

CURRENT THEOLOGY

ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY, 1956-1957

PART 1: HISTORICAL¹

It has become increasingly obvious these last few years that the discovery of the so-called Dead Sea Scrolls was an event of surpassing importance for the study, within historical perspectives, of biblical and patristic spiritualities. The witness of the Scrolls to the existence of a religious ideal of celibacy, for instance, that was contemporaneous with Christ, of a practice of communal ownership previous to that of the apostolic community, of a detailed doctrine of the discernment of spirits long before Origen, of an organized monasticism long before Anthony and Pachomius, etc., has provided a new background against which early Christian doctrines and practices may be the more accurately examined and assessed. But the day has not yet come for such examination and assessment; too much work remains to be done on the Scrolls themselves before ever they can be used in this profitable fashion.²

The consequence of all this for the first two sections of the survey that follows is itself twofold. First of all, one will remark therein a large and prudent silence on the subject of the Scrolls. Secondly, there will be little talk of the "originality" of this or that early author. It would be preferable to have it otherwise, for this means a lessening both of the survey's coverage and, in the earlier sections, of its clarity. But there seems at the moment no help for it.

Sacred Scripture

The importance of the *OT* notion of "God's poor" for a proper understanding of both *OT* and *NT* spiritualities recent scholarship has put excellently in evidence.³ The concept itself has now been clarified in a particularly helpful fashion by Vansteenkiste.⁴ His method, initially, is chronological—more severely so than any previous study I have seen. The result is a lucid semantic pattern which will allow future students of the question to disengage immediately the varied meanings of *anaw* and *ani* at every

¹ For an explanation of the purpose, method, and content of these biennial surveys, see *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 15 (1954) 258. This historical survey will be concluded in a subsequent issue; the same issue will carry the doctrinal survey.

² Probably the most that can be said at the moment has been said with exemplary probity and balance by John M. Oesterreicher; see his "The Community of Qumran," *The Bridge* 2 (1956-57) 91-134.

³ Cf. *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 15 (1954) 259; 17 (1956) 40-41.

⁴ M. Vansteenkiste, C.M., "L'*ani* et l'*anaw* dans l'Ancien Testament," *Divus Thomas* 59 (1956) 3-19.

level in the development of the religion of Israel and which permits the author himself, in the concluding pages of his paper, to erect into historical certainties conclusions tentatively proposed by his predecessors. Previous to the Exile the two terms had already acquired, over and above the generic idea of "poor," a connotation of humiliation and moral abasement that had—if one excepts two texts of Zephaniah—no religious overtones. After the Exile it was progressively the religious aspect that came to the fore, ending in their becoming practically technical terms of the spiritual life for the pious, the God-fearing, etc. The disaster of 587 induced an awareness, first in regard to the person of Jeremiah and then in regard to the nation as a whole, of those—the *anawim*—who precisely amid oppression and tragedy remain objects of God's free covenant, an awareness that culminated in the type par excellence of the *anaw*, the Servant of Yahweh in the Deutero-Isaiah, and in the literary expression of the Book of Job. Why was this awareness so long in coming into existence? There was needed the historical incidence of multiple and seemingly endless trials to render the Jewish spirit conscious of its utter "poverty," of its inability to find hope or repose anywhere but in its dependence upon Yahweh. And with this there emerges in the analysis of Vansteenkiste a note which had been previously, but hesitantly, made: the "poor of God" is not only one who has abased himself before God but, especially, one whom God has abased by suffering.⁵ Further, this note of the divine initiative in the constitution of His elite sets in clear relief two notions which, along with that of the *anawim*, would be also basic to NT spirituality: the Lordship of God and the eternal Covenant. As is the happy convention of late, the author concludes with a reference to the Magnificat of our Lady, the perfect expression at the dawn of the Christian era of the *anawim* spirituality.⁶

For his part, Daniélou makes explicit the connection between the doctrine of the *anawim* as it has been rediscovered of late, and the doctrine of "poverty" such as we have always, perhaps too narrowly, understood it.⁷ One of the trials of the *anaw* is that he is poor in material possessions. It is a condition which does not, of course, automatically make him dependent solely upon God but can contribute rather effectively to such dependence. Or, conversely (and this is the author's chief point), such total dependence can in concrete circumstances involve such destitution, just as it always involves such detachment. This it can do because it is before all else at-

⁵ This confirms the tentative conclusion of Knepper, whose little study (cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 15 [1954] 259, n. 6) apparently escaped the author's notice.

⁶ But see P. Winter, "Le Magnificat et le Benedictus sont-ils des psaumes macchabéens?", *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 36 (1956) 1-19.

⁷ J. Daniélou, S.J., "Bienheureux les pauvres," *Etudes* 288 (1956) 321-38.

tachment to God.⁸ Hence the nuanced doctrine on material possessions that was possible in those first days which, significantly enough, were characterized in prophecy and fulfilment: "The *anawim* have the gospel preached to them."⁹ It was a doctrine of ends and means,¹⁰ however graphically and unphilosophically expressed. The philosophic expression would come later and, among the early Fathers at least, introduce a negative emphasis and a rigidity quite foreign to the *anawim* mentality.¹¹ We have a somewhat similar instance of this in the contrast that exists between the biblical doctrine of work—particularly of manual labor—and that of pagan philosophy which would eventually intrude, under patristic auspices, into the Christian consciousness. In the Bible, as Desee has pointed out, work is something beautiful and holy and as such willed as normal for man.¹² With the arrival of the Kingdom, with the constitution of the *nova creatura*, it was assumed into an even higher perspective of the redemptive plan of God.¹³ So positive and favorable a view of work becomes more easily understandable directly one recognizes its close kinship with the basic *anawim* spirituality: all things (food is the stock example, temporal possessions, work itself) have meaning only in terms of that about which one should be, according to the evangelical admonition, exclusively solicitous. But they thus do have positive meaning.¹⁴ This sort of thing, fragmentary, incomplete, of an eschatological emphasis calculated to induce a temporary despair into the hearts of the "incarnationalists" among our theologians of history, has been brought to the fore once again in singularly convincing fashion by Gryglewicz.¹⁵ His careful philological study has in particular made it clear how circumspectly the Septuagint translators and the NT writers avoided any Greek term that might possibly convey a negative or a pejorative notion of work, and this while using the language of a culture which held manual labor in contempt. He concludes with the remark (likely the understatement of the year) that it would be somewhat difficult to reconcile

⁸ S. Jeanne d'Arc, O.P., "Heureux les pauvres," *Vie spirituelle* 96 (1957) 115–26.

⁹ Mt 11:5; cf. Lk 4:18 (Is 61:1).

¹⁰ R. Koch, "Die Wertung des Besitzes im Lukasevangelium," *Biblica* 38 (1957) 151–69.

¹¹ Something of the early patristic pattern has been plotted out with her usual competency by Hilda Graef, "La vertu de pauvreté chez les Pères grecs," *Vie spirituelle: Supplément*, n. 40 (1957) 127–31.

¹² B. Desee, "De bijbel en de arbeid," *Tijdschrift voor geestelijk leven* 12 (1956) 715–21.

¹³ Desee, "Der kristen en de arbeid," *Tijdschrift voor geestelijk leven* 13 (1957) 165–85.

¹⁴ Cf. B. Prete, "Vangelo e lavoro," *Sacra doctrina* 1 (1956) 280–309.

¹⁵ F. Gryglewicz, "La valeur morale du travail manuel dans la terminologie grecque de la Bible," *Biblica* 37 (1956) 314–37.

this fact with the conventional theological concept of work as a thing initially accursed of God and the result of original sin.

Edlund's monograph of a few years ago on the *NT* doctrine of simplicity of heart did not receive the attention it deserved.¹⁶ Bacht has now most helpfully synopsized its conclusions.¹⁷ The Septuagint and Vulgate versions usually translate *tamin* of the *OT* with the equivalent of our "simple." But its meaning, Edlund made clear, is rather more nuanced and richer. Thus the heart of one who treads the path that leads Godward, who is undeviatingly loyal to the Covenant, who is unrestrained in giving himself to God—such a heart is "simple" because undivided. Again, the "simple" eye of Mt. 6:22 (where "eye" stands for "soul") means absolute totality in the gift of self to God. Fr. Bacht does not go into the matter and it is beyond the purpose of this survey to dwell on it, but the doctrinal coincidence between this recaptured biblical concept and the *simplicitas* sought in subjects up for canonization should at least be remarked here and, perhaps, returned to later.¹⁸

One of the more exciting and difficult uses to which Form Criticism has been put of late is surely that of trying to penetrate back of the *NT* to the liturgical formulae of the primitive Christian community. It would be premature to hazard a guess at the implications of de Ausejo's inquiry into the Prologue of John; all we have of it are the largely preparatory stages.¹⁹ But it is allowable to remark on the method. That a stanza division is possible in a particular *NT* passage, that it is Christ who is praised therein, seem most tenuous grounds upon which to conclude that here we have a hymn. On comparable grounds one would be led to affirm that some of the most characteristic passages in, say, Thomas Wolfe were chorales sung by Pullman-car conductors. But as one awaits the completion of de Ausejo's work (which may well quiet all doubts), one may profitably consult the solid and more pedestrian efforts of Lacan,²⁰ Wennemer,²¹ and Meyer.²²

¹⁶ C. Edlund, *Das Auge der Einfalt* (Copenhagen, 1952).

¹⁷ H. Bacht, S.J., "Einfalt des Herzens—eine vergessene Tugend?", *Geist und Leben* 29 (1956) 416-26.

¹⁸ Dom G. Lefebvre has expressed most felicitously the ordinary notion of simplicity in his "La simplicité," *Vie spirituelle* 97 (1957) 115-26.

¹⁹ S. de Ausejo, "Es un himno a Cristo el prologo de San Juan?", *Estudios biblicos* 15 (1956) 223-77.

²⁰ M. F. Lacan, "L'oeuvre du Verbe incarné: le don de la vie (Jo. 1,4)," *Recherches de science religieuse* 45 (1957) 61-78.

²¹ K. Wennemer, S.J., "Geist und Leben bei Johannes," *Geist und Leben* 30 (1957) 185-98.

²² P. W. Meyer, "A Note on John 10, 1-18," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956) 232-35. The "door" of the first verse refers not to Christ Himself but to His death.

Of especial worth to one engaged in such work as that of de Ausejo is the lecture by des Places.²³

In his monumental effort to erect a *NT* theology of love, Père Spicq also has recourse to preexistent liturgical formulae in order to determine the proper content of *philein*.²⁴ Paul's famous anathema of the man who has not *philia* for the Lord is not the personal explosion of a great and loving heart that would demand beyond *agapē* the affective attachment to Christ. It is apparently only a quotation from an ancient Aramaic liturgical formula and implies no distinctive quality of love at all.

Somewhat more convincing are Boismard's analyses of 1 Peter, perhaps because of the studies by Preisker and Cross which preceded them.²⁵ In common with them he holds that the epistle reflects elements of a baptismal liturgy which was not (how could it be?) something like a present-day ritual and thus the same in all the churches, but a variety of formulae expressing parallel or identical themes. His conclusions seem sufficiently significant for transcription here, because if he is right they open out to us the broad perspectives of Christian spirituality as it was taught and, at especially climactic moments, lived a mere twenty years or less after the death of Christ.

1:3-5—A baptismal hymn (cf. Tit 3:5-7; 1 Jn 3:1-2; Col 3:1-4).

1:6-9—A liturgical fragment (cf. Jas 1:12; Rom 5:2-5) which ought not to be joined to the preceding hymn.

1:13-21—A homily preparatory to baptism, here simply synopsized, centered upon the baptismal typology of Exodus (cf. 1 Jn 3:3-10; Tit 2:11-14).²⁶

1:22-2:10—A homily subsequent to baptism which continues the theme from Exodus with especial insistence upon the Christian's rebirth by the

²³ E. des Places, S.J., "Hymnes grecs au seuil de l'ère chrétienne," *Biblica* 38 (1957) 113-29. It is a question of *pagan* hymns.

²⁴ C. Spicq, O.P., "Comment comprendre *philein* dans I Cor. XVI, 22?", *Novum testamentum* 1 (1956) 200-204. And see as well his "*Epipothein*, désirer ou chérir?", *Revue biblique* 64 (1957) 184-95.

²⁵ M. E. Boismard, O.P., "Une liturgie baptismale dans la *Prima Petri*," *Revue biblique* 63 (1956) 182-208; 64 (1957) 161-83.

²⁶ This Exodus typology helps explain a curious item to be found even today in our baptismal procedure: the renunciation of Satan and all his "poms." Just as the people of God were to be released from the works of slavery under Pharaoh that they might go into the desert and sacrifice to Yahweh, so by baptism one is released from the slavery of works under Satan and consecrated to the divine cult. The original formula contained a renunciation of Satan and his works considered as a cult. When it was translated into Greek, some misread the unvowelled Hebrew text and translated "his work" as "his angels" or "his mission (*pompē*). See M. E. Boismard, "Je renonce à Satan et à ses oeuvres," *Lumière et vie*, n. 26 (1956) 105-10.

Word and the moral obligations that derive from it (cf. Jas 1:17-27; Rom 8:14-17; 12:1-2).

2:11-3:7; 5:5—The ideal of Christian living for the newly baptized according to different social and domestic categories (cf. Tit 2:1-10; 3:1; Col 3:18-4:1; Eph 5:22-6:9).

5:5b-9— A baptismal hymn by way of conclusion to the moral admonitions.

The provenance of the remaining parts of the letter is more difficult to determine. If Boismard's mode of proceeding appears from the synopsis to be fanciful and farfetched, blame must be laid on the synopsis; his own procedure inspires considerable conviction. The gains in both clarity and depth for our understanding of primitive Christian spirituality that are thus obtained he has himself spelled out rather admirably.²⁷ All that is needed is that such elements be integrated within the total *NT* doctrine of baptism. And that can now be easily achieved, thanks to Stanley's brilliant study.²⁸

Fr. Stanley in the course of his exposition highlights the importance of the apostles' experience of the Spirit in His Pentecostal descent. For one thing, it was this which alone founded and gave specific character to their subsequent "apostolic" efforts. The quality of recent essays on the *NT* notion of the apostolate (called into being, it must be confessed, less by scientific curiosity than by pastoral concern) has gained immeasurably from their authors' explicit advertence to this fact. That much still needs to be done before ever we have a truly adequate transcript of scriptural teaching on the subject should not therefore lead one to neglect such interim and fragmentary contributions as those of Giblet,²⁹ Gelin,³⁰ or Devloo.³¹ Their orientation is right, although they carry one somewhat less far than their authors apparently believe.

Hamman approaches more closely to the ideal.³² He has managed to

²⁷ "La typologie baptismale dans la I^{re} Epître de saint Pierre," *Vie spirituelle* 94 (1956) 339-52.

²⁸ D. M. Stanley, S.J., "The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism: An Essay in Biblical Theology," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 18 (1957) 169-215. The equivocation throughout, in the use of the sole term "baptism" for the baptism and/or confirmation reality, should not be allowed to put off the reader unduly. And here, perhaps, is as good a place as any to recommend the series of articles by Stanley on the spirituality of St. John which have begun to appear in *Worship*.

²⁹ J. Giblet, "Les promesses de l'Esprit et la mission des apôtres dans les évangiles," *Irenikon* 30 (1957) 5-43.

³⁰ A. Gelin, P.S.S., "L'Idée missionnaire dans la Bible," *Ami du clergé* 66 (1956) 411-18.

³¹ L. Devloo, "Iesus' apostolaatszin en onze apostolaatszin," *Tijdschrift voor geestelijk leven* 13 (1957) 562-85; 630-46.

³² A. Hamman, O.F.M., *L'Apostolat du chrétien* (Paris, 1956).

gather together just about all the scattered elements of that scriptural teaching, analyzed them, set them in correlation one with another, and done it with that sure historical sense which is his great characteristic. If the result still falls short of what, strictly, is needed, it is because he is reluctant—or unable—to dominate his matter. An instance of the sort of thing that is required here is provided in Mouroux's transcription of the Pauline teaching on the spiritual dimensions of time.³³ Admittedly the subject is one that is more circumscribed, and the theologian who addresses himself to it is one who is more competent than most. Yet the comparison, Hamman-Mouroux, is not wholly unfair. It is merely a question of clarifying thereby the ideal to which efforts should be unremittingly pitched in matters such as these. All too easily does the impression persist that in the history, or even in the theology itself, of spirituality, half measures are all right. That they are not is the moral one should draw in comparing the good of Hamman with the better of Mouroux.

The Fathers

With that clarity and order which has always characterized his writing, but joined now to a lively enthusiasm for his subject which many of his readers, I imagine, will find to be completely contagious, Cayré has attempted to plot out the entire spirituality of the patristic period within such doctrinal limits and in such terms as will make it intelligible to the general public.³⁴ The result is a pleasant sort of double synthesis: a synthesis of patristic teaching grouped under various headings which is merely, as he himself admits, a synthesis of what he has already published in his *Patrologie*. It is accordingly somewhat withdrawn both from the sharp historical articulation of the patristic writings themselves and from the best of recent patristic research, which is rather a pity. That it need not have been so the earlier efforts of a Viller or a Bardy attest; indeed, more than two decades after their initial appearance, Viller's *La spiritualité des premiers siècles chrétiens* and Bardy's *La vie spirituelle d'après les Pères* are still more alert and reliable introductions to the field than this work of Cayré. But there is something to be said, surely, for enthusiasm in a work that is intended to waken interest in a subject. And Cayré, here, has enthusiasm to spare. Some may think it gets a trifle out of hand now and again, as when, for instance, the apostles are heralded as "the precursors of the Fathers," but in general it seems justified and is indeed refreshing

³³ J. Mouroux, "Structure spirituelle du présent chrétien," *Recherches de science religieuse* 44 (1956) 5-24.

³⁴ F. Cayré, A.A., *Spirituels et mystiques des premiers temps* (Paris, 1956).

to come upon. More serious and much more difficult to countenance is his ignoring of the entire martyrdom spirituality of the early centuries; its absolute centrality has long been known.

The general reliability of one of the sources of our information about this spirituality, the early *acta* of the martyrs, Simonetti has asserted once again.³⁵ The earliest of them, he holds, could not have been inspired by the pagan *acta*, since these were already of a distinct and different literary type, the *exitus*.³⁶ What pagan dependencies there are come to little more than matters of style or, more generally, a rhetoricism which in any case was everywhere in the air at the time. On the other hand, their basically biblical inspiration is manifest.³⁷ It is this, perhaps, which allows Jouassard to interrogate such data afresh in a purely biblical perspective and to find what we should call today a doctrine of the communion of saints.³⁸ But that conclusion, to this chronicler at least, seems to stray rather far beyond the evidence adduced. Basically there is no more in the particular texts he has chosen than a manifestation of that fellow feeling common to any beleaguered group—a community caught in a flood, a football team making a goal-line stand. But what dominates his investigation and probably prevents his seeing the proper, limited import of his texts is his concern to find an explanation of Irenaeus' reference to our Lady as *Adae advocata* (*Adversus haereses* 5, 19), and so he has given us just another, quite unnecessary instance of that defective scholarly method to which present-day Mariology seems strangely congenial. What might perhaps have been more advisedly put in evidence is that special intercessory capacity of the martyrs which was believed to derive from their union, in the act of martyrdom, with Christ, who is of course eternally our intercessor before the Father;

³⁵ M. Simonetti, "Qualche osservazione a proposito dell'origine degli Atti dei martiri," *Revue des études augustiniennes* 2 (1956) 39-57. More to the point, perhaps, would have been a consideration of such elements as R. Joly has now put in evidence: "L'Exhortation au courage (*tharrein*) dans les mystères," *Revue des études grecques* 68 (1955) 164-70. The entire question of Stoicism has been investigated by the Abbé Michel Spanneut. See G. Mathon, "Une thèse de Sorbonne sur le stoïcisme des Pères," *Mélanges de science religieuse* 13 (1956) 97-102.

³⁶ The author appears to be unfamiliar with H. A. Musurillo's *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford, 1954). That may account for the occasionally simplicist approach to the problem.

³⁷ The martyr legends of the Bible itself can provide a fascinating field of investigation. See the admirable instance of this: R. A. F. MacKenzie, S.J., "The Meaning of the Susanna Story," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 3 (1957) 211-18.

³⁸ G. Jouassard, "Le rôle des chrétiens comme intercesseurs auprès de Dieu dans la chrétienté lyonnaise au second siècle," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 30 (1956) 217-29.

that is a point that deserves looking into.³⁹ The fundamental idea, the union of martyr with Christ, Kettel profitably assumes in a study of the relationship between martyrdom and Eucharist that is illuminating in several directions at once.⁴⁰ According to the early *acta martyrum*, he points out, martyrdom was considered a "eucharistic" celebration and (what has been generally recognized all along) somehow the final result of the Eucharist itself. In a number of the accounts a conscious parallelism is established between the ritual of the Eucharist—dress, gesture, mode and content of prayer—and the events of a martyrdom such as that, say, of Polycarp.⁴¹ For his part, Kettel is content to emphasize the thanksgiving aspect of martyrdom which the *acta* thus set in such clear relief, but further reflection upon the data he has gathered would not be altogether out of order. As Brilioth noted some years ago, sacrifice in primitive Christianity was identified with what was done in the Eucharist and not with what was done on Calvary. Now this directly "eucharistic" understanding of martyrdom which Kettel has so splendidly put in evidence offers us perhaps the final clue to much in primitive spirituality that has hitherto remained so confusing. For instance, the martyr's sacrifice did not consist essentially in his suffering and dying, and yet he was held to be the perfect imitator of Christ in His dying;⁴² the virgin and the ascetic did the same as the martyrs, theirs was a consummate "sacrifice," and yet death and suffering were as such not involved;⁴³ the first monks were esteemed as the successors to the martyrs,⁴⁴ and yet the sufferings they imposed upon themselves were precautionary in purpose, medicinal, and as such disassociated from the sufferings of Christ. And so on. But now all such seemingly conflicting data can finally be resolved into a harmonious and intelligible pattern; for the conflicts were born, it would seem, only of our having read back into the documents a later notion of sacrifice that was immediately derived, not from the Eu-

³⁹ A by-product of such an investigation might well be a happy clarification of the grounds of that eventual Marian title, *regina martyrum*.

⁴⁰ J. Kettel, "Martyrium und Eucharistie," *Geist und Leben* 30 (1957) 34-46.

⁴¹ It will be helpful to recall in this connection Dürig's work on martyrdom as a priestly anointing; see *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES* 17 (1956) 43-44.

⁴² New light on the "essential" aspect of martyrdom as primitively understood is provided in A. Orbe, S.J., *Los primeros herejes ante la persecución (Estudios Valentinianos 5)*; Rome, 1956). The accusation of the heretics was that Christian martyrdom, which involved death, corrupted and degraded the essential thing. The reply was that the essential thing was not the suffering and dying.

⁴³ Cf. M. del Estal, "Origen cristiano de la práctica virginal en la Iglesia primitiva," *Ciudad de Dios* 169 (1956) 209-52.

⁴⁴ Cf. E. E. Malone, O.S.B., "The Monk and the Martyr," in B. Steidle, *Antonius magnus eremita* (Rome, 1956) pp. 201-28.

charist, but from the crucifixion and thus included the historical concomitants of the sacrifice of Calvary, Christ's suffering and death. Sacrifice, however, is dedication. Sacrifice to God is one's freely and irrevocably making something God's. Although this may sound strange to our post-Reformation ears, it is at least historically true: thus did the primitive Church understand "sacrifice." And thus, in varying temporal circumstances, is the monk, the ascetic, the virgin at one with the martyr; for the essence of the martyr's act was dedication, not death (or suffering), as is clear from its primary referent being not Calvary but the Eucharist.

The great doctrinal influence in the transition from the age of the martyrs to that of the monks was, of course, Origen. Not a year passes now but that our appreciation of his greatness is further heightened by fresh research. Rondet has set in new relief the impact of his teaching on sin;⁴⁵ Musurillo, that on fasting;⁴⁶ Marx, that on "continuous prayer."⁴⁷ But Méhat illustrates perhaps best of all the greatness of Origen's influence in situating historically one of his less felicitous doctrines, that on the *apokatastasis*.⁴⁸ For Clement of Alexandria (as also, it would seem, for Irenaeus) *apokatastasis* was an *apodosis* in all the various contemporary significations of that term: it is that which hope awaits; it is hope itself fully and definitively fulfilled; it is the "balancing of accounts" by God when He "acquits Himself" of His promises. But for Origen it was restoration to the primitive state. And thus (so great was his influence) did he make "of a biblical word the title of a chapter in the history of heresies."

It is a more flattering sort of originality and influence that Crouzel seeks to ascribe to Origen: he was, in effect, the founder of mystical theology.⁴⁹ Strenuously taking sides in the contemporary dispute between Walter Völker and Jean Daniélou, he agrees with the first that the title of founder should be accorded Origen rather than Gregory of Nyssa because Origen was himself an authentic mystic (though not for the reasons Völker alleges) and everything you find regarding mysticism in the writings of Gregory is already discoverable in those of Origen. No one, so long as Fr. Crouzel is

⁴⁵ H. Rondet, S.J., "Aux origines de la théologie du péché," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 79 (1957) 16-32.

⁴⁶ H. Musurillo, S.J., "The Problem of Ascetical Fasting in the Greek Patristic Writers," *Traditio* 12 (1956) 1-64.

⁴⁷ M. J. Marx, O.S.B., "Incessant Prayer in the *Vita Antonii*," in *Antonius magnus eremita*, pp. 108-35.

⁴⁸ A. Méhat, "'Apocatastase': Origène, Clément d'Alexandrie, *Act.* 3, 21," *Vigiliae christianae* 10 (1956) 196-214.

⁴⁹ H. Crouzel, S.J., "Grégoire de Nysse est-il le fondateur de la théologie mystique?", *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 33 (1957) 189-202.

around, is going to diminish by a hairsbreadth the stature of Origen as he conceives him. And that is all to the good. It is that loyalty which has given us two extremely provocative analyses in the present article, one (against Daniélou's interpretation) of Origen's doctrine of the mystical dark, and another (against that of Völker) of his notion of ecstasy. It has also provided us new reasons for thinking that the Origen so highly regarded by Longinus, so confided in by Ammonius Saccas, so awesome to Plotinus that he was struck speechless in his presence, is our man and not some pagan philosopher with the same name.⁵⁰ But loyalty, as a kind of love, can be blind at times. It is a pity that the truth of this familiar observation had to be so extensively documented in what is Crouzel's most ambitious work to date.⁵¹ Many are the distractions that await the student here as he reads, on successive pages or even on the same page, that Origen's thought "has a twofold origin, Hellenism and Scripture" and "Scripture alone is the starting point and support of his thought"; that Gn 1:26-27 distinguishes between "image" and "likeness" and Fathers who make the same distinction on the basis of the same text are far from the text's true meaning; that this same distinction "has an important place in the Origenist doctrine of the image" and Origen "is as little faithful to the distinction as was Clement"; and so on. In what is apparently his impetuous need to say as many nice things about Origen as he can, the author resembles no one quite so much as Origen himself; the student accordingly would be wise to follow, in his reading of Crouzel, the program that Crouzel sets down as mandatory in one's reading of Origen: do not tarry over the contradictory statements but push determinedly on until you have read him completely and the contradictions will then be found to have pretty much canceled each other out along the way. Doing that, the student will be rewarded with a most fruitful understanding of one of the most imposing figures in the entire history of spirituality. The Christocentrism of Origen's spiritual doctrine has been commonly asserted, at least since the pioneering studies of Viller. But never before has its rationale been properly spelt out. Christ alone is the image of God. Man was made *kat' eikona*, "according to" the image which is Christ. His being "according to the image" is what, Crouzel holds, we would call today sanctifying grace. It is resident in the fine point of the soul, the *hēgemonikon* (the *principale cordis* of the Rufinus translation which would enjoy such a vogue in the medieval mystical literature), and as both

⁵⁰ Crouzel, "Origène et Plotin élèves d'Ammonios Saccas," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 57 (1956) 193-214.

⁵¹ *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène* (Paris, 1956).

knowledge and mode of being it is intended to develop into the final consummating being and knowledge of "likeness."

The over-all picture that Crouzel intends to convey is that of an Origen faithful first of all to what Scripture, and not to what Hellenic philosophy, has to say. Yet clearly there is no reason for Origen's teaching that there must be the upward progression from "according to the image" to "according to the likeness" except his fidelity to Platonism; if Christ is the image, it is in terms of image alone that, on the biblical evidence, one can speak of progression. So large a philosophic dosage as this makes one wonder if the doctrine of the image is so central to Origen's thought as Crouzel would have us believe. Generally speaking, an evolution is perceptible in his career that is ever toward a more scriptural and less philosophic mentality. His general ethical doctrine is one example of it.⁵² His theory of redemption is another.⁵³ Yet his image doctrine, so largely drawn from his late, biblical writings, is as constrained by philosophy as anything he wrote at the outset. Might he not, then, have been just repeating himself on a subject he thought not especially important?

Crouzel promises us a book on the mystical doctrine of Origen. It will be awaited impatiently. Meanwhile one may avail oneself of Lawson's excellent version of two of Origen's chief "mystical" works, his commentary and homilies on the Canticle of Canticles,⁵⁴ and Hanson's perfectly fascinating article on two of the others, the homilies on Genesis and on Numbers.⁵⁵ It is difficult enough to disengage an author's genuine mystical teaching from writings which are not *ex professo* mystical treatises. With Origen the difficulty is enormously compounded by his predilection for biblical place-names as themselves descriptive of stages in the soul's mystical exodus. Prof. Hanson, fortunately, has faced this especial difficulty head on with a richly documented study of Origen's usage. Two conclusions are arrived at, one of them tentative, the other most firm. The tentative conclusion: he had two types of etymological sources at his disposal, a "Greek" and a "Hebrew." In the "Greek" type, which likely originated with the Jewish community at Alexandria, the Greek word was translated

⁵² Cf. G. Bardy, "Les idées morales d'Origène," *Mélanges de science religieuse* 13 (1956) 23-38.

⁵³ Cf. R. Göglér, "Die christologische und heilstheologische Grundlage der Bibelexegese des Origenes," *Theologisches Quartalschrift* 136 (1956) 1-13.

⁵⁴ *Origen, The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*, tr. and ann. R. P. Lawson (Westminster, Md., 1957).

⁵⁵ R. P. C. Hanson, "Interpretations of Hebrew Names in Origen," *Vigiliae christianae* 10 (1956) 103-23.

into Hebrew and thence the meaning derived. In the "Hebrew" type, possibly obtained from the rabbis of Caesarea, the meaning is directly derived from the Hebrew. The certain conclusion: Völker and many another scholar have been misled by this device of Origen. Contrary to what they believe, Origen showed "amazing psychological skill" in interpreting the Stations of the Wilderness (in the homilies on Numbers) as mystical ascent because he had himself no hand in deriving these names. No one henceforth can pretend to have disengaged Origen's mystical doctrine unless he has made constant and wise use of this article.

Regarding early monastic spirituality, its provenance and its evolution, we have been excellently served during the past two years. It was only appropriate that we should, since 1956 was, of course, the sixteenth centenary of the death of St. Anthony, who dominated in one way or another all the early, formative years.

Among the more general studies which, trespassing as they must beyond the primly chronological arrangement of a survey such as this, may most fittingly be mentioned here, the following seem of especial worth. The most generic is the collection of studies by Dom Rousseau which treat successively of the notions of perfection, virginity, common life, poverty, and obedience in a *vue d'ensemble* that ranges all the way from Anthony to Benedict without losing sight for a moment of the varying historical contexts.⁵⁶ To the notion that the monastic life was somehow an "angelic life,"⁵⁷ Ranke-Heinemann contributes further useful clarifications: it was a life whose ideal was obedience to the divine will as set out in the petition of the Lord's Prayer, "on earth as it is in heaven."⁵⁸ She also brings to the fore, perhaps too exclusively, the negative aspect of the early spirituality of the desert.⁵⁹ For separation from "the world" was only the consequent, in a concrete historical moment, of its basic characteristic, the total attachment to God.⁶⁰ Of course, as time

⁵⁶ O. Rousseau, O.S.B., *Monachisme et vie religieuse d'après l'ancienne tradition de l'église* (Paris, 1957). Despite the title, history is not the concern of I. Van Houtryve, O.S.B., *L'Unique nécessaire d'après Saint Benoît, la tradition monastique et les grands maîtres de la vie spirituelle* (Bruges, 1956); it is simply a collection of spiritual conferences to religious, of that high quality we have come to expect of Dom Houtryve.

⁵⁷ Cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 17 (1956) 42-43.

⁵⁸ U. Ranke-Heinemann, "Zum Ideal der *vita angelica* im frühen Mönchtum," *Geist und Leben* 29 (1956) 347-57.

⁵⁹ "Das Verhältnis des frühen Mönchtums zur Welt," *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 7 (1956) 289-96.

⁶⁰ Even in his own day St. Basil felt that the moment had passed; hence his harsh criticism of the desert monks as being unchristian. Incidentally, one should not take seriously the quotations of "St. Basil" that Ranke-Heinemann draws from the *De renuntiatione saeculi*.

went on the negative aspect did receive increasing, and unhealthy, emphasis.⁶¹ But that took a while. Meantime the basic characteristic of all monasticism continued to flourish elsewhere in different, non-eremitical forms. But there is another negative aspect which cannot be interpreted so benignly. To students coming for the first time into contact with the documents of primitive monasticism the question always poses itself: Did this sort of life actually mean the withdrawal from frequentation of Mass and sacraments it seems to imply? A well-documented "yes" has now been provided.⁶² If one would seek some sort of reason, however specious, that might historically have been at the back of so deplorable a situation, he would do well to look toward the "eucharistic" interpretation of martyrdom of which I have already spoken. The monk, as successor to the martyr, is by his entire way of life engaged in a "eucharistic" celebration. Hence, what need of frequent assistance at the celebration of the Eucharist? That the original profound theological intuition should have resulted so soon in so absolute a distortion is a question that might profitably be investigated.

The doctrine of Anthony himself, as distinguished from the doctrinal example provided by the *Vita Antonii*, Giardini has bravely attempted to glean from his letters.⁶³ It took courage, because the obscurity of the letters is proverbial.⁶⁴ But it needed the doing; it has become the convention of late to be simply content with what is to be found in the *Vita*, which is however, just a *genre littéraire* graphically expressive of an entire school of thought. For the most illuminating results, Giardini's presentation of the doctrine of Anthony should be studied in conjunction with his presentation of the doctrine of Ammonas.⁶⁵ The second is an excellent complement to the first, and can serve to set in clear relief the mystical implications in the teaching of Anthony, for Ammonas—a mystic—was Anthony's disciple. It will come as a surprise to those whose information has been drawn exclusively from the *Vita* how theological both authors are—Semi-Pelagian, as we would say today, but theological. The *Vita*, of course, presents its

⁶¹ J. C. Guy, S.J., "Un dialogue monastique inédit," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 33 (1957) 171-88.

⁶² E. Dekkers, O.S.B., "Les anciens moines cultivaient-ils la liturgie?", *Maison-Dieu*, n. 51 (1957) 31-54.

⁶³ F. Giardini, O.P., "La dottrina spirituale di S. Antonio Abate nelle sue sette lettere autentiche," *Rivista di ascetica e mistica* 2 (1957) 124-39.

⁶⁴ It was long thought that their general opaqueness was born simply of the ineptitudes of the versions which alone we possess. But now we have the alarming assurance of Garitte that the originals are themselves obscure; see G. Garitte, O.S.B., *Lettres de s. Antoine: Version géorgienne et fragments coptes* (Louvain, 1955) p. vii.

⁶⁵ "La dottrina spirituale di Ammonas, discepolo di S. Antonio Abate," *Rivista di ascetica e mistica* 2 (1957) 242-57.

own problems. Hertling's survey of Antonian studies throughout the past three decades gives some idea of how numerous and persistent they are.⁶⁶ One of them, its demonology, has been taken care of in rather magisterial fashion by Daniélou: it was formed by the assumption of Hellenic and Semitic notions into a concept that is specifically Christian.⁶⁷ But the basic problem, that of the text itself, has not been taken care of, although we had come to think that for all practical purposes it had. The Migne text is based on six manuscripts, all of which apparently stem from Metaphrastes' tenth-century collection of biographies. The way to check on its reliability was to compare it with early translations. The convention for the longest while was to use to that end the rather free Latin version made by Evagrius of Antioch about twenty years after the death of Anthony. But then in 1939 Dom Garitte published another Latin translation which, earlier even than that of Evagrius, had managed to survive in one sole manuscript. The very awkwardness of its style succeeded in commending it, in the eyes of most, as being a blindly literal version of the original Greek. But now Mlle Mohrmann, if she has not tipped over that particular applecart, has certainly left it at an alarming cant: the anonymous author, she has proved, was only too happy to make free with his Greek source.⁶⁸

Writing with only an occasional show of understandable *parti pris*, Bacht corrects on a number of points the conventional picture of the monastic achievement of Pachomius.⁶⁹ It was not, in any sense, a repudiation of Anthony. The institution of the cenobitic form of monastic life was only an instance of the "evolution" of the eremitic ideal of Anthony. If intelligence boggles at such an assertion and memory is disturbed by the realistic comments of the Antonian solitaires,⁷⁰ one should still read on; there is much solid information in Bacht's study that is not otherwise easily come upon. Pachomius knew Anthony, it is pointed out; he esteemed him; he conserved

⁶⁶ L. Hertling, S.J., "Studi storici antoniani negli ultimi trent'anni," in *Antonius magnus eremita*, pp. 13-34.

⁶⁷ J. Daniélou, S.J., "Les démons de l'air dans la 'Vie d'Antoine,'" *ibid.*, pp. 136-47; and cf. U. Ranke-Heinemann, "Die ersten Mönche und die Dämonen," *Geist und Leben* 29 (1956) 164-70.

⁶⁸ C. Mohrmann, "Note sur la version latine la plus ancienne de la Vie de s. Antoine par s. Athanase," in *Antonius magnus eremita*, pp. 35-44.

⁶⁹ H. Bacht, S.J., "Antonius und Pachomius: Von der Anchorese zum Coenobitentum," *ibid.*, pp. 66-107. Much detailed information is to be found in D. J. Chitty, "A Note on the Chronology of the Pachomian Foundations," in K. Aland and F. L. Cross, *Studia patristica: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies* 2 (Berlin, 1957) 379-85.

⁷⁰ One will recall that for them the Pachomian way of life was counter to the gospel, particularly in that it substituted "OT law for NT liberty."

a number of his most characteristic ideals. It was just that he wished a life that was less open to aberration and danger and thus more reasonably accessible to the generality of men. The difference between the two types of life is not easy to determine, the author says (surprisingly enough, until we remember that for him there is no break between the two but only an evolving). He suggests (and here surprise is unlikely) that it lay in the notion of monks living together in community. The Pachomian *koinos bios* is fascinating in its ordered naïveté: it meant (1) living *alike* (i.e., dressing in the same fashion) and (2) living-eating-praying-working *together* (i.e., behind a wall). Bacht goes into a number of interesting details, the most interesting of which, perhaps, are those which have to do with the monks' life of prayer: twice daily in common, once daily in private.⁷¹ Looking now in the other direction, Bacht is unable to perceive the great difference that others have found between Pachomius and St. Basil the Great, and here, surely, it is impossible to quarrel with him. Wisdom and moderation characterized Pachomius quite as it did Basil and, as far as the much vaunted originality of Basilian obedience is concerned, that of Pachomius (the inspiration of the entire life and not merely a provisional measure as with Anthony) was exactly the same.

This meticulous ticking off of the originality of one historic figure at the expense of another historic figure is not the petty business that it may at first glance appear to be. Until Amand de Mendieta and Gribomont set seriously to work on Basil, he was, in the history of monastic spirituality, a figure as vague as he was imposing, indiscriminately credited with ideas he never had, much as in previous generations he was credited with works he never wrote. The attempt to find what really was, in this area of spirituality, the achievement of Basil has already resulted in unexpected clarifications of the whole of Eastern spirituality. Two recent studies may be taken as examples. Gribomont poses the question whether Basil wrote the *Exhortatio de renuntiatione saeculi* (PG 31, 625-48) and concludes that he did not.⁷² But in arriving at that conclusion he brings to light both another current of spirituality (evidenced by the *Exhortatio*, which is rigidly Antonian and yet eclectically dependent upon Basil for some of its ideas) and the historical grounds of Basil's hostility to the Antonian ideal; the existence of either of these might easily have remained unknown, had not Gribomont placed his initial question. Again, we called attention a few years ago to

⁷¹ For additional details see A. van der Mensbrugge, "Prayer-time in Egyptian Monasticism," *Studia patristica* 2, 434-54.

⁷² J. Gribomont, O.S.B., "L'*Exhortation au renoncement* attribuée à saint Basile," *Orientalia christiana periodica* 21 (1955) 374-98.

Amand's publication of a Greek sermon on virginity which the MSS ascribe to Basil but which he denied was Basil's.⁷³ On that basis Vööbus has examined it anew and come to the conclusion that it is a Greek version of a Syriac original: the scriptural text used by the preacher provides the major argument.⁷⁴ The geographical shift that this involves has important consequences for the history of spirituality because the document itself is an unparalleled witness to a family asceticism which antedated monasticism. As to Basil himself and his genuine achievement, Gribomont has now provided what may well turn out to be the most valuable aid to date.⁷⁵ He realizes that he has, though not seeking to do so, opened up an entire fresh perspective. Situating Basil within the complex religious pattern set up by the condemnations of the Council of Gangra and the perseverance of many, despite the Council, in their ascetic teaching, he is able to isolate the essential ambiguity of Basil's concept of monasticism. The Basilian achievement was to join in unstable equilibrium the notion of asceticism acquired from his master in the spiritual life, Eustathes of Sebaste, but stripped of its monastic limitations, and the notion of perfection in charity acquired from his attentive reading of the Gospels, but which similarly was shorn of limitations: Basil was "incapable of introducing into his system, or at least of generalizing, the idea of evangelical counsels." The immediate consequence of this juncture was a tremendous impulse and inspiration for the monastic movement, because Basil wrote not as though to monks but as to all Christians, and not as though of matters of counsel but of precept. What wonder that many would have concluded that to be Basil's "logical Christian" there was no help for it except to be a monk? And this brings us to the point where new perspectives open: how much there is in common between Basil's teaching and Messalianism.⁷⁶

The affinity of Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, to Messalianism in the matter of "prayer of the heart" Kemmer has proved.⁷⁷ Gregory himself

⁷³ Cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 15 (1954) 263.

⁷⁴ A. Vööbus, "Syrische Herkunft der pseudo-Basilianischen Homilie über die Jungfräulichkeit," *Oriens christianus* 40 (1956) 69-77.

⁷⁵ "Le monachisme au IV^e s. en Asie Mineure: de Gangres au Messalianisme," *Studia patristica* 2, 400-415.

⁷⁶ Thanks especially to the work of Dom Gribomont, the historical dossier on this intermediate, non-heretical "Messalianism" is becoming more complete; see his "Les homélies ascétiques de Philoxène de Marbourg et l'écho du messalianisme," *Orient syrien* 2 (1957) 419-32.

⁷⁷ A. Kemmer, O.S.B., "Gregor von Nyssa und Ps. Makarius: Der Messalianismus im Lichte östlicher Herzensmystik," in *Antonius magnus eremita*, pp. 268-82. He has also suggested that Cassian might have known the *De instituto christiano* of Gregory and thus submitted to its "Semi-Pelagian" ideas, which were familiar to ancient monasticism

eventually embraced the Basilian monastic reform. But when? Daniélou contends that it could not have been until after the death of his wife, because it would have meant separating from her.⁷⁸ The argument does not inspire total conviction. There was nothing unusual about married men becoming monks in those days, and Basil takes care of the matter explicitly in number 12 of the *Great Rules* (PG 31, 948-49), adding that, on the Gospel evidence, one who does not hate father, mother, and wife is unworthy of the Lord, and the wife who refuses to let her husband join up shows little regard for God's will. Often, he says, prayer and fasting obtain from God the salutary illness of such a wife and thus, graphically, is she taught obedience to His will. And, to judge from Gregory's way of talking about marriage in his *De virginitate*, he would have found it no great hardship to separate from the good Theosebia.

Völker's long-awaited study of the mystical doctrine of Gregory has finally come to hand.⁷⁹ It was worth waiting for. The author was singularly fitted for the task because of his previous studies of Gregory's predecessors, Philo, Clement, and Origen. After a summary and evaluation of previous Gregorian research, he considers in turn Gregory's doctrine on sin, on the struggle with one's passions, on detachment, on spiritual progress, on *gnōsis*, and on the active life. The concluding chapter, a masterly piece of synopsis, seeks to recapitulate all that has been said, while situating it within historical perspective. It is worth remarking that for Völker the historical perspective in which this Cappadocian of the fourth century is to be seen is exclusively Alexandria of the first three centuries. Two conclusions are possible. Gregory was an Alexandrian born out of due time—and place. Or Völker is working on too small a canvas. The second appears the more likely. Only one other defect would I note (the only other one, indeed, that I have detected in this splendid book): lack of theological awareness on the part of the author, who is, after all, writing about a theologian. The same defect was apparent in his Origen volume. He stirs up all sorts of theological questions regarding faith, grace, freedom, etc., without being conscious that he has done it; so naturally he provides no answers.

An alert theological awareness combined with a sure historical sense makes Burghardt's monograph on Cyril, an authentic Alexandrian, one of

and were able to pass, through him, into the Rule of St. Benedict: "Gregorius Nyssenus estne inter fontes Joannis Cassiani numerandus?", *Orientalia christiana periodica* 21 (1955) 451-56.

⁷⁸ J. Daniélou, S.J., "Le mariage de Grégoire de Nysse et la chronologie de sa vie," *Revue des études augustinienes* 2 (1956) 71-78.

⁷⁹ W. Völker, *Gregor von Nyssa als Mystiker* (Wiesbaden, 1955).

the truly noteworthy achievements to be recorded in this survey.⁸⁰ The author's task was not easy. The growing frequency with which it is chosen as topic of a doctoral dissertation might lead one to believe that the image theology of this or that ancient author provides an especially safe and easy entry into patristic research for young scholars; but such is not the case. As Camelot has pointed out, "It must be said (no pun intended!) that this image theology has the disadvantage of remaining on the level of images. Model, image, mirror, splendor, irradiation—these are metaphors which have to be purified to their depths and transposed if they are to express the mysteries of God and of the soul."⁸¹ Such purification and transposition the Fathers have effected only partially, if at all. So the task devolves upon the scholar who would, in this theologically more self-conscious era, restate their thought on man the image of God. Clearly, it is not a chore for novices in the field. Fr. Burghardt, with almost two decades of publication in the most exigent areas of patristic research behind him, is of course no novice. So the task, for him, was not impossible; it was only enormously difficult. His own happy disclaimer in the Introduction no one should take seriously.

Cyril is faithful to the scriptural evidence in placing no real distinction between "image" and "likeness"; he is less faithful in assigning merely the soul of man as the locus of the image. God made the first man to His image in endowing him with reason, freedom, dominion, holiness, and incorruptibility. Sin removed solely such aspects of the image as were consequent upon the inhabitation of the Spirit: holiness, incorruptibility, and a certain "kinship" with God; it diminished the freedom that had been Adam's and his dominion over brute creation. With the recapitulation effected by Christ there are mediated to man through baptism some of the aspects that had been lost or lessened through Adam's sin: freedom, holiness, incorruptibility. And a new and greater one is accorded, that which for Cyril is the very reason of the Incarnation: sonship. The fleshing out of this clearly articulated doctrinal skeleton by Cyril is, on Burghardt's showing, a major theological achievement. And it is no less so because of Cyril's repeated unwillingness to speculate beyond the evidence which, rightly or wrongly, he thought he had before him.

Something should be done about St. John Chrysostom, who has fallen of late upon most evil days. Admittedly, mystics are the fashion and few

⁸⁰ W. J. Burghardt, S.J., *The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria* (Woodstock, Md., 1957).

⁸¹ T. Camelot, O.P., "La théologie de l'image de Dieu," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 40 (1956) 443-71.

among the great ancients are more *terre à terre* than Chrysostom. Yet it is a rare year in which there is anything at all to report beyond a graceful popularization or two; those by Vandenberghe can be taken as representative examples.⁸² This year is a trifle better than most, at least in the promise it offers. Wenger's competent study may be a presage of further serious work to come;⁸³ Uleyn's reveals a young scholar already in full command of his matter.⁸⁴ Agreeing with Fittkau (against Casel) that Chrysostom was not influenced by pagan cults in his *mystērion* doctrine, Uleyn asserts none the less that both Meyer and Moulard are wrong precisely in not taking sufficient cognizance of his Hellenism. There is, he proves, a marked affinity in Chrysostom's sermons with Hellenic moral doctrine, in particular with that of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. This allows the author to analyze the Matthew Commentary in terms of the highly stylized technique of the diatribe. The results, of which only a few are hinted at in the present article, should be extremely informative.⁸⁵

A bridge is provided between what has been reported thus far, on the patristic spirituality of the East, with what follows on that of the West by two very curious studies. One concerns itself with identifying the Pseudo-Dionysius, whose origin was in the East and whose influence was in the West; the other seeks to construct a "theology of monuments," of which the inspiration is Eastern and the exemplification is Western. (If this attempt at graceful transition seems overly contrived, I can only ask the reader's patience. For these *are* curiosities, and it is not too easy to fit them in anywhere.) According to Turolla, the unknown author of the *Corpus dionysiacum* was most likely an Alexandrian of the first part of the second century.⁸⁶ His arguments have to be read in his own presentation of them to be enjoyed properly. The scholars who have been engaged with the Diony-

⁸² B. H. Vandenberghe, O.P., "La théologie du travail dans saint Jean Chrysostome," *Revista española de teología* 16 (1956) 474-95; "St. John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," *Cross and Crown* 9 (1957) 408-25; "La charité du prêtre selon saint Jean Chrysostome," *Vie spirituelle* 97 (1957) 175-86.

⁸³ A. Wenger, "La tradition des oeuvres de saint Jean Chrysostome," *Revue des études byzantines* 14 (1956) 5-47.

⁸⁴ A. Uleyn, O.M.I., "La doctrine morale de saint Jean Chrysostome dans le Commentaire sur saint Mathieu et ses affinités avec la diatribe," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 27 (1957) 5*-25*, 99*-140*.

⁸⁵ It merely presents the first part of his doctoral dissertation, *De zedeleer van Johannes Chrysostomus in zijn Matheuskommentaar: Hellenistische en kristelijke factoren* (Louvain, 1956).

⁸⁶ E. Turolla, "Introduzione a una lettura di Dionigi Areopagita," *Sophia* 24 (1956) 46-65.

sian question for the past few decades, all of whose views Turolla rejects, will probably conclude he has done them most injury in his persistent inability to get their names straight.⁸⁷ Grillmeier's is, of course, a much more serious and scholarly piece of business.⁸⁸ Yet it is no less curious in its content nor ill-founded in its conclusions for all of that. Early archeological remains portray the dead Christ upon the cross with His eyes open. In the animal fables of antiquity it is said of the lion that it sleeps with its eyes open. This is possible, according to the so-called *Physiologus*, because the lion has more than one nature. But the lion as symbol of Christ is a commonplace in early Christian iconography. Therefore the early portrayal of Christ dead but with His eyes open is a testimony to the belief in the two natures of Christ, and specifically in the *divine* nature; for, the author adds, pagan divinities are always portrayed with their eyes open. What he should have added as well is that all early portraits of the dead, as dead, show them with their eyes open. But that would have killed the book, and that would have been a pity, for between its covers an amazing amount of erudition is compressed.

The favored working hypothesis today regarding the problem, which year by year becomes more complex, of Augustine's role in early Western monasticism comes down pretty much to the following. He did not introduce monasticism into Africa, nor did he found an order in which he would have been a kind of major superior. His "Rule" was solely destined to the private usage of the clerical monastery of Hippo. For there were in Africa at that time two types of monasticism. There was the Egyptian type with which we are the more familiar: individualistic, mendicant, amorous of solitude, given to excessive mortifications, with little or no relation to the local hierarchy. And there was another with which Augustine was in some way connected: social in its orientation, self-supporting, urban, moderate in its asceticism, and—most important—grouped about the bishop. It is perhaps within such a framework that the reader would be best advised to evaluate three recent studies, that of Folliet on the Messalian monks of Carthage as

⁸⁷ Nothing startling came from them during the past two years. But the reader will pick up some incidental clarifications from the genial in-fighting of certain of them. Thus, J. M. Hornus, "Les recherches récentes sur le pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 35 (1955) 404–48 (on Hönigmann and Hausherr); I. Hausherr, S.J., "Note sur l'auteur du *Corpus dionysianum*," *Orientalia christiana periodica* 22 (1956) 384–85 (on Hornus); V. Grumel, "Autour de la question pseudo-dionysienne," *Revue des études byzantines* 13 (1955) 21–49 (on Hönigmann); I. Colosio, O.P., "La prima traduzione italiana di tutte le opere di Dionigi Areopagita ed una nova soluzione della questione dionysiana," *Rivista di ascetica e mistica* 2 (1957) 295–302 (on Turolla).

⁸⁸ A. Grillmeier, S.J., *Der Logos am Kreuz: Zur christologischen Symbolik der älteren Kreuzigungsdarstellung* (Munich, 1956).

reflected in Augustine's *De opere monachorum*,⁸⁹ the linguistic analysis by Chatillon of the opening words of the "Rule" which seem to indicate an Eastern influence,⁹⁰ and Sister Melchior's impressive bit of work on the authorship of the "Rule."⁹¹

Even more acute, for the resolution of many a problem in the history of monastic spirituality in the West, is the question of the *Regula magistri* and its relation to the Rule of St. Benedict. An excellent survey of the research of the last two decades is provided by Dom Penco, himself a new recruit to the work in progress and already a singularly imposing one.⁹² Dom Gómez shows himself rather less *au courant* with the work that has been done of late, which may account for such tenuous conclusions being so confidently proffered.⁹³ He holds that the *Regula magistri* is the composition of Benedict himself when "an impetuous youth, full of ideals, but without much practical experience." The *Regula Benedicti* is Benedict's later redaction of his earlier effort; because of its greater brevity and maturity of outlook, it soon cast the other in the shade. He is surely right in saying that this solution simplifies matters greatly; it would be good were we simply to use *RM* henceforth as primary referent for the understanding of *RB*, as he says we ought. Unfortunately, that is out of the question. Penco, claiming that Benedict utilized *RM* in compiling *RB*, has made it only too clear how different the spiritual doctrine of *RB* is.⁹⁴ And he has established that *RM* originated in Provence, was widely utilized there and in Italy and even in Spain throughout the sixth and seventh centuries; it continued to be known after this period, though more as a document of the ascetical life than as a source of monastic legislation, and traces of its influence persist down to the eleventh century.⁹⁵ Upon *RM* much more work needs to be done, as Franceschini has pointed out,⁹⁶ because even if it is not (as Gómez would have it) the manifestation of the first of two stages

⁸⁹ G. Folliet, "Des moines euchistes à Carthage en 400-401," *Studia patristica* 2, 386-99.

⁹⁰ F. Chatillon, "Quelques remarques sur 'ante omnia,'" *Revue des études augustiniennes* 2 (1956) 365-69.

⁹¹ Sr. M. Melchior, O.P., "Who Wrote the Rule of St. Augustine?," *Cross and Crown* 8 (1956) 162-79. I have put the word, Rule, in inverted commas throughout to indicate that there is not absolute uniformity among the authors in what is meant by their use of it.

⁹² G. Penco, O.S.B., "Origine e sviluppi della questione della *Regula magistri*," in *Antonius magnus eremita*, pp. 283-306.

⁹³ I. M. Gómez, O.S.B., "El problema de la Regla de San Benito," *Hispania sacra* 9 (1956) 5-55.

⁹⁴ "La 'Regula Magistri' e la spiritualità di San Benedetto," *Vita monastica* 10 (1954) 130-35.

⁹⁵ "Sulla diffusione della 'Regula Magistri,'" *Benedictina* 10 (1956) 181-98.

⁹⁶ E. Franceschini, "La questione della Regola di San Benedetto," *Aevum* 30 (1956) 215-38.

in Benedict's monastic legislation, it can be a precious manifestation of the climate in which the author of *RB* (was it Benedict?) worked.⁹⁷

The firm, large grasp of Benedictine principles which characterized St. Gregory the Great is set in excellent relief by Rudmann's dissertation.⁹⁸ By sheer force of historical circumstances Gregory was compelled to resolve the apparent antinomies of monastery life and apostolate, of contemplation and activity, of solitude and society. The manner of his doing so was to penetrate from within the theological implications of every least detail of the Benedictine monastic pattern. The result, on Rudmann's showing, was a structured theology of the spiritual life that answered Gregory's personal need and yet far transcended it; his was one of the truly magisterial replies to the perplexities which vex the Christian in whatever age and in whatever state of life. It is rare that we come upon a strictly historical work that has immediate contemporary significance. This is such a work.

Jesuit Seminary, Toronto

ELMER O'BRIEN, S.J.

⁹⁷ Penco would date the final chapter of *RB* as before 529 or 531, previous, that is, to the Church's taking a stand on Semi-Pelagianism: "Ricerche sul capitolo finale della Regola di S. Benedetto," *Benedictina* 8 (1954) 25-42.

⁹⁸ Remigius Rudmann, O.S.B., *Mönchtum und kirchlicher Dienst in den Schriften Gregors des Grossen* (St. Ottilien: Eos-Verlag, 1956).