originally come to Germany in 1518 for the express purpose of arousing interest in a crusade against the Turks.²⁰ Now in 1528 Cajetan argues forcefully for the position that crusades blacken and discredit the Christian Church.²¹

An even more remarkable example of Cajetan's change of heart is his view of indulgences. This had been, of course, one of the main issues in the Augsburg confrontation with Luther in 1518 (along with the issue of the necessity of faith for the sacrament of penance and the question of the papacy).²² Cajetan's "Augsburg Treatises," written at the time of the confrontation, leave little doubt that he strongly defended the practice of granting indulgences at that time.²³ However, in 1529 Cajetan denounced indulgences in terms reminiscent of Luther himself. The preachers of indulgences, according to him, abuse the devotion of Christian people for money; they are monsters who make merchandise of Christian people by introducing figments and inventions that are foreign to the Christian religion.²⁴

These, then, are some examples that point to a development in Cajetan's thought that was surely influenced, in some respects at least, by the events of the Reformation. The later Cajetan represents some points of view that

are no longer those of a staunch traditionalist but rather those of a reformer sensitive to the needs and realities of his age.

But this is not the whole story. Most of the changes we have seen in Cajetan to this point have little to do with the issue Luther insisted was his main Reformation concern. Things like indulgences, crusades, etc. were "trifles" according to Luther. (On the more important issue of Scripture, Luther seems to have welcomed Cajetan's new emphasis.) But what about Cajetan's views on the issue of justification *sola gratia*, the issue that was for Luther the "articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae," the hinge on which all else turns? Was Cajetan a "Thomist reformer" on this issue as well?

Cajetan's position on this central question is of considerable significance for a related issue presently under discussion among scholars. An extraordinarily important conclusion that has been reached after two decades of widespread and intensive scholarly discussion is that, in the words of Heiko Oberman, "the mature Thomas of the *Summa* teaches unambiguously Augustine's doctrine of justification *sola gratia*."²⁵ Oberman is only the most recent of a long line of both Catholic and Protestant scholars who concur on this. But, if this is so, the question then arises, why did Luther's Thomist contemporaries, supposed followers of Thomas, oppose him so bitterly on exactly this question? At least part of the answer, I should like to suggest, can be found by looking at Cajetan's teaching on this issue in relation to that of both Thomas and Luther.

A close analysis of Cajetan's treatment of this issue in his early commentary on the *Summa* yields the following major result:²⁶ Cajetan is far more generous than Thomas in the capacities he allows to fallen man. For Cajetan there is in fact no natural morally good act that is beyond fallen man's natural capacities.²⁷ Cajetan's position on the theologico-anthropological question shifts his entire theology of nature and grace in what might be called a non-Augustinian direction.²⁸ Since man is capable of the same morally good acts both before and after the Fall, the doctrine of original sin loses at least some of its meaning. For Cajetan, man's nature after the Fall remains fundamentally intact. Here, it has been said, Cajetan speaks as a sixteenth-century humanist and not as the thirteenth-century student of Augustine.²⁹ The direct consequences of this position on the powers of fallen man is that the necessity of grace (the *gratia sanans*) is seriously limited. Here in Cajetan's commentary on the *Summa*, the genuinely Augustinian elements in Thomas' theology are distorted. Here it can safely be said that Cajetan does not reflect the authentic teaching of Thomas.

But did Cajetan's views on this issue change after the Augsburg confrontation of 1518? We have already seen that on many secondary issues Cajetan's views changed rather dramatically. But on this particular issue – the one that Luther regarded as most fundamental – one finds little evidence of a development or reversal.

To be sure, one does find statements, especially in Cajetan's commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, that sound congenial to Luther's point of view.³⁰ One must remember, after all, that Cajetan is commenting on St. Paul! But there are other strong indications in these same commentaries that the later Cajetan did not substantially modify his views on the major theological issue of the Reformation.³¹ Cajetan here upholds his earlier teaching on the powers of fallen man and the role of grace.

But we need not rely totally on these Pauline commentaries to determine Cajetan's later views. In the fourteen years of polemics following the Augsburg confrontation of 1518, Cajetan wrote numerous *opuscula* attacking the Lutheran "error." One of the surprising things about these late *opuscula* is their subject matter. Of them all, there is only one, written at the end of his life and perhaps then only on the command of Pope Clement VII,³² in which Cajetan comes close to dealing with what was for Luther the "article on which the Church stands or falls." This is the short work bearing the title *De Fide et Operibus adversus Lutheranos* written at Rome in 1532.³³

Consistent with the commentary on the *Summa* and the Pauline commentaries, this work argues that fallen man is capable of all natural morally good acts.³⁴ But this work goes beyond Cajetan's early position in ascribing some salutary significance to such acts, even though they are done without the help of grace. These acts are, in Cajetan's words, "useful in asking for and procuring the forgiveness of sins."³⁵ Though Cajetan does not use the term, such acts are, in late medieval scholastic terms, *merita de congruo*. This means that Cajetan in this late work departs even further than he does in the commentary on the *Summa* from the Augustinian teaching of Thomas Aquinas on this point.³⁶ For to ascribe any salutary value whatsoever to natural acts done without the help of grace is to speak in a language that is, to say the least, foreign to Thomas. Here Cajetan has indeed "distorted" rather than "disclosed" the authentic Thomas.³⁷

How then is Cajetan to be evaluated in the light of this? First, there is little doubt that Cajetan, out of a deep concern for the consequences of the Reformation, familiarized himself with Luther's writings and tried to respond to them. And Cajetan's emphasis on the importance of Scripture must be seen as an appropriate response to the Reformers' emphasis on *sola scriptura*. Yet some doubt is raised about Cajetan's understanding of Luther by the fact that he did not, until 1532, address himself to Luther's main concern. And when he finally did, he failed, as we have seen, to do justice to those Augustinian elements in Thomas that Luther would have found congenial.

In a little-known work that Cajetan sent to Pope Clement VII in 1531, he suggested several major concessions that could be made to the Lutherans in order to restore the unity of the Church.³⁸ These included marriage for priests and communion under both kinds.³⁹ It is the great irony of Cajetan's

life that, while he was willing to make such major concessions to Luther, the greatest Thomist of the Reformation era failed to concede to Luther a theological tenet that was the teaching of Thomas himself. While exhibiting a great sensitivity to many of the secondary issues involved in the Reformation, Cajetan remained to the end of his life insensitive to Luther's main Reformation concern, as well as to those Augustinian elements in Thomas that in fact converge with Luther's teaching on this point.

Loyola University, New Orleans

Notes

- 1 The main outlines of Cajetan's career are well known and consequently only the briefest sketch is necessary here. For further details, see J. Quéatif and J. Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Paris, 1719), 2.1: 14-21; F. Lauchert, *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers* (Nieuwkoop, 1972), pp. 133-177; P. Mandonnet, "Cajétan," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris, 1930ff), II, 1313-1329; Y. Congar, "Bio-Bibliographie de Cajetan," in *Revue Thomiste*, 17 (1935), 3-49; J.F. Groner, *Kardinal Cajetan: Eine Gestalt aus der Reformationszeit* (Fribourg, 1951); J.A. Weigheipl, "Cajetan," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1967); II, 1053-1055; and most recently, J. Wicks, *Cajetan Responds: A Reader in Reformation Controversy* (Washington, 1978), p. 1-46.
- 2 The three meetings between Cajetan and Luther at Augsburg took place on October 12-14, 1518. Cajetan gave his own description of the Augsburg encounter in a letter to Friedrich von Sachsen, written on October 25, 1518 (printed in WABR 1, no. 110). Cajetan's secretary also wrote an account of the proceedings. On this, see P. Kalkoff, "Flavio als Biograph Kajetans und sein Bericht über Luthers Verhör in Augsburg," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 33 (1921), 240ff. Luther's account of the proceedings at Augsburg is known as the "Acta Augustana" (in WA 2, 6-26). Cf. also Luther's letters in WABR 1, nos. 99-104, 110. Both Cajetan's and Luther's descriptions of each other's theological position must, of course, be used with caution. For recent accounts, see E. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times* (St. Louis, 1950), pp. 338-357; G. Hennig, *Cajetan und Luther*, pp. 61-82; O. Pesch, "'Das Heist eine Neue Kirche Bauen': Luther und Cajetan in Augsburg," in M. Seckler, O. Pesch, J. Brosseder, and W. Pannenberg, eds., *Begegnung: Beiträge zu einer Hermeneutik des Gesprächs* (Cologne, 1972), pp. 645-661; and J. Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, pp. 12-27.
- 3 However, Hennig is incorrect in saying that for the last 15 years of his life, Cajetan did nothing but combat Luther (*Cajetan und Luther*, p. 11).
- 4 "Si vis intelligere Cajetanum lege Thomam." Quoted in Hennig, *Cajetan und Luther*, p. 12, n. 9.
- 5 Luther himself recognized this change in Cajetan when he said, "Cajetanus postremo factus est Lutheranus" (WATR 2, 2668 a/b [1532?]). To my knowledge, only one modern scholar has taken such a view seriously – perhaps more seriously than Luther himself. See R. Jenkins, *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine: A Review of the Commentary on the Scriptures of Cardinal Cajetan*, (London, 1891). Jenkin's point of view is so polemical and his interpretation of Cajetan so one-sided that his argument scarcely demands a refutation. Lack of reference to his book in subsequent Cajetan scholarship would indicate that, soon after it was published, it sank into well-deserved oblivion. Nevertheless, it is, to my knowledge, the only work in English on Cajetan's biblical commentaries. Its value lies only in the fact that it points out several interesting features of these commentaries.
- 6 On this, see Weisheipl, "Cajetan," p. 1054.

- 7 Commenting on Jesus' use of the words "It is written . . ." in the story of his temptation (Matt. 4:4, 7, and 10), Cajetan says, "Let us learn from hence that our arms are the Holy Scriptures, for Jesus conquers all these temptations with the Holy Scripture alone, that he might teach us to fight and conquer in the same way." (Quoted in Jenkins, *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine*, p. 119).
- 8 Wicks is surely justified in calling for a full monographic treatment of Cajetan's "later biblical theology." See "Thomism Between Renaissance and Reformation: The Case of Cajetan," in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 68 (1977), 9-31, p. 14.
- 9 According to O. Pesch, Thomist commentators generally failed to recognize the importance of biblical theology and exegesis for Thomas ("Thomismus," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 10, 161). While this may be true of Cajetan in his commentary on the *Summa*, his exegetical work sets him apart from other Thomists of the Reformation era.
- 10 One can find in Cajetan's Scripture commentaries a "sola Scriptura" principle that is substantially the same as that of Luther. Commenting on Romans 10:17, he says, ". . . unde nulla hominum autoritate possunt credenda nova introduci: sed ea tantum explicari quae per verbum Dei revelata sunt Apostolis et Prophetis" (*Epistolae Pauli et Aliorum Apostolorum*. . . *juxta sensum literalem enarratae*, [Paris, 1532], p. 37r. C). It should be noted here that neither Luther nor Cajetan deny the normative significance of tradition. One of the things Cajetan is probably alluding to in the above-quoted passage is the immaculate conception controversy which occupied his attention during the Fifth Lateran Council (1512-1517).
- 11 Gerhard Hennig makes this point in *Cajetan und Luther*, p. 119f. For Hennig's treatment of the Scripture commentaries, see pp. 117-132.
- 12 On Cajetan's exegetical method, see above all I.M. Vosté, "Cardinalis Caietanus Sacrae Scripturae Interpres" in *Angelicum*, 11 (1934), 445-513. Cf. also M.J. Lagrange, "La Critique textuelle avant le Concile de Trente" in *Revue Thomiste*, 17 (1935), 400-409; and A. Colunga, "El Cardenal Cayetano y los problemas de introducción bíblica" in *Ciencia Tomista*, 18 (1918), 21-32, 168-175, 280-290; 20 (1919), 43-50. According to Wicks, Cajetan employed two assistants knowledgeable in Hebrew to "explain to him word-by-word the exact meaning of the Hebrew original"; for the New Testament, he used Erasmus' edition of the Greek text (*Cajetan Responds*, p. 34).
- 13 *Epistolae*, p. 188v, H-I. It was of course not only the Reformers who questioned the Pauline authorship of Hebrews. Many in the Catholic tradition since the time of Tertullian had raised this question. In 1442, however, the Council of Florence had included "Ad Hebraeos" under the "Quatuordecim Epistolae Pauli".
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 207v, G.
- 15 At the Fifth Lateran Council in 1512, "Cajetan delivered a lengthy oration on the structure of the earthly church, developing an analogy with the heavenly church depicted in John's Apocalypse" (Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, p. 10).
- 16 "Apocalypsim enim fateor me nescire exponere iuxta sensum literalem: exponat cui deus concesserit" (*Epistolae*, p. 231v, I).
- 17 The faculty's "Epistola reprehensoria" to Cajetan censuring his "errors" can be found in M.H. Laurent, "Quelques documents des Archives Vaticanes" in *Revue Thomiste*, 17 (1935), 50-148. O. Clemen, "Luther und die Rüge der Sorbonne gegen Cajetan" in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 93 (1920/21), 294-304, points out that the edition of the censure printed at Wittenburg in 1534 includes, in a postscript, a defense of Cajetan's use of the Hebrew and Greek biblical texts. And Clemen argues that this defense of Cajetan comes from the hand of Luther himself! Scholars such as Henning, however, regard this as highly questionable (*Cajetan und Luther*, p. 130, n. 184).
- 18 For Cajetan's reply, see "Responsionum ad quosdam articulos nomine Theologorum Parisiensium" in his *Opuscula Omnia Thomae de Vio Caietani* (Lyons, 1581), pp. 298-299.
- 19 Weisheipl, "Cajetan," p. 1054.
- 20 At the Diet of Augsburg in 1518 Cajetan "addressed the assembled estates on behalf of the Pope, assuring them that the future of religion and humanity itself hung in the balance" (Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, p. 17).
- 21 *Epistolae*, p. 87r, A.

- 22 In fact, according to Wicks, the question of indulgences ultimately turned out to be the *only* real issue at Augsburg. Cajetan assured Luther that the official *processus* against him would be halted if only he expressed his obedient agreement on this one issue (*Cajetan Responds*, pp. 21 & 25).
- 23 Some of these treatises are translated in Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, pp. 47-98.
- 24 "Non longe ab istis sunt praedicatores quaestus, qui abutuntur populi Christiani devotione ad quaestum: qui ignoranter aut temere praedicare audent quod solventes carlinum aut ducatum pro vocata indulgentia plenaria, sunt in eo statu ac si tunc baptizati fuissent: et similiter quod liberant animam unam a purgatorio, haec enim monstra sunt, et negociationes de Christiano populo. Nescit Christiana religio haec figmenta: sed an inventiones sunt eorum qui in avaritia fictis verbis de Christianis negociantur, abutentes illis ad quaestum" (*Epistolae*, p. 218v, I-K).
- 25 H. Oberman, "Fourteenth Century Religious Thought: A Premature Profile," in *Speculum*, 53 (1978), 80-93, p. 83. Two of the most important works by Catholic scholars pointing to this same conclusion are O. Pesch, *Theologie der Rechtfertigung bei Martin Luther und Thomas von Aquin* (Mainz, 1967); and H. McSorley, *Luther: Right or Wrong?* (New York-Minneapolis, 1969).
- 26 To analyze these complex passages from the commentary on the *Summa* and to document the results I give here would carry us far beyond the scope of this paper. I would only refer the reader to the relevant passages: "Summa Theologiae cum commentariis Thomae de Vio Caietani Ordinis Praedicatorum," 1a2ae, 109, 2ff, in *Thomae Aquinatis Opera Omnia* (Iussu Leonis XIII, 1882), Vol. VII, pp. 292ff. Full analysis and documentation is carried out at length in my forthcoming work, *Luther and Late Medieval Thomism: a Study in Theological Anthropology*.
- 27 E.g. according to Cajetan, fallen man can even love God *quantum ad substantiam operum* without the help of grace (*Thomae Aquinatis Opera Omnia*, vol. VII, p. 298, no. 6). For Thomas Aquinas, of course, fallen man can in no way love God without the help of grace (*Summa Theologiae* 1a2ae, 109, 3).
- 28 I have argued elsewhere that "Augustinianism" should in fact be taken to mean anti-Pelagianism. "Towards a Definition of Late Medieval Augustinianism," in *The Thomist*, 44 (1980), 117-127.
- 29 O. Pesch, *Theologie der Rechtfertigung*, p. 524f. J. Wicks suggests more explicitly that Cajetan was to some extent influenced by "the Renaissance celebration of man's abilities." "Thomism Between Renaissance and Reformation: The Case of Cajetan," in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 68 (1977), 9-31, p. 20.
- 30 See, for example, Cajetan's comment on Gal. 2:21: "Vitam mihi sic conferentem sine meis meritis, sine operibus meis. Hoc enim significat dicendo gratiam, gratia enim non esset gratia si ex nostris operibus seu meritis esset . . ." (*Epistolae*, p. 119v, G).
- 31 For example, Cajetan interprets II Cor. 3:5 to mean that man by his own powers is incapable of thinking, willing, and acting *sufficiently* to merit eternal reward. Yet man can, to some extent, do these things without the help of grace. This then is what St. Paul means when he says that man's "sufficiency" is from God (*Epistolae*, p. 92v, F).
- 32 Hennig asserts that it was written at the command of Clement VII without substantiating his claim (*Cajetan und Luther*, p. 162). The *opusculum* is of course dedicated to Clement VII.
- 33 This can be found in *Opuscula Omnia Thomae de Vio Caietani* (Lyons, 1581), Vol. III, pp. 288-292. A recent translation can be found in Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, pp. 219-239.
- 34 Again, the argument I summarize here is made and documented at much greater length in my forthcoming *Luther and Late Medieval Thomism*. To my knowledge, the crucial passages in the tenth chapter of this *opusculum* have been passed over in complete silence by interpreters of Cajetan. See, for instance, F. Lauchert, *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers* (Nieuwkoop, 1972; First published, Freiburg, 1912), pp. 169-176; Hennig, *Cajetan und Luther*, pp. 164-177; V. Pfnür, *Einig in der Rechtfertigungslehre? Die Rechtfertigungslehre der Confessio Augustana (1530) und die Stellungnahme der katholischen Kontroverstheologie zwischen 1530 und 1535* (Wiesbaden, 1970), pp. 369-378; and E. Stakemeier, "Lutherische Stimmen zum kommenden Konzil," in *Theologie und Glaube*, 52 (1962), 260-279, especially pp. 271-275.
- 35 "Vere benignissimus erga nos est Deus, providendo, ut quam in statu peccati mereri non

possumus remissionem peccatorum, impetrare oratione, ieiunio, eleemosynis, aliisque bonis operibus valeamus. In hoc enim immensa charitas divina erga peccatorum salutem commendatur, ut etiam nostris quamvis impiorum bonis operibus vim impetratoriam remissionis peccatorum largiri dignata sit. Et praeter haec ut in capite septimo, ex verbis Exechielis monstrandum est sunt meritoria alicuius temporalis boni a Deo. Ex quibus patet inducendos esse peccatores ad bona opera, quia vere utilia sunt ad remissionem peccatorum impetrandum et assequendam, cum devota mente fiunt" (*De Fide et Operibus*, Ch. 10, p. 291).

- 36 I cannot therefore agree with Wicks that by the time he wrote this *opusculum* "Cajetan's thinking had clearly been enriched through his exposition of Paul's Epistles" (*Cajetan Responds*, p. 42). Nor do I think that this is a "model work of controversy that ranks among the very best products of pre-Tridentine Catholic answers to the Reformation" (*Ibid.*, p. 46).
- 37 Pesch uses these words of Cajetan in a more general context (*Theologie der Rechtfertigung*, p. 9).
- 38 Printed in W. Friedensburg, "Aktenstücke über des Verhalten der römischen Kurie zur Reformation 1524 und 1531," in *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven*, 3 (1900), 1-20, pp. 16p18. This document has now been translated by Wicks, *Cajetan Responds*, pp. 201-203.
- 39 Cajetan further recommended that laws that are not of divine origin should not be binding under pain of serious sin. Wicks is surely correct in saying that, had this recommendation been accepted, it would "have made a breathtaking difference in early modern Catholic life and practice" (*Cajetan Responds*, p. 41).