

ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY, 1956-1957¹

The Middle Ages

Of course Dom Leclercq had put medievalists irretrievably in his debt long ago with the steady impact of his articles, monographs, and edited texts which throughout two decades pacifically dislodged time-honored misapprehensions, substituted fact for fiction, sureness for surmise, and (like those of Wilmart before him) widened most healthfully the frontiers of research. But now he has pretty much sealed his claim to their gratitude with a work which may well long remain what it certainly is today, the single absolutely indispensable guide for the study of monastic spirituality of the medieval West.² The transcript of a series of lectures given to his young confreres in religion at San Anselmo, the exigencies of that initial oral presentation have resulted in a book of singular clarity and cleanness of line. From the introductory chapter, "Grammaire et eschatologie," to the epilogue, "Littérature et vie mystique," the monastic variations to the beginning of the thirteenth century upon the love of letters and the desire for God are plotted out with enormous erudition but with never an ambiguity about whither one is being led and why. Many problems which beset the historian of medieval spirituality are thus solved or, at the very least, so situated that the prospect of an early solution is, for the first time, reasonably good. I have in mind such hardy perennials as the relation between sacred and profane studies, biblical exegesis (or was it "eisegesis"?), a specifically monastic theology, and so on. Of commanding interest is the author's exposition and assessment of the monastic literary genres of the time: *collatio*, *sermo*, *historia* (its model, significantly enough, was the biblical passage read in an atmosphere of prayer during the office), *epistola*, and the *flores*.³ His long apprenticeship poring over unedited manuscripts has

¹ For the early pages of this survey, see THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 19 (1958) 50-72.

² J. Leclercq, O.S.B., *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1957, pp. 254).

³ As Dom Leclercq himself points out, we are poorly off in our documentation of the literary forms utilized in the instruction of the young religious aside from such indirect witnesses as the *Golden Letter* of William of St. Thierry (on which see now *Guillaume de S. Thierry: Lettre d'or aux Frères du Mont-Dieu*, with introduction, French translation, and notes by J. M. Déchanet, O.S.B. [Paris: Desclée, 1956, pp. 189]) and the *Speculum caritatis* of Aelred of Rievaulx (cf. P. Courcelle, "Ailred de Rievaulx à l'école des 'Confessions,'" *Revue des études augustinienne*s 3 [1957] 163-74). He has sought to remedy the deficiency somewhat with his "Lettres de vocation à la vie monastique," in *Analecta monastica* 3 (Rome: Herder, 1955) 169-97, to which one will now wish to add the excellent analysis of a similar letter of Guigo the Elder by G. Hocquard, "La vie cartusienne

made possible the invocation of a cloud of witnesses for any such point that he takes up, and he is not at all loath to do so. But it is, naturally, to St. Bernard that he turns with greatest frequency.⁴ That he is justified in doing this in a work of so generic a nature, no one these days should doubt for a moment. If anything has become moderately clear of late, it is that Bernard was a product of this distinctive culture, however much he may have towered therein.⁵ And the same thing might be said of that other rugged individualist of the history manuals, St. Peter Damian.

Fr. Gonsette has taken time out to say it.⁶ And he believes it so thoroughly that he even uses anachronisms which will surely distress the more punctilious of historians in his attempt to present Damian as he really was. He was not the foe of secular learning and of literary pursuits that uninformed opinion has long esteemed him to be. But he does present, when all the evidence is in, a pretty problem in the reconciling of opposites, and Fr. Gonsette has been eminently successful, upon the popular level, in effecting a reconciliation of sorts. For a more scholarly essay in the same direction, we must await Dom Leclercq's *Saint Pierre Damien, ermite et homme de l'église*.⁷ The problem is one that would be less difficult, obviously, were there less literary remains around pointing, each in its own diverse way, to the varied facets of this complex genius.⁸ Our own authority on Damian,

d'après le Prieur Guigues I^{er}," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 31 (1957) 364-82. But the most notable contribution to date is Leclercq's own "Deux opuscules sur la formation des jeunes moines," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 33 (1957) 387-99.

⁴It is rather a more "authentic" Bernard than is usually provided us by authors, thanks again to Leclercq's work on the manuscript sources. In this connection, consult his "Les collections de sermons de Nicolas de Clairvaux," *Revue bénédictine* 66 (1956) 269-302, and "Gebouin de Troyes et s. Bernard," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 41 (1957) 632-40.

⁵See, for instance, the magisterial study of P. Delhaye, *Le problème de la conscience morale chez s. Bernard étudié dans ses oeuvres et dans ses sources* (Namur: Godenne, 1957, pp. 120), and H. Wolter, S.J., "Meditation bei Bernhard von Clairvaux," *Geist und Leben* 29 (1956) 206-18. Delhaye is able to discover thereby the *two* notions of *conscientia*, the "Scholastic" (judge of the past, guide for the future) and the "monastic" (sentience of God in the present), and Wolter to present the complete articulation of what was meant by *meditatio*, its centrality with regard to the *lectio*, to private and choral prayer, etc.

⁶J. Gonsette, S.J., *Pierre Damien et la culture profane* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1956, pp. 104).

⁷Some sections have already been published: "S. Pierre écrivain," *Convivium* 7 (1957) 385-99; "Saint Pierre Damien, poète," *Vie spirituelle: Supplément* 10 (1957) 432-40.

⁸For the most recent listing of the edited works, see P. Palazzini, "Il diritto strumento di riforma ecclesiastica in S. Pier Damiani," *Ephemerides iuris canonici* 12 (1956) 9-10, to which must be added the items edited by Dom Leclercq in "Inédits de s. Pierre Damien," *Revue bénédictine* 67 (1957) 151-68.

Fr. Blum, has made a very good case for removing a few such literary remains.⁹ He suggests it as highly probable that the best of the religious poetry conventionally ascribed to Damian are really the work of the eleventh-century Cassinese monk, Alberic. It is a conclusion not lightly arrived at, however tentatively it has been expressed. Yet Dom Meyvaert has questioned Fr. Blum's reliance upon the ascription of Alberic as author in the *Chronica monasterii Casinensis* (PL 173, 766) and the *De viris illustribus coenobii Casinensis* (*ibid.*, col. 1032).¹⁰ Prof. Reindel has questioned as well his argument from the manuscript tradition,¹¹ and, to a degree, so has Dom Leclercq.¹² Clearly the matter is not yet settled one way or the other, but the student should not allow himself to be put off on that account; each of these studies is an extremely competent contribution and is able, if nothing more, to inculcate a salutary lesson in methodology.¹³

What never wholly ceases to surprise, as gradually the manuscript material of this early part of the Middle Ages is made more generally available, is the doctrinal depth and breadth of its spirituality.¹⁴ The surprise is mildest, perhaps, when it is question of the products of the monasteries, for their scholarly aptitudes have long been known, even if their scholarly

⁹ O. J. Blum, O.F.M., "Alberic of Monte Cassino and the Hymns and Rhythms Attributed to Saint Peter Damian," *Traditio* 12 (1956) 87-148.

¹⁰ P. Meyvaert, O.S.B., "Alberic of Monte Cassino or Saint Peter Damian?", *Revue bénédictine* 67 (1957) 175-81.

¹¹ K. Reindel, "Zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung der Gedichte des Petrus Damiani," *ibid.*, pp. 182-89.

¹² J. Leclercq, O.S.B., "Sur l'authenticité des poèmes de saint Pierre Damien," *ibid.*, pp. 172-74.

¹³ Damian the historian, with especial regard to the *Vita s. Mauri*, has been studied by P. Burchi, "Il vescovo di Cesena S. Mauro e il monastero della Madonna del Monte," *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 11 (1957) 95-106; and the theologian, inheritor of the Fathers, by D. M. Della Santa, "Il sabato giudaico nell'interpretazione di S. Pier Damiano," *Vita monastica* 10 (1956) 68-73.

¹⁴ That of the monasteries of nuns has been largely neglected by scholars. Some aids toward a redressing of the balance: M. Schrader and A. Führkötter, *Die Echtheit des Schrifttums der heiligen Hildegard von Bingen* (Cologne-Graz: Böhlau, 1956, pp. xi + 227), which, seeking to establish the authenticity of the Hildegard corpus (and succeeding therein), provides a fund of information of more general relevance; M. Bernard, *Speculum virginum: Geistigkeit und Seelenleben der Frau im Hochmittelalter* (Cologne-Graz: Böhlau, 1955, pp. xvi + 262) the pioneering study of the eleventh-century work which was to have such influence and be so widely reproduced through following generations, to which one will wish to add the same author's discussion and edition of two sections of the *Speculum* in "Zur Seelsorge in den Frauenklöstern des Hochmittelalters," *Revue bénédictine* 66 (1956) 256-68; T. P. McLaughlin, C.S.B., "Abelard's Rule for Religious Women," *Mediaeval Studies* 18 (1956) 241-92.

accomplishments have not. What is truly astonishing is the revelation of the quality of doctrinal spirituality outside the monasteries. A few years ago attention was called to the writings of Hildebert of Lavardin (1056–1133) in a study which somehow escaped me at the time.¹⁵ On the author's showing, the sometime Bishop of Mans and Tours was the exponent of an integrally conceived theology of the spiritual life which differed from that of his secular contemporaries solely in the consummate grace of its expression: people, if you please, learnt his pastoral letters by heart. And now the areas of doctrinal emphasis in a number of unedited sermons of the twelfth century have been similarly disengaged. According to Mlle Lebreton, the basic themes were two: the redemption (along with connected questions on Incarnation and Eucharist) and the "invisible and visible" Church (together with the sacraments).¹⁶ We are a long way from the moralism, shallow and individualistic, of the late Middle Ages which did much, it is to be feared, to ease the entry of the Reformation.¹⁷ According to Bishop Landgraf, the basic unity of the clerical and lay states was put in evidence, the while an admirable balance was maintained in speaking of the body-soul relationship in the ascetic enterprise.¹⁸ This last is of especial interest, given that the philosophic temper of the day was largely Neoplatonic¹⁹ and that it was precisely one of the chief matters upon which Cistercians and Cluniasts were so strongly divided.²⁰

Gradually the lines of doctrinal demarcation between the two dominant

¹⁵ N. Scivoletto, *Spiritualità medioevale et tradizione scolastica nel secolo XII in Francia* (Naples: Armanni, 1954, pp. 231).

¹⁶ M. M. Lebreton, "Recherches sur les principaux thèmes théologiques traités dans les sermons du XII^e siècle," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 23 (1956) 5–18.

¹⁷ Cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 15 (1954) 269, and infra, p. 215.

¹⁸ A. M. Landgraf, "Weisungen der Aszetik in Werken der Frühscholastik," *Collectanea Franciscana* 27 (1957) 196–205.

¹⁹ For precisions, see M. D. Chenu, O.P., "*Spiritus*, le vocabulaire de l'âme au XII^e siècle," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 41 (1957) 209–32; R. Baron, "A propos des ramifications des vertus au XII^e siècle," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 23 (1956) 19–39; A. M. Landgraf, "Schwankungen in der Lehre des Petrus Lombardus," *Scholastik* 31 (1956) 533–44; P. Michaud-Quantin, "Une division 'augustinienne' des puissances de l'âme au moyen âge," *Revue des études augustiniennes* 3 (1957) 235–48.

²⁰ J. Leclercq, O.S.B., "Nouvelle réponse de l'ancien monachisme aux critiques des Cisterciens," *Revue bénédictine* 67 (1957) 77–94.—The debate on the origins of Cîteaux (cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 17 [1956] 52) continues. See the studies of J. Lefèvre, "Saint Robert de Molesme dans l'opinion monastique du XII^e et XIII^e siècle," *Analecta Bollandiana* 74 (1956) 50–83; "Que savons-nous du Cîteaux primitif?", *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 51 (1956) 5–41; "Les traditions manuscrites du *Exordium parvum*," *Scriptorium* 10 (1956) 42–46; and the partial rejoinder of J. Winandy, O.S.B., "Les origines de Cîteaux et les travaux de M. Lefèvre," *Revue bénédictine* 67 (1957) 49–76.

spiritual traditions of the early Middle Ages, the Benedictine and the Victorine, are coming into the clear as the slow and difficult process (as necessary in medieval studies as in patristic) of assigning works to their real authors proceeds.²¹ Thus the good offices throughout the past several decades of Hauréau, Landgraf, Moore, Pelletier, Chatillon, and Lasić in determining what are the authentic writings of Hugh of St. Victor have made possible in our day a reliable full-length study of the one who, whether rightly or wrongly, is credited with the distinctive, successful character of the second of those traditions. But, by the happiest of accidents, we have been provided with *two* reliable full-length studies, independently achieved and excellently complementary one with the other. That by Fr. Lasić himself is at first a little deceiving.²² The ordered doctrinal pattern it follows so meticulously makes it appear more like a theological treatise than an historical monograph. And its title seems overly contrived and contentious. Yet it is a solid piece of historical research, and even the title is not altogether unjustified. Hugh's is a *theologia perfectiva* in the sense of being "a science which in accord with the principles of Holy Scripture teaches man how that manner of living is achieved which refashions him to the likeness of God." One would be tempted to call it simply a *theologia ascetica* and, since Fr. Lasić was so tempted, it is rather a pity he did not give in; not until one arrives at the third last page of his exposition is the chimera of a "theology-which-perfects" wholly exorcized. But in the course of that exposition a number of interesting things come to the fore: the extraordinary reflex consciousness Hugh possessed of the distinction between the natural and supernatural orders long before the speculative theorem had been properly worked out; his doctrine of hope sustained by the action, under grace, of faith and charity; his understanding of *sacra scriptura* as embracing not only the Bible but what the Fathers had to say about the Bible and what, finally, the theologians had to say about either the Bible or the Fathers. Of course, the most interesting thing of all is the hardy intelligence of Hugh himself which is here freshly revealed. And Lasić, remember, does not include a discussion of the most cerebral of Hugh's achievements, his mystical doctrine. M. Baron, however, does.²³ Indeed, this full-length study by today's outstanding authority on Hugh leaves nothing out that can

²¹ A characteristic contributor to historical confusion, the *Tractatus de interiori domo seu de conscientia aedificanda*, which was long thought to be Victorine when actually it was Benedictine, has been studied anew by Philippe Delhay, "Domo (De interiori)," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1956) 1548-51.

²² D. Lasić, O.F.M., *Hugonis de S. Victore Theologia perfectiva* (Rome: Antonianum, 1956, pp. xxxvi + 402).

²³ R. Baron, *Science et sagesse chez Hughes de Saint-Victor* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1957, pp. li + 283).

possibly, by whatever ruse, be left in. The consequence is constant danger to the mind of colliding with foreign objects lying about in his text or of getting forever lost in the unweeded garden of his footnotes. A suspicion intrudes that the author has no wastebasket. But, whatever the incidental hazards, no student of medieval spirituality can afford to neglect reading this book. Much of it does double service with that of Lasić, confirming in its early stages what Lasić is at pains to prove throughout, that Hugh's was first of all a *theologia perfectiva* in the sense explained above. It is a confirmation of particular worth because Baron seems not to have set out to prove it (indeed, it is not clear *what* he set out to prove in this doctoral dissertation), he never states it explicitly when he has proved it, and he did all this independently of Lasić. This independence of his, we might remark, is one of Baron's happiest and most promising traits, especially since it is joined to a truly phenomenal capacity for work. With no criticism of the scholars who have preceded him, with faithful reference to their relevant contributions, he yet persists in doing everything all over again for himself. Aside from the new things that are thus brought to light now and again, this charming mania results in a valuable double check for the rest of us. To take but one example: while Lasić is understandably content now with the conclusions of others in the complex problem of authenticity, Baron has attacked it afresh.²⁴ His best lines, however, he has kept to the last. *Science et sagesse* concludes with a lengthy exposition of Hugh's doctrine of the mystical ascent which it were an impertinence to attempt to synopsise here. Let it merely be said that it is by far the most accurate presentation generally available to date,²⁵ even if one admits, as it seems one should, that the influence of the Pseudo-Dionysius upon Hugh is unduly scanted²⁶ and those "intuitions" which seem always to characterize Sorbonne dissertations written under Prof. de Gandillac are a trifle too frequent.

Miss Kirchberger's purpose was popularization. But her unusual compe-

²⁴ Both in this volume (which, despite the impression one might get from the publication date and some of the footnotes, was completed in 1953) and since. See his "Étude sur l'authenticité de l'oeuvre de Hughes de Saint-Victor," *Scriptorium* 10 (1956) 359-66; "Textes spirituels inédits de Hughes de Saint-Victor," *Mélanges de science religieuse* 13 (1956) 157-78. He has also reopened the question of Hugh's place of origin in "Notes biographiques sur Hughes de Saint-Victor," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 51 (1956) 920-34, and is forced to conclude, against the majority of contemporary scholars, that it was Ypres.

²⁵ Some may prefer to await M. Baron's promised edition of Hugh's own synopsis of his mystical doctrine, the *De contemplatione et eius speciebus*.

²⁶ Fr. Lasić is open to the same criticism. On an interesting Dionysian borrowing which neither author mentions, see H. R. Schlette, "TEAETAPXIE: Ein Begriff aus der Eucharistielehre Hugos von St. Viktor," *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 8 (1957) 114-21.

tence in the area of medieval spirituality makes her annotated selections from the other great Victorine deserving of notice here.²⁷ The most extended passages are, of course, from Richard's *Benjamin Minor* on ascetic preparation and *Benjamin Major* on mystical prayer itself, with shorter excerpts from other works, notably from the *Four Degrees*. Her remarks are everywhere acute, often provocatively so. It is doubtful that Richard, who depended upon him so much in everything else, was disloyal to Hugh's position against an excessively allegorical interpretation of Scripture. There is not more allegorizing in Richard than in Hugh. It is simply more obvious, because Richard was more of a poet. It is neither irresponsible nor excessive. Indeed, one of the difficulties in interpreting Richard's allegorical interpretations is precisely the amplitude of their theological content. Fr. Beumer has recognized this and he proceeds with fitting cautiousness in his attempt to disengage Richard's mystical doctrine.²⁸ But, such is the breadth of theological reality that is laid bare once one has assessed aright the allegorical media within which it is contained, he is at a loss to determine when Richard is the theologian propounding general doctrine and when he is the mystic relating personal experience. Fr. Dumeige does rather better in the commentary to his critical edition of the *Four Degrees of Passionate Love*, perhaps because he is addressing himself to one sole work set in illuminating jointure with the Pseudo-Richardian *Letter to Severinus*, but more than likely because he is our greatest authority on Richard today.²⁹ It is all too easy for our twentieth-century mentality to dismiss this twelfth-century sort of thing as naively compounded of the fanciful, the arbitrary, and the non-scientific because of our own strait-laced and rather spinsterish notions of what properly constitutes the scientific.³⁰ And, finding it immediately uncongenial, we esteem it less meaningful than it is. Whence the trouble.

But the history of ideas has its own ironies. The difficulty of determining the exact contours of primitive Franciscan spirituality has been increased beyond measure, it would seem, for precisely the opposite reason: it was from the outset found to be immediately congenial. All manner of non-

²⁷ *Richard of Saint-Victor: Selected Writings on Contemplation*, translated with an introduction and notes by Clare Kirchberger (New York: Harper, 1957, pp. 269).

²⁸ J. Beumer, S.J., "Richard von St. Viktor, Theologe und Mystiker," *Scholastik* 31 (1956) 213-38.

²⁹ *Ives: Epître à Séverin sur la charité; Richard de Saint-Victor: Les quatre degrés de la violente charité*, critical text with introduction and notes by G. Dumeige, S.J. (Paris: Vrin, 1955, pp. 206).

³⁰ For a first-hand description, in verse, of university life at Paris and religious life at St. Victor in this later day, see the text, edited and annotated by P. Michaud-Quantin, *Godfrey de Saint-Victor: Fons philosophiae* (Namur: Godenne, 1956, pp. 71).

Franciscan people have in the course of the centuries adopted it as meaningfully their own. And, in adopting, they of course adapted. The process got under way early.³¹ Efforts of Catholic scholars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to get back to the sources was complicated by the presence of reputedly primitive documents which were actually later polemical weapons manufactured chiefly during the poverty controversy. In the nineteenth century Francis was adopted by the Protestants. Identifying him with the Catharist and Vaudois movements, they saw in him a Luther born out of due time but no less acceptable for all that. This was the Francis who was conveyed, under the most winning of literary auspices, from Von Hase to Renan to Sabatier to our own time. The fascinating chronicle of these and other such Catholic-Protestant contretemps one may read in Fr. Van den Borne's article.³² A contemporary instance of Francis-as-Luther one may find in Pastor Beyschlag's otherwise serious and competent study.³³ Just how these days one should go about reconstituting the real St. Francis and (I suppose here the author means if one is not a Franciscan) recapturing his spirit, Fr. Van den Borne has also attempted to spell out.³⁴ It will come as an unpleasant surprise to many, the literary and imaginative latitude which he, an historian, thinks necessary in the utilization of the sources. Fortunately, bit by bit, the more prosaic and needful kind of textual work continues.³⁵

The general, popular studies of St. Francis by Fr. Gennaro³⁶ and M. Gobry³⁷ complement each other most helpfully. The first is a theological synthesis; the second, an historical study bolstered by extensive selections from the writings of Francis himself, from the *Vitae* of Thomas of Celano, and the *Fioretti*. In each is presented the *Franciscus totus*, the historical Francis and Francis living on in his family. In each, from different perspectives, the identical themes constantly reappear: poverty, Eucharistic devo-

³¹ S. Clasen and J. van Gurp, "Nachbonaventurianische Franziskusquellen in niederländischen und deutschen Handschriften des Mittelalters," *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 49 (1956) 434-82.

³² F. Van den Borne, O.F.M., "Het probleem van de Franciscus-biografie in het licht van de moderne historische kritiek," *Sint Franciscus* 57 (1955) 241-320.

³³ K. Beyschlag, *Die Bergpredigt und Franz von Assisi* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1955, pp. 243).

³⁴ F. Van den Borne, O.F.M., "De Franciscus-biografie als litterair werk: Een vraagstuk van methodiek," *Sint Franciscus* 58 (1956) 31-80.

³⁵ G. Pagnani, "Contributi alla questione dei *Fioretti di S. Francesco*," *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* 49 (1956) 3-16.

³⁶ G. Gennaro, O.F.M., *Francesco Cherubico: Commento alla spiritualità di S. Francesco* (Rome: Aedes Franciscana, 1956, pp. 198).

³⁷ I. Gobry, *Saint François d'Assise et l'esprit franciscain* (Paris: Seuil, 1957, pp. 192).

tion,³⁸ apostolate. But what was peculiarly distinctive about Francis? According to Fr. Esser it was his ideal of absolute poverty and itinerant preaching which distinguished him and his followers from the older religious orders.³⁹ That, I fear, sounds like a canonist speaking. Fr. Van Corstanje penetrates more deeply, although what he eventually hits upon will at first, for many readers, awaken images less of Francis than of Anatole France.⁴⁰ St. Francis, he says, was "Christ's juggler." There was about his life the abiding characteristic of "play" in the sense both of "frolic" and of "drama." His life was a childlike rejoicing in the gospel and a rendering visible, after the fashion of an actor, of its values. The first aspect is what has grounded to an extent the Lutheran (read: "anomian") interpretation of Francis to which we had reference above. The second is what is back of the Franciscan preoccupation, from that day to this, of according Christian truth a visible expression of one sort or another (one need merely recall the Crib, the devotions to the Holy Name and to the Sacred Heart, the Way of the Cross, the liturgical celebration of the *Transitus*, etc.). And the spiritual doctrine of St. Bonaventure could be termed its theological justification. Nowhere is this, the incarnational aspects of his teaching, more clearly delineated than in the twin treatises, the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* and the *De triplice via*, the second being largely a psychological restating of the metaphysics of the first. Of each of them we have been provided especially good studies during the past few years. The French translation of the *De triplice via* (for which, in accord with some of the manuscripts, Fr. Jean de Dieu prefers to retain the more provocative title of *Itinerarium mentis in se ipsam*) is fitted out with an introduction and a commentary which could hardly be bettered.⁴¹ Especially good is the analysis of Bonaventure's notion of contemplation.⁴² Briefly, it comes down to this: "the experiential knowledge of God who with love is perceived in the soul and recognized in all His works, particularly those of grace." An even more extended analysis, matching in its psychological finesse that of Bonaventure himself, has been made by

³⁸ B. Cornet, "Le *De reverentia Corporis Domini*, exhortation et lettre de s. François," *Etudes franciscaines* 6 (1955) 65-91, 167-80; 7 (1956) 20-35, 155-71.

³⁹ K. Esser, "Gestalt und Ideal des Minderbrüderordens in seinen Anfängen," *Franziskanische Studien* 39 (1957) 1-22.

⁴⁰ A. Van Corstanje, O.F.M., "Franciscus de Christusspeler," *Sint Franciscus* 58 (1956) 7-24.

⁴¹ *Saint Bonaventure: Itinéraire de l'âme en elle-même*, Introduction and translation by Jean de Dieu de Champsecret, O.F.M. Cap., commentary by Louis de Mercin, O.F.M. Cap. (Blois: Librairie Mariale et Franciscaine, 1956, pp. 355).

⁴² It has also been published separately. See Jean de Dieu de Champsecret, "L'Intuition sans concept et la théorie bonaventurienne de la contemplation," *Etudes franciscaines* 7 (1956) 63-74, 133-54.

Prof. Phillips.⁴³ When set against the doctrines of the Pseudo-Dionysius and David of Augsburg, upon both of which he was greatly dependent, it becomes clear that the utterly new thing in Bonaventure's own doctrine was the role it accorded to love. Interesting, too, is the prominent place that is given to meditation: no one, says Phillips, since Augustine himself appreciated so well its importance as the occasion of a new ethical orientation and not simply a means for acquiring a new understanding of spiritual things.

Fr. Boehner before his death was at work upon the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*. His English version has now been published together with commentary compiled from his notes.⁴⁴ The last, familial gesture of a great scholar, it needs no further commendation in our eyes. Of the doctrine of the *Itinerarium* itself it is easy to make something rigid and closed, especially if one attempts interpreting it in too great independence of Bonaventure's own interpretation in the *De triplice via*. Thus, in the hands of Fr. Teichtweier it has become a ballistic missile for shooting down moral theologians.⁴⁵ But that freedom in the Spirit which Francis always exemplified Bonaventure always taught. And that, perhaps as much as anything else, is the explanation of a late medieval phenomenon that has recently been revealed in a new and striking fashion: the propagation of Bonaventure's spiritual doctrine by people of other religious families. Prof. Ruh, seeking to determine the influence of the spiritual and the strictly Scholastic works of Bonaventure upon the formation of Middle German, provides specific documentation of the widespread program in the latter part of the fourteenth and in the early part of the fifteenth centuries of translating his works for the benefit of those—sisters, brothers, laity—who knew no Latin.⁴⁶ By far the larger number engaged in this spontaneous enterprise were not Franciscans; the contribution of the Carthusians was especially marked.

Students of Rhineland spirituality (Ruh includes Netherlandish in his

⁴³ D. Phillips, "The Way to Religious Perfection according to St. Bonaventure's *De triplici via*," in J. H. Mundy, R. W. Emery, and B. N. Nelson, *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955, pp. xiii + 258) pp. 31-58.

⁴⁴ *Saint Bonaventure's Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, translated with introduction and commentary by P. Boehner, O.F.M. (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1956, pp. 132).

⁴⁵ G. Teichtweier, "Die aszetisch-mystische Methode im *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* des Bonaventura," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 138 (1956) 436-62. And cf. J. P. Rézette, "Grâce et similitude de Dieu chez saint Bonaventure," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 32 (1956) 46-64.

⁴⁶ K. Ruh, *Bonaventura deutsch: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Franziskanermystik und -scholastik* (Bern: Francke-Verlag, 1956, pp. 384).

“Deutsch”) will learn much from this careful language study. A largely unexplored field hitherto, the Bonaventure translations can provide useful precisions comparable to those that have been derived latterly from philological studies of Eckhart but, I should think, even more reliable because here we have both the Latin and the vernacular versions. With Eckhart there is the necessity (not always recognized) of climbing precariously through the German text to the mind, thinking in Latin, behind it. And it is an enterprise, of course, rendered all the more perilous in that we have not as yet a completely reliable text of Eckhart's writings.

However, the situation is improving slowly. The Eckhart-Kommission has finally completed the critical edition of his Latin works.⁴⁷ And the companion edition of his German works proceeds apace.⁴⁸ None of this, however, promises to eliminate wholly the strong temptation to the virtuoso performance in interpreting Eckhart, as when, to take one recent instance, he is made to sound like a fourteenth-century Heidegger.⁴⁹ As Prof. Heussi's survey makes clear, the temptation has been around a long time.⁵⁰ So the pleasure that is to be found in so rare and balanced a piece of writing as the lengthy introduction Prof. Clark has prefaced to his selections from the vernacular sermons.⁵¹ He is aware of the temptation, and his own repeated advertence to how this or that scholar gave into it has, for the most part, kept him safe. Perhaps he discounts unduly the impact of Neoplatonic influences upon Eckhart's thought (he admits its impact upon his language) with the consequence, first, that he thinks Eckhart himself was a mystic and, second, that he never is able to reconcile properly the Eckhart of the Latin writings and the Eckhart of the German ones. He does, however,

⁴⁷ *Meister Eckhart: Die deutschen und lateinischen Werke: Die lateinischen Werke*, Vol. 4 edited and translated by E. Benz, B. Decker, and J. Koch; fascicles 4-5, 6-7 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955-56). The second fascicle contains Msgr. Koch's important preface in which the whole question of the *Sermones* and the manuscript tradition of this edition is discussed. Since then Fr. Kaepelli has called attention to a Kremsmünster manuscript containing some two hundred sermons preached at Paris in 1293-94. Most, he suggests, are the work of Jean Quidort; a few are from Meister Eckhart. See T. Kaepelli, O.P., "Praedicator monachus: Sermons parisiens de la fin du XIII^e siècle," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 27 (1957) 120-67.

⁴⁸ Cf. H. Fischer, S.J., "Der jetzige Stand der neuen Eckhart-Ausgabe," *Scholastik* 31 (1956) 90-95.

⁴⁹ M. S. Morard, "Ist, istic, istikeit bei Meister Eckhart," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 3 (1956) 169-86.

⁵⁰ K. Heussi, "Meister Eckhart," in *Eckhart-Studien* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1953, pp. 47) pp. 5-28.

⁵¹ J. M. Clark, *Meister Eckhart: An Introduction to the Study of His Works with an Anthology of His Sermons* (New York: Nelson, 1957, pp. xii + 267).

make the attempt at reconciliation, which is in itself something of a welcome novelty.

Mme Ancelet-Hustache works upon a broader canvas with more limited knowledge.⁵² Hers is an Eckhart presented not only in himself but in his successors, real or reputed. Her imagination perhaps is at its flamboyant best in the discovery of Eckhart's influence in Groote, Thomas a Kempis, the English mystics of the fourteenth century, and (so that the list, apparently, be truly memorable) Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross. The doctrinal points are in general well taken.⁵³ The selections from Eckhart are interesting (she includes the *Benedictus Deus*) and there are nice pictures. Fr. Gieraths, similarly, does not offer the reader an Eckhart in isolation.⁵⁴ But, unlike Mme Ancelet-Hustache, he gives selections as well from the writings of the others. In some instances they are pieces not easily come by, as the excerpts from various convent chronicles and those from John of Sterngassen (all, of course, in modern German versions). Throughout, the discussion is of a more severely theological tone than is to be found in either Clark or Ancelet-Hustache. Unfortunately, his theological concern seems to have led the author into a selective (one might even say, a partisan) reading of history. But he has not succeeded in being altogether consistent; data which do not fit into his speculative pattern are sometimes to be found on his pages as well, so that the result is perhaps as good a picture of Dominican spirituality of that time and place as you will find anywhere.⁵⁵

Fr. Ampe's magisterial *Kernproblemen uit de leer van Ruysbroec* has come to its peak with the publication of the fourth volume, which is consecrated to Ruysbroek's mystical doctrine.⁵⁶ Here, in this greatest of the Lowland mystics, is the kind of thing people are perpetually trying to find in Eckhart: a complete, heady synthesis that is as thrilling as it is orthodox. That they

⁵² J. Ancelet-Hustache, *Maitre Eckhart et la mystique rhénane* (Paris: Seuil, 1956, pp. 192).

⁵³ Useful precisions on the role of *Armut* in the mystical ascent are to be found in P. Kelley, O.S.B., "Poverty and the Rhineland Mystics," *Downside Review* 74 (1956) 48-66, and upon the term of that ascent in R. L. Oechslin, O.P., "Eckhart et mystique trinitaire," *Lumière et vie*, no. 30 (1956) 99-120.

⁵⁴ G. M. Gieraths, O.P., *Reichtum des Lebens: Die deutsche Dominikanermystik des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Düsseldorf: Albertus-Magnus-Verlag, 1956, pp. 124).

⁵⁵ To this one will now wish to add the evidence of the German texts, popularly ascribed to St. Albert, and admirably expressive of a popular piety that wedded mystical aspiration and down-to-earth practicality, that are to be found in W. Stammler, "Albert der Grosse und die deutsche Volksfrömmigkeit des Mittelalters," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 3 (1956) 287-319.

⁵⁶ A. Ampe, S.J., *De mystieke leer van Ruysbroec over den zieleopgang* (Tielt, Belgium: Lannoo, 1957, pp. vi + 562).

do not find it is only partially explained by the fact that many of them are busily reading themselves into the documents; chiefly they do not find it, it would seem, because it is not there. But perhaps there had to be that earlier Rhineland period, the experimentation, the false starts, the wrestling with a still intractable Neoplatonism before one man could thus speak of his experience. Having expounded at length in the previous three volumes his doctrine of the Trinity, creation, Incarnation-redemption, and grace, Fr. Ampe is in a position now to synthesize Ruysbroek's mystical doctrine without, it is hoped, readers seeing only an assertive psychologism there. The properly psychological is present in a much larger dosage than is usual even in mystical writers, and it is just this completeness of the psychological schema which can easily lead one to think it sheerly aprioristic. The more surely to allay that danger, Fr. Ampe constantly breaks through the logical consistency of his own exposition to refer to the relevant passages in his earlier volumes. If now medievalists do not properly understand Ruysbroek, they are without excuse. This is especially true regarding the two points which harry them most, the conformity of the Trinity to the operations of the soul and the mystic's vision of the divine essence, for the author goes into them with extreme thoroughness. Indeed, he goes into everything with what one would think to be definitive thoroughness. But he thinks differently and has returned once more to points he deems improperly scanted in the book, humility and freedom,⁵⁷ and singleness of heart,⁵⁸ with promise of more such addenda to come. And when you read his further treatment you see how right he was. Ruysbroek's is a doctrine of almost unlimited vistas.

It is difficult, then, to say Fr. Axters is wrong in considering even the *Devotio moderna* as directly deriving from, and not a reaction against, this highly speculative spirituality. Such is the position he takes in the latest volume of his monumental history of spirituality in the Low Countries.⁵⁹ Perhaps we should say, with certain phrases of the *Imitation* ringing in our ears, that the matter is not yet settled. With that easy placidity which characterized the earlier volumes even when he was engaged in controversy, the author spreads out the entire panorama of the *Devotio*: origins, chief figures (Groote, the Brothers and the Sisters of the Common Life, the

⁵⁷ "De vrijheid en de ootmoed bij Ruysbroec," *Ons geestelijk erf* 30 (1956) 400-421. The notion of infused humility is not unknown to Scholastic theology, so that it is to Ruysbroek's nuanced doctrine of infused "freedom" that Fr. Ampe gives most attention.

⁵⁸ "De structuur van de 'eenicheit des herten' volgens Ruysbroec," *Ons geestelijk erf* 31 (1957) 150-86.

⁵⁹ S. Axters, O.P., *Geschiedenis van de Vroomheid in de Nederlanden 3: De Moderne Devotie* (Antwerp: Sikkell, 1956, pp. viii + 498).

Congregation of Windesheim, Thomas a Kempis), later tributaries up to the time of Trent. One thing in particular is clear from this learned and gracious book: one cannot speak simply of the *Devotio* as a "lay" movement. Rather was it a revaluating of the monastic life. Upon this point Fr. Van Woerkum has since returned.⁶⁰

The long hue and cry after the author of the *Imitation* (Ruysbroek? Zerbolt? Kalkar? Kempis? Gerson? Gersen? an Italian Benedictine? any old Italian?) has, as everybody knows, achieved a particularly high decibel count these last years.⁶¹ Lack of space forbids our doing anything more here than saluting, with much gratitude, two works which should eventually impose a salutary quiet. In the first, M. Delaissé has published a diplomatic edition of an autograph manuscript dated and signed by Thomas a Kempis in 1441 (*Bruux. bib. roy.* 5855-61) and prefaced it with a meticulous paleographical introduction of 150 pages.⁶² In the second, the late Dom Huijben and Fr. Debongnie have covered the matter of authorship, and just about every theory about it, from every point of view.⁶³ The common conclusion of these ponderous tomes? Thomas a Kempis was indeed the author of the *Imitation*.⁶⁴

So much work still needs to be done on the medieval English mystics, it is with a mild but real malaise that one picks up a French anthology of their writings that is quite unaware of it. Yet M. Renaudin is hardly to be blamed.⁶⁵ Their rich personalities, ineptly grasped in the defective texts and then garbed incongruously in ill-fitting French, still manage to exercise

⁶⁰ M. Van Woerkum, S.C.J., "Moderne devotie en lekenzvróomheid," *Streven* 10 (1956-57) 119-26. And cf. R. G. Villoslada, S.J., "Ragos característicos de la Devotio Moderna," *Manresa* 28 (1956) 315-50.

⁶¹ P. Debongnie, C.S.S.R., "Petite chronique imitationiste (1940-1956)," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 32 (1956) 215-24.

⁶² L. M. J. Delaissé, *Le manuscrit autographe de Thomas a Kempis et "l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ": Examen archéologique et édition diplomatique du Bruxellensis 5855-61* (2 vols.; Antwerp: Standaard-Boekhandel, 1956, pp. ix + 548). And see as well his "Vues nouvelles sur l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ," *Lettres Romanes* 10 (1956) 27-37.

⁶³ J. Huijben, O.S.B., and P. Debongnie, C.S.S.R., *L'Auteur ou les auteurs de L'Imitation* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957, pp. xiii + 425).

⁶⁴ By way of informative contrast one may consult P. Scazzoso, "Conobbe l'autore dell'*Imitatio Christi* le opere di Seneca?," *Scuola cattolica* 84 (1956) 369-84, in which the author is led, because of a similarity of themes in Book 1 and the works of Seneca, to attribute its composition to a Latin mentality, i.e., to Gersen. A comparably rootless theorizing characterizes G. G. Amato, *L'esperienza mistica nel De Imitatione Christi* (Caltanissetta: Intilla, 1955, pp. 210).

⁶⁵ Paul Renaudin, *Mystiques anglais: Oeuvres de Richard Rolle, Juliette de Norwich, Walter Hilton, le Nuage de l'Inconnaissance* (Paris: Aubier, 1957, pp. 252).

something of their charm. If I mention this little book here, it is because of Renaudin's introductions to each of the mystics represented (the translation itself is the old Solesme version), for his perceptiveness here is of a piece with that which made his earlier studies of Marie of the Incarnation so memorable. But the kind of thing we really need professional scholars in the field are slowly providing, and one of the happier signs of the times is the attention, long overdue, now being accorded Richard Rolle. Prof. Liegey of Fordham is engaged in editing the hitherto unedited Latin works. Prof. Arnould of Trinity in Dublin has edited the *Melos*.⁶⁶ That this, the most important work of the man who has been called the Father of English Mysticism, should have had to wait until now before being published in full (it was excerpted, of course, by Allen and Horstman) is a genuine puzzle. Arnould is not altogether convincing when he says that the reason for this centuries-long neglect "is not far to seek: it is a difficult text and none of the manuscripts can be deemed altogether satisfactory." He has himself diminished its difficulty for the ordinary reader by providing a long and singularly acute preface, and Liegey has performed a similar salutary office by editing, with commentary, an anonymous medieval compilation of passages from the *Melos* which can serve as a reliable initial guide to the matter and manner of the parent work.⁶⁷ Now for the first time the generality of medieval scholars are in a position to study the mystical teaching of Rolle, forever freed from the persistent headache of trying to make head or tail of the snippets, tendentiously interpreted, of Horstman and Allen. The next few years should be extremely informative ones. They should provide as well, it can be hoped, new and more balanced estimates of the place of our Lady in Rolle's spirituality, for here again Miss Allen, great pioneer of Rolle research, was a little too hasty and categorical, and her judgment has prevailed. The indispensable beginning has been made by Prof. Liegey with his edition-commentary of the *Zelo tui lingueo*.⁶⁸

The impact of Rolle's writings was widespread for generations after his death, but it was not everyone who looked upon it with an approving eye. His *canor-calcor-dulcor* may well have introduced, here and there, a cult of sensible devotion that was not altogether healthy. In any case, the reactions of Walter Hilton and the author of the *Cloud of Unknowing* are well known.

⁶⁶ *The Melos Amoris of Richard Rolle of Hampole*, edited by E. J. F. Arnould (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957, pp. lxxxvi + 244).

⁶⁷ "Richard Rolle's *Carmen Prosaicum*, an Edition and Commentary," *Mediaeval Studies* 19 (1957) 15-36.

⁶⁸ G. M. Liegey, "The 'Canticum amoris' of Richard Rolle," *Traditio* 12 (1956) 369-91.

To such testimony it is now possible to add further documentation, thanks to the perfectly brilliant critical edition of the *Chastisyng of Goddis Children*.⁶⁹ However, the worth of the *Chastisyng* far transcends any such merely marginal significance. A series of conferences given (apparently) to a convent of nuns, it presents a fascinating picture of how, walking soberly between extremes, one can make the life of prayer a personal reality. Of more than ordinary historical interest is its revelation of the things that had to be specially emphasized by an experienced director of souls around the year 1382: watchfulness in the face of quietist doctrines, suspicion of all "enthusiasm" (in Msgr. Knox's sense), the subordination of private to liturgical devotion, etc. Finally, by its frequent citing of them, it provides additional evidence of the strong, firm influence exercised in the cause of orthodoxy by the writings of Ruysbroek. Indeed, the *Chastisyng* contains so much Ruysbroek, the editors had the happy thought of joining to it a critical edition of the *Tretesse of Perfeccioun of the Sonnys of God*, a fifteenth-century translation of Jordaen's Latin version of Ruysbroek's *Vanden blinckenden Steen* "so as to include in one volume the only two Middle English translations from the Ruysbroek canon." Scholars will long be burrowing happily and profitably about, I expect, in this admirable volume of Miss Bazire and Mr. Colledge.

Modern Times

That mysterious law which governs the scholarly celebration of centenaries whereby much is written but little is said was flagrantly violated in 1956, the fourth centenary of the death of St. Ignatius. Much was written and much was said. Indeed, there was so much of worth produced that it has been thought advisable not to attempt considering it in this survey. Instead, evaluative reference to it is included here and there as the matter warrants in an article by the chronicler, "Spirituality, Ignatian and Jesuit," which will appear shortly.

Prof. Lenhart, continuing the project initiated in 1936 by the late Ludwig Veit with his *Volkfrommes Brauchtum und Kirche im deutschen Mittelalter*, tells the story of the spiritual revolution that was effected by the Reformation among those who remained faithful to Rome.⁷⁰ On every side there sprung into being what I suppose you could call a spirituality of riposte:

⁶⁹ *The Chastising of God's Children and the Treatise of Perfection of the Sons of God*, edited from the manuscripts by J. Bazire and E. Colledge (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957, pp. x + 359).

⁷⁰ L. A. Veit and L. Lenhart, *Kirche und Volksfrömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (Freiburg: Herder, 1956, pp. xi + 332).

what was denied or contemned by the Reformers became for that very reason the areas of chief, sometimes of exclusive, emphasis. Thus the distinctive lines of popular Catholic spirituality came, by indirection, from Protestantism. It was, to change the image, just the obverse of a medal most adventitiously struck. Lenhart chronicles the efforts of Rome to deepen the faithful's appreciation of the positive values of their Christian heritage, and he seems to believe, despite the contrary evidence adduced by his pages, that Rome succeeded. Given that the Reformation on the Continent was less a reaction against ecclesiastical abuses than an effort, situated initially within a movement more ancient and vast, at religious renewal, the pitifulness of this baroque spirituality of protest becomes even more manifest. The effort of Luther himself was triggered by the religious inadequacies of the theology upon which he had been bred and compromised forever thereafter by that same theology. That fact Fr. Iserloh's study of the role of Ockhamism in occasioning the Reformation has proved once again.⁷¹ One would have thought, therefore, that at least the theologians of the time, if not the unlettered faithful, could have adjusted themselves, with the Lutheran spectacle before them, to a theology at once more traditional and more relevant to this movement of renewal. A few did. In a compact Louvain dissertation of surpassing interest, the Abbé Etienne tells the story of the reaction of the theologians, Jean Driedo and Jacques Latomus, to this spiritual renaissance specifically as it was exemplified in Erasmus and in Luther.⁷² Only Driedo showed himself capable of addressing himself to the concrete situation. He alone did not react to exaggeration with counter-exaggeration. But it was the other Louvain faculty member, Latomus, who was to the forefront in this exchange (a point not sufficiently brought out by the author); poor Latomus, shuffling his yellowed class-notes and shouting louder and louder. Driedo's ability to maintain *all* the threads of theological discourse dispassionately in hand in the midst of such dialogue is perhaps nowhere more graphically revealed than in his *De captivitate et redemptione humani generis*.⁷³ Written in response to the problems of Christian anthropology which the Reformation posed, it begins with the basic affirmation of gratuity of salvation. Proceeding from the redemptive

⁷¹ E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie in der philosophischen Theologie des Wilhelm von Ockham: Ihre Bedeutung für die Ursachen der Reformation* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956, pp. xl + 286).

⁷² J. Etienne, *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvanistes: Un changement de problématique au début du XVI^e siècle* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1956, pp. xxvi + 201).

⁷³ T. Dhanis, "L'anti-pélagianisme dans le 'De captivitate et redemptione humani generis' de Jean Driedo," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 51 (1956) 454-70.

Incarnation to the concrete realization of the salvation of man, it underlines at every stage the need of divine intervention that the liberation of man be achieved. In the early sections it shows how Christ did not come principally as teacher and model of mankind but as saviour. Then is explained how faith, the principle of salvation's being accorded, is at one and the same time the continuing work of God and the active response of man. Now all this of Driedo is extraordinary for the place, time, and circumstances. I continually remind my students of the necessity of reading Counter Reformation authors, especially the great spiritual authors, in their historical context because otherwise the doctrine is Semi-Pelagian. The caution is justified because they do, good men, lean into the wind. They do oppose exaggeration with counter-exaggeration. But not Driedo. As Dhanis points out, in thus establishing so solidly the gratuitous character of salvation Driedo was able to respond directly and in a positive way to Luther. And, putting himself upon the same terrain where Luther struggled, he could show how the exaggerated Anti-Pelagianism of Luther simply destroyed traditional Christian verities. One would naturally like to know more of the spiritual doctrine of such a one as this, theologically mature, spiritually so well grounded that he could appreciate that religious *élan* of the Reformers however much it was obscured by extravagances. A first introduction to his spirituality has been provided now by Abbé Etienne.⁷⁴

One of the great advantages of Driedo was his having been brought up in that rich and realistic spirituality of the Lowlands which was so akin to the best in the Reformation. We cannot generalize here, because Latomus had the same background. But it is worthy of remark that it was to that same Lowlands spirituality that Cisneros turned in his own historic effort to stir and sustain the same religious *élan* in Spain, which was to have such widespread and beneficial results for the Church universal.⁷⁵

The thesis counter to that of Chevallier, Krynen, Vilnet, *et al.*, according to whom the redaction in forty verses of the *Spiritual Canticle* of St. John of the Cross is an interpolated copy,⁷⁶ has received new confirmation.

⁷⁴ J. Etienne, "Driedo (Jean)," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1957) 1717-19.—An interesting complement to our knowledge of the spiritual temper of the times is provided by A. L. Mayer, "Das Gräbtuch von Turin als typisches Beispiel spätmittelalterlicher Schaudévotion," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1956) 348-64. The author's own doubts about the authenticity of the Shroud of Turin he finds confirmed by the relation of the Shroud-cult with other contemporary instances of the devotion of "seeing relics." The instances he has collected are extremely informative.

⁷⁵ G. M. Colombas, O.S.B., *Un reformador benedictino en tiempo de los reyes católicos, García Jiménez de Cisneros, Abad de Montserrat* (Montserrat: Abadía, 1955, pp. xxx + 510).

⁷⁶ Cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 17 (1956) 63-64.

Krynen in particular had appealed to the witness, which he thought to be in his favor, of the commentary thereon of Augustín Antolínez (1554-1626). Now the commentary has been published.⁷⁷ The preface by Fr. Vega and the appendix by Fr. Michel Ledrus, S.J., have removed forever that small last plank from under Krynen.⁷⁸

The obscurity in which Antolínez has lain throughout three centuries could easily continue undisturbed despite this volume, so great is the attraction of the detective work between which his *Amores* is sandwiched. Not merely the scholarly thing but the simple Christian thing to do is to take the volume as a whole for its quite exceptional value, from three converging perspectives (Vega, Antolínez, Ledrus), in the interpreting of St. John. So assumed it can make one healthily impatient of such otherwise excellent exercises in personal ingenuity as M. Florisoone's aesthetic theory,⁷⁹ or in pious reflection, as Fr. Jérôme's conferences,⁸⁰ and that would not be an altogether bad thing.

With Fr. Healy's valuable study we are, once more, on the solid terrain of history.⁸¹ It is an analytical examination (context, content, sources) of the fourth volume of the *Directoires des novices*, product of the great French Carmelite reform of the mid-seventeenth century. This, the concluding volume, was devoted wholly to the question of prayer and how, in the Carmelite tradition, the young religious should set about it. It was a very remarkable piece of work, and its influence from that day to this has been beneficial and wide. Why this was so, is clear from Fr. Healy's careful analysis. Its abidingly successful character derived from the skill with which its two authors drew from the best of recent writers (Ignatius, Louis of Granada, Blossius, Teresa, Francis of Sales) who had treated of meditative prayer. In this way what had, I suppose, always been operatively present in the traditional Carmelite spirit was brought into the clear and accorded a new cogency. Inevitably, one's appetite is whetted for more about the Touraine reform. Aside from Mlle Bouchereaux's learned sallies into the field of a decade ago, it has been egregiously neglected by scholars. A

⁷⁷ A. Antolínez, O.S.A., *Amores de Dios y el alma*, Introduction, notes, and edited text by A. C. Vega, O.S.A. (Madrid: Escorial, 1956, pp. lxxx + 462).

⁷⁸ For a more extended evaluation, see L. M. Mendizábel, S.J., "Un comentario agustino a las estrofas de S. Juan de la Cruz," *Gregorianum* 38 (1957) 97-102.

⁷⁹ M. Florisoone, *Esthétique et mystique d'après sainte Thérèse d'Avila et saint Jean de la Croix* (Paris: Seuil, 1956, pp. 206).

⁸⁰ Jérôme de la Mère de Dieu, O.C.D., *La règle du Carmel* (Avignon: Carmel, 1956, pp. 179).

⁸¹ K. J. Healy, O.Carm., *Methods of Prayer in the Directory of the Carmelite Reform of Touraine* (Rome: Institutum Carmelitanum, 1956, pp. xvi + 184).

similar, incomprehensible neglect has also been largely the lot of Bossuet's St. Teresa of the New World, Marie of the Incarnation. Mother Aloysius Gonzaga has made giant amends in what will henceforth be the constant vade mecum of those who would unlock the secret of the great Canadian mystic.⁸²

As we had occasion to remark earlier,⁸³ things are much better with St. Francis of Sales. Yet only now have we finally been accorded the kind of discussion that is primary in any real understanding of Salesian spirituality, that is, a historical discussion of its "humanism." Bremond's charming ruse in the early volumes of his *Histoire littéraire*, whereby he created a Francis in his own image, seems to have deceived no one except, eventually, Bremond himself. Sister Teresa's Fordham dissertation analyzes the Salesian humanism chiefly in philosophic terms;⁸⁴ Fr. Julien-Eymard's study, in theological.⁸⁵ The combination of the two provides an integrated, nuanced statement of that basic Salesian mystery which is all the more mystifying because of its seeming ordinariness. No such built-in deceptiveness lies at the heart of Vincentian spirituality. Therefore it has been possible for Fr. Remírez to write a sort of textbook of the doctrine of St. Vincent de Paul, complete with all the familiar divisions and subdivisions of conference-hall presentation, which yet merits acceptance as a piece of valid historical interpretation.⁸⁶

The mystery of Fénelon continues to cast its spell over minds. In any given year a half-dozen or so people, otherwise unknown to fame, will feel a sudden compulsion to "defend" Fénelon. I have in the past felt no corresponding compulsion to record in these pages such brief, largely bemused,

⁸² Aloysius Gonzaga L'Heureux, O.S.U., *The Mystical Vocabulary of Venerable Mère Marie de l'Incarnation and Its Problems* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1956, pp. xi + 193).

⁸³ Cf. THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 17 (1956) 61. An indispensable tool for students of Salesian spirituality has been provided by the publication of V. Brasier, E. Morganti, M. St. Durica, *Bibliografia salesiana: Opere e scritti riguardanti S. Francesco di Sales (1625-1955)* (Turin-Milan: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1956, pp. 104), wherein Don Durica brings up to date Don Morganti's 1943 completion of Canon Brasier's bibliography of 1881. It is an indication of the happy, latter-day proliferation of Salesian studies that, despite the listing here of 1299 titles, some quite important ones have managed to escape Don Durica's net.

⁸⁴ María Teresa Guevara, R.S.C.J., *El humanismo de San Francisco de Sales: Estudio del Renacimiento Francés* (Mexico City: Bajo el Signo de Abside, 1955, pp. 255).

⁸⁵ Julien-Eymard d'Angers, O.F.M.Cap., "Etudes sur les rapports du naturel et du surnaturel dans l'oeuvre de s. François de Sales," *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 32 (1956) 461-86.

⁸⁶ J. Remírez Muneta, C.M., *La espiritualidad de San Vicente de Paul* (Madrid: Fax, 1956, pp. 342).

public appearances. Lately, however, the quality of self-appointed champions is much improved. Messrs. Stanford⁸⁷ and De la Bedoyere⁸⁸ are quite clearly a cut above the ordinary. Yet, even with them, it is not manifest against what they are defending Fénelon. The unworthy thought comes to mind that it is perhaps less a defense than a prankish attack, that they have been caught less by the spell of Fénelon than by the spell, very different but no less potent, of his historical adversary, Bossuet. For he who was to his contemporaries the mighty "Eagle of Meaux" seems to us today like nothing so much as a balloon in the shape of a man, and the urge to puncture him anew, even from a distance of almost three centuries, can become at times well-nigh irresistible. I would hesitate, however, to ascribe such schoolboy antics to Mlle Goré. She, more appropriately, has a schoolgirl crush on Fénelon that has resulted in much mooning about in libraries and in archives, much perfervid literary composition, much ground for exasperation among scholars who have forgotten somewhere along the line what it is like to be young. All the best words are to be found in her general study of Fénelon's development.⁸⁹ Every contemporary slogan from the Boule-Miche is made to apply. The pallid Prince Charming that eventually emerges, buttressed though he is with footnotes up to the hips, could not have stood for a moment against the mildest *moue* from Bossuet. In her companion volume, Mlle Goré manages to confuse indifference with fatalism, with *apatheia*, with the medieval *quies mentis*, and with *pur amour*—a notable achievement even for one understandably so distraught.⁹⁰ But the pleasant foolishness of her own text will be balanced in the eyes of the more sober-sided among us by the appendix which follows it. There she has had the happy inspiration of reproducing three rare documents relevant to the understanding of Fénelon's doctrine on indifference, his *Mémoire sur l'état passif* and *Traité sur l'autorité de Cassien*, and the anonymous *Description du dernier état d'anéantissement*. Finally, therefore, after so many pages of girlish enthusiasm, we have Fénelon himself. And we have once more the familiar drawing-room spirituality, perfumed, powdered, meticulously coiffured. It is with relief that one turns to the doctrine of St. Paul of the Cross.

It has received, perhaps, its best recent exposition at the hands of Fr.

⁸⁷ D. Stanford, "A Word for Fénelon," *Clergy Review* 40 (1957) 14-25, 76-84.

⁸⁸ M. De la Bedoyere, *The Archbishop and the Lady* (London: Collins, 1956, pp. 256).

⁸⁹ J. L. Goré, *L'itinéraire de Fénelon: Humanisme et spiritualité* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1957, pp. 754).

⁹⁰ *La notion d'indifférence chez Fénelon et ses sources* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1956, pp. 316).

Brovetto.⁹¹ However, presented thus synthetically it can lose something of that cogent realism which is, in the writings of the Saint himself, its chief characteristic. The safest way to proceed, it would seem, is from his mystical experiences. It was this that the late Fr. Viller did in studies which, at the time, came as positive revelations not merely of the distinctiveness of St. Paul's mystical experiences but of the rich virtualities of a spirituality that is specifically of the passion. Fr. Basilio continues the work of exposition in this, the Viller, direction.⁹² His concern is the reparative aspect of the Saint's mysticism, and he is able in brief compass thus to present his spirituality as the dynamic thing he lived, taught, governed by. All this, of course, is only a beginning.⁹³

Of another whose way to sanctity was by the humanly ambiguous path of failure, suffering, and destitution Fr. Rétif has written.⁹⁴ It is unfortunate that an unjustified diffidence prevented the author from considering the mystical life of the Venerable Libermann as well as its ascetical aspects. His delineation of the doctrine of spiritual poverty is, however, excellent. It was, according to Libermann, the consciousness and the love of one's own abjectness, nothingness before God, inability in the service of God and of the apostolate. No one will deny, I expect, that Libermann was aided to this insight by his own experience with himself; the imbalance (we hesitate to say more) of his nerves was a greater help in this direction than their healthy equilibrium would have been. Some, perhaps unduly enamored of an abstract "perfectness," would appear to deny such a possibility. In this connection, Fr. Aumann's article and the correspondence it occasioned is of interest, not least because in his communication Pierre Blanchard, the psychologist, gives the good word that he is engaged in a projected two-volume work on Libermann where the matter will receive *ex professo* treatment.⁹⁵

Was St. Thérèse of Lisieux a neurotic? A few years ago Fr. Robo said

⁹¹ G. Brovetto, *Introduzione alla spiritualità di S. Paolo della Croce* (Termao: Eco, 1955, pp. xv + 216).

⁹² Basilio de S. Pablo, C.P., "La contemplación reparadora en San Pablo de la Cruz," *Revista de espiritualidad* 16 (1957) 449-65.

⁹³ Much to be recommended is the quarterly, *Fonti vive*, for consistently good studies (upon the popular level) of the spirituality of the passion. Begun in 1955 by the Italian Passionists, its roster of contributors is becoming progressively more international.

⁹⁴ A. Rétif, S.J., *Pauvreté spirituelle et mission d'après le Père Libermann* (Paris: Spes, 1956, pp. 205).

⁹⁵ J. Aumann, O.P., "Maladie mentale et perfection chrétienne," *Vie spirituelle: Supplément* 9 (1956) 440-48. For the correspondence, *ibid.* 10 (1957) 108-10; 265-67 (Blanchard).

she was, and great was the clamor that resulted. He has now said so once more, even more categorically and with greater detail, in the revised and expanded version of his book.⁹⁶ That there will be a tumult and a shouting all over again seems unlikely; surely all participants to the controversy must by now be in a state of emotional exhaustion. Perhaps, then, so long as one keeps one's voice low, it is allowable to make a minor observation or two here.

In his pursuit of the genuine human being who was Thérèse Martin, Fr. Robo becomes a little forgetful of the genuine humanness of those around about her. (And that he should be, again, only human; he is pioneering, and it is just about impossible to assess all values properly the first, or even the second, time through.) Thus he seems to make overmuch of the "touching-up" of her photographs. It is common experience now that not every photograph is a good likeness. It was an even more common experience seventy years ago with the long immobile pose that was required, the crudely sensitive plates that were used. Hence the practice of touching-up. Its purpose was not to fob off a different personality on the public; it was to capture the real personality. In the misty, antediluvian period when I was a boy it was standard procedure of the professional photographer; it probably still is. Fr. Robo's further grief is that the retouching by Céline always ended in a vacuous prettiness which he thinks was intentional. Maybe it was. But the faces Céline produced are just like those produced every day in the week by people with little or no artistic competence when they try to paint a young woman. Let Fr. Robo, if he doubts it, take a long, slow look at his grocer's calendar.

Again, the touching-up of the *Story of a Soul* by Pauline is, for Fr. Robo, a further component in Carmel's devious and unworthy plot to foist a saint upon the world. But Pauline had been told by Thérèse to correct, add, subtract from the text as she saw fit. Now it is common, bitter experience, as anyone will tell you who has done much preparing of authors' manuscripts for the press, that if you change one word you end by changing a hundred. You practically rewrite the whole thing. And the intention is not to deceive. Rather is it to convey more effectively what the person wanted to say.

Finally, the neurosis of St. Thérèse. There is a bit of the neurotic in all of us and there was a bit of the neurotic, likely, in her. But the series of casual and ordinary incidents that go to establish Fr. Robo's conclusion of the presence of a real psychoneurosis makes one wonder if his normally steady hand has not become unsure, his sharp eye unaccountably glazed

⁹⁶ E. Robo, *Two Portraits of St. Teresa of Lisieux*, revised and enlarged edition (Westminster: Newman, 1957, pp. 238).

over. And when he remarks that thus Thérèse made "very slow progress" in the way of sanctity, one is sure of it. In any case, it is certainly perilous to attempt now the psychoanalysis of someone dead these sixty years. It is doubly so if the one who attempts it is an amateur. The appreciation of Thérèse written a few years ago by one of our leading psychiatrists, Dr. Karl Stern, might here be called to mind.⁹⁷ No such notion troubles its pages.

Now I have bothered to make these homely and, I fear, deplorably obvious observations not for the purpose of buffeting poor Fr. Robo anew but in order to point a moral. Each generation, unfortunately, has its own, popular notion of what sanctity is. Pauline, who was very much of the nineteenth century, had hers. Fr. Robo, who is very much of the twentieth, has his. Both of them made the mistake of imposing their respective notions upon, rather than having them corrected by, the documents before them. Thus, in the hagiography of every era, do the popular misconceptions batten, in effect, upon themselves and grow strong. And thus, seeing what is happening and not able to do one single thing about it, do theologians grow grey and gibbering before their time. The moral? Don't be a theologian.

Fr. Robo is very much his sensible self in discussing the strange malady with which Thérèse was afflicted (or which, as she came to suspect later, she perhaps inflicted on herself) when Pauline entered the convent. The principle upon which he proceeds is the traditional one: Do not conclude to supernatural or preternatural causes unless a natural explanation is clearly impossible. It can be an instructive experience to compare his pages with those of Fr. Barrios.⁹⁸

The most noteworthy event for the history of spirituality in the past two years was the publication, by photographic process, of St. Thérèse's autobiographical manuscripts out of which, by so many hands and with so many changes, was confected the *Story of a Soul*.⁹⁹ It should in time banish forever the illusion of *la petite Thérèse*.¹⁰⁰ She was, as the evidence now of

⁹⁷ K. Stern, "St. Thérèse of Lisieux," in C. B. Luce, *Saints for Now* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1952) pp. 295-312.

⁹⁸ A. Barrios Moneo, C.M.F., "Un problema oscuro en la infancia de Teresa de Lisieux," *Revista de espiritualidad* 16 (1957) 25-68.

⁹⁹ *Les manuscrits autobiographiques de sainte Thérèse de l'Enfant-Jésus* (Lisieux: Carmel, 1956).

¹⁰⁰ The literature which its appearance gave rise to is extensive. The following studies are, for one reason or another, especially worthy of note: B. Arminjon, S.J., "Les manuscrits autobiographiques de sainte Thérèse de Lisieux," *Christus* 3 (1956) 546-60; A. Barrios Moneo, C.M.F., "La publicación de los 'Manuscrits Autobiographiques' de Teresa de

her own words amply testifies, the most profoundly theological of all the female saints even though those words continued to be part and parcel of the bourgeois mode of expression of her time and place.

But have we, even now, Thérèse's own words throughout? Fr. Robo says: "When Mother Agnes [Thérèse's sister, Pauline] was 'editing' the text in 1898 she could not possibly suspect that the manuscript would ever fall under critical eyes. Still less could she imagine that it would one day be photographed and published, and she rubbed out or modified without hesitation any sentence or episode that conflicted with the picture of the angelic child she wished the world to accept. Can we feel confident that the many passages reconstituted from memory twelve years after their obliteration, conform to the original? Even if she remembered their substance, is it likely the wording would be the same? Is it likely that it would not be doctored, attenuated, like the one we have quoted . . . ? Who can tell? Since the new texts written by a strange hand are indistinguishable from the original and genuine ones, we may be always left in doubt, whatever the experts say. This is all very perplexing."

Indeed, it is. Yet the situation, if not perfect, is obviously better by far than it was before the publication of the manuscripts. A decade or so poring over the new data they provide should give us something pretty close to the authentic doctrine of St. Thérèse. In the meantime the interested student would do well to take note of the following first essays at re-interpretation.

Lisieux, apología de M. Inés de Jesús," *Revista de espiritualidad* 16 (1957) 208-28; I.C. "Les manuscrits autobiographiques de Sainte Thérèse," *Carmel* (Petit Castelet) 29 (1956) 296-306; F. M. Catherinet, "S. Thérèse: Edition phototypique des écrits autobiographiques," *Ami du clergé* 66 (1956) 523-27; L. Chaigne, "A propos des manuscrits autobiographiques de l'Histoire d'une âme," *Annales de sainte Thérèse de Lisieux* 32 (1956) 5-7; S. S. Cunneen, "Saint Therese," *Jubilee* 5 (October, 1957) 25-31; M. Day, "The Autograph Manuscript of 'The Story of a Soul,'" *Sicut parvuli* 18 (1956) 175-83; F. Hillig, S.J., "Die Urfassung der 'Geschichte einer Seele,'" *Geist und Leben* 30 (1957) 128-34; T. Keulemans, O.Carm., "De 'Manuscrits autobiographiques' van St. Teresia van Lisieux," *Carmel* (Tilburg) 9 (1956) 151-58; M. Molenaar, M.S.C., "Het handschrift van Teresia van Lisieux," *Ons geestelijk leven* 33 (1956-57) 285-87; D. M. de Petter, O.P., "De facsimile-uitgave van de autobiografische handschriften van de H. Teresia van Lisieux," *Tijdschrift voor geestelijk leven* 12 (1956) 674-80; M. M. Philippon, O.P., "La pubblicazione del Testo Autografo della 'Storia di un'Anima,'" *Rivista di vita spirituale* 10 (1956) 470-81; Philippe de la Trinité, O.C.D., "Les Manuscrits autobiographiques," *Ephemerides Carmeliticæ* 7 (1956) 528-57; A. Plé, O.P., "Les manuscrits autobiographiques de sainte Thérèse de l'Enfant-Jésus," *Vie spirituelle* 95 (1956) 443-46; P. Ploumen, S.J., "De manuscripten van de kleine Theresia en haar spiritualiteit," *Bijdragen* 18 (1957) 162-67; A. Tapiador, "Se ha publicado el texto integro y auténtico de la Historia de un Alma," *Ecclesia* 16 (1956) 323-25.

Independently achieved, each of them is forced by the additional evidence now at hand to center everything upon the Teresan theology of divine love. This is something new. The Abbé Combes in the past forced texts from St. Thérèse into his own, somewhat arbitrary theological pattern of the workings of God's love in the spiritual life, and the results—fortunately—inspired small conviction. With the studies by Fr. Victor,¹⁰¹ Fr. François,¹⁰² and Mlle d'Hendecourt¹⁰³ the true gravitational center of her doctrine has at last been found. Much excitement awaits the theologian who with the aid of these monographs addresses himself anew to the spirituality of St. Thérèse as revealed now in the *Manuscrits autobiographiques*.

Jesuit Seminary, Toronto

ELMER O'BRIEN, S.J.

¹⁰¹ Victor de la Vierge, O.C.D., *Réalisme spirituel de sainte Thérèse de Lisieux d'après les manuscrits authentiques* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1956, pp. ix + 201).

¹⁰² François de l'Immaculée-Conception, O.C.D., *Pour mieux connaître sainte Thérèse de Lisieux* (Brussels: Carmel, 1956, pp. 314).

¹⁰³ M. M. d'Hendecourt, *La perfection de l'amour d'après sainte Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1956, pp. 143)