Journal of the Faculty of Arts

THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF MALTA

CONTENTS

Volume II Number 4 1964

Editor: Professor J. Aquilina
Asst. Editor: Mr D.L. Farley-Hills

All enquiries should be addressed to the Editor:
c/o The Royal University of Malta,
St. Paul's Street,
Valletta,
MALTA.

Subscription: Five shillings per copy

Printed at the Malta University Press

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS

Royal University of Malta

Volume II Number 4 1964

COMMENT

THIS number of the *Journal of the Faculty of Arts* is the first to appear in an Independent Malta. The advent of independence brings with it not only a new and well-earned freedom, it brings new responsibilities and the need for a concerted effort to guarantee that Malta shall have as prosperous and distinctive a future as it has had a glorious and distinctive past. In this future the paramount importance of education should be obvious to everyone. Malta's natural resources are slender and to survive not merely as an independent nation but as a distinctive representative of Western European civilisation, Malta will have to live by the intelligence, industry and skill of its people. The most urgent need is therefore to create a dynamic and progressive educational policy which will develop to the full the native capacity of her people, and in this the University must play a central role. Scientists, technologists, and skilled workers Malta will need to produce in abundance and every effort should be made to make sure that the appropriate skills are made available to whoever has the ability to use them. But to develop an efficient economy is only half the problem, though an essential half. Just as important is to make sure that this economic progress is the basis of the civilized way of life that has been built up over the centuries in Malta. For this we must be aware of our past (which means understanding what is bad in it as well as what is good), we must be able to resist the encroachments of some of the more facile aspects of Western Civilization by fostering respect for, and participation in, the Arts, by an awareness both of the literature in our own language and the potentiality of our own language, and the literatures of the other European languages which are also part of our heritage.

In this determination to remain civilized as well as prosperous the study of the Arts is a central concern, and in this the *Journal of the Faculty of Arts* of the Royal University of Malta will strive to be a forum where our best endeavours in the artistic field can be recorded and discussed. Already our University is encouraging the development of a re-

search degree in the Faculty of Arts and this, it will be hoped, will provide an increasing number of people who will be able to contribute to the *Journal* at a level of scholarships that will bear comparison with any institution of higher learning elsewhere. At the same time it is hoped to continue to encourage foreign scholars to contribute articles especially in those fields of interest to Malta. Where possible in the future the editors will endeavour to devote each number of the Journal to one particular aspect of artistic studies. Our job, as we see it, is to reflect all aspects of interest in artistic subjects in our island, but at the same time we will try to give homogeneity to each particular number by focussing our attention on a particular discipline each time. It is hoped to apply this policy to the next issue where we hope that a number of papers of a historical nature will be published on matters affecting the history of the Maltese islands.

The advent of Independence also coincides with a change at the head of our University. This October saw the inauguration of Professor Borg Costanzi as our new Vice-Chancellor. In wishing him a long and successful tenure of his high and responsible office we would also like to express our thanks and appreciation for the work of his predecessor, Professor Manché, who has just retired. Under Professor Manché the University continued that expansion and modernization which began under his predecessor and without which it cannot hope to fulfil its proper function as the hub of Malta's prosperity in the future. We are convinced that under our new Vice-Chancellor this policy will be continued and accelerated.

The new Vice-Chancellor, in his public address, which he gave after he was installed Vice-Chancellor of the University on October 5th, said that "we must give our Staff sufficient time to carry out essential research". That is an important statement of policy because, as pointed out by Herbert Butterfield, ex-Vice-Chancellor of the University College on on page 19 of his book *The Universities and Education Today* "It is best of all if teaching is combined with live research, with original work that is still in progress. Only those who are continually probing into the body of their knowledge, and trying to unthink last year's thoughts, can convey, along with the information, the thrill of the real quest for the truth".

We pledge our full energies in supporting him and pray that those whom high office gives them the right and duty to aid him in this work will view the question with the same determination and sense of urgency that he has already evinced.

THE TWO VOICES OF HISTORY

By P. SERRACINO INGLOTT

THE past is dead; by definition it no longer exists, yet sometimes it comes back to us so vividly that we feel we are its prisoners. But if the past strikes us at times by its elusiveness and at others by its ineluctability, the paradox does not lie perhaps in the past itself, but rather in men's own attitudes towards it. Sometimes they wish to preserve it, to keep it intact forever: their closets are filled with bottles, old clothes, concealed mementoes; their houses with old clocks, medallions, portraits, shells; their churches with tombs, tablets, brasses, regimental flags; their cities with monuments, museums, and arches. Then other times come when they wish to destroy these remembrances, to forget the past and wash the slate of memory clean. They tear up their old letters and burn the faded photographs; the statues of the Stalins, till lately the objects of near idolatrous cults, topple down. But both attempts, to capture the past as if with a butterfly net or to slip out of its grasp, are obviously doomed to failure; however hard one tries to shut out the noise from one's ears, at one's back one will 'always hear Time's winged chariot hurrying near', and however hard one tries to recover the past, one will always find, as Professor Ryle has said in a different context, that one fails to catch more than the flying coat-tails of that which one is pursuing, for the quarry is itself the hunter.

Still more strikingly, this dual attitude to the past betrays itself at the level of political history, in the sempiternal clashes between the radical and the conservative tempers. The former, from Mirabeau to Bevan, urge us to look at reality with the naked eye instead of through the smoked glasses inherited from our grandparents, the latter from Burke to Lord Hailsham warn us perenially that what saves us from chaos is habit, what creates order amid the flux of facts is tradition. However, there is only a seeming paradox if one says that those ages when the conservative and stabilizing spirit predominates have a less intense historical consciousness than the radical and revolutionizing ones. The conservative is anxious to discount the importance of historical changes. 'Burke', Professor Butterfield himself tells us, 'tended to confirm the nation in its belief that the liberties of this country went back to times immemorial'. While for conservatives, the past has this flavour of indefiniteness, radicals feel enclosed within a vast but essentially limited historical horizon. Staunch

conservatives, like the theologians of the Middle Ages, though they knew that they had been preceded by a long procession of successive generations, still felt the past to be qualitatively homogeneous. This frame of mind made it possible for brilliant men like Aquinas never to bother about the authenticity of the Pseudo-Dionysius. That it seems puzzling to us how the writings of a sixth century neoplatonist could have been for so long unquestioningly accepted as those of a disciple of St. Paul is clear proof that our own attitude to the past is different. Exact dates were for the medievals a matter of more or less useless erudition – a not very significant label stuck to an event to help in its identification and cataloguing. Today, we feel that unless we know a writer's dates, we cannot fully understand him. His actions and sayings will acquire a different meaning according to the historical framework into which we fit him. Nor does a work of art deliver a message beyond time; for us, it is internally conditioned by the date of its first appearance. But the medievals did not bother about more than a rough localisation in time. Was not Truth eternal? How then could the significance of something that was worth saying two hundred years ago dissolve with the mere passage of time? Dates, likewise, had no place in hagiography: for the medievals, sanctity was at bottom always the same; they did not worry, like the modern Christian, about its having to garb itself in different historical forms in different ages. The chronology of the past became logically a minor matter; the specific characteristics of each epoch were frequently blurred lest they should impede the contemplation of unchanging Truth.

The tendency of the historian who does not wish to challenge the customs, beliefs and social institutions which he found in existence at his birth, which he sees continuing with little change throughout his lifetime, and which he believes likely to last for ever, is to divest history, as it were, of its temporality and turn its particular events, their contexts reduced to merely accidental relevance, into myths. Like Professor Butterfield, he feels that history should be taught as 'a modern equivalent of Aesop's fables' and holds that 'the method must adequate to its purpose is perhaps the mere telling of stories to the very young, possibly with a side-glance at some moral that may be drawn from the narrative'. And doubtless the moral ideals of nations have been more profoundly affected by the traditional myths and fables that have been presented to them as paradigms of noble and heroic conduct than by the enunciation of rules of an abstract Kantian type. Christ was not the only teacher to preach ethics by means of parables. This normative function is fulfilled for the conservative by his sense of the past. An essential feature of the technique is to eviscerate the 'pastness' out of past events. The stories that can serve

the purpose of being doctrinal to the nation have to convey a timeless message; their historical context only serves, if anything, to provide an added picturesqueness. If Raleigh had worn a khaki raincoat, instead of a rich cloak, the story would be somewhat devalued but its point could still be strongly made. And Henry's speech at Agincourt surely provides sturdier nourishment for the soul than dusty academic disputations about the exact figure of his troops. The historical significance of events is implicit within them; they mean what they point out by having a point. For the conservative therefore, if Lord Russell will forgive the travesty, 'the unimportance of time is the gateway to historical wisdom'. This happy sense of the past tends to prevail when no forebodings of danger threaten established order and the social stability of a nation.

When however the dominant feeling of society is that 'behind the ermine cape is the sealing-wall and the broken windows; underfoot lies the dust and rubble of bombs that have not yet descended', the factor of change is driven to the forefront of human attention. If the typical feature of the conservative sense of the past is the depiction of history as a fairly disjointed series of self-contained episodes, the radical sense of the past is typified by the refusal to see significance in a historical event unless as part of a self-metamorphosing whole. Each historical event is a fragment of an unfinished mosaic, its meaning not only undiscovered outside its place in the design but shifting as new bits are added to the growing pattern. Metaphysically, the conservative conceives reality as Being, the radical as Becoming. The past is for the latter not a series of colourful but static magic-lantern slides, but a closely-connected film sequence in constant motion. Radicals have, however, described the historical movement in three different ways. The Optimists picture it as forward in a perhaps slightly deviating line, the Pessimists as round in a circle, and Professor Toynbee as a fusion of both these forms. The first two theories are, I think, twentieth-century secular disguises for the two living traditions of the religious interpretation of history. The Positivists' pedigree is the Judeo-Christian eschatological vision of the past; the Spenglerites derive from Hellenic and Eastern sources their doctrine that we are fixed on the 'Faustian' switchback of a historical cycle hurtling to disaster. Professor Toynbee has tried to reconcile the belief in the 'elemental rhythm of yin and yang' and the Hellenic life-cycles of growth and decay with his belief in a progressive revelation of divine truth in history by arguing that the perpetual turning of a wheel is not vain repetition if with each revolution it is carrying a vehicle nearer to its goal. 'If Religion is a chariot, it looks as if the wheels on which it mounts towards Heaven may be the progressive downfalls of civilisations on Earth'. These

three theories of history clearly both derive from and lead to three different attitudes to life in general. The Positivist conduces to that strange kind of inverted Confucianism which is the worship of one's grandchildren, the Spenglerite to a feeling that the hourglass of time is about to turn with no power at hand to reverse the instrument, the Toynbeesque to a half-despairing, half-hopeful sense of being in a leaky boat on a rough sea in a dark night sailing towards a known but distant shore. The first tends to be the result of a near Cartesian faith in the knowability of the world by human reason, the second of an opposite faith that no theoretical explanation of reality is ever final, the third of that trait in Professor Toynbee's character which believes in 'Reunion all Round; or Jael's Hammer laid Aside and the Milk of Human Kindness Beaten up into Butter and served in a Lordly Dish'. Despite their differences, they have been lumped together as Radical because they are all based on a dynamic picture of the past; the factor of change in history is felt by them to be more important than that of enduring stability and order.

The Conservative Theory of History

There are three forms of the sense of the past which can be easily distinguished and between which the student of history has to choose. Should he feel, like Sir Winston Churchill, that the most important aspects of the past are its archetypal stories with the patriotic innuendoes they provide? Should he, like the Radicals, be struck, above all, by the irreversible process of change? If so, should he see in the long story of the defeats and failures of all human attempts to find fixity in things, a progressive and increasingly successful effort to pierce the changing flux of appearances and reach a world of immutable essences in which Truth and stability reside? Or should he enlist with the band of mournful dirgers shedding melancholy tears over the disappearance of what has gone before and the certainty of being overtaken by the same fate themselves? Need the sense of the past take the shape of either a dim remembrance of disconnected series of haphazard events, or a triumphant faith in the future which is only the inexorable working out of the laws of progress embedded in the past, or the feeling of checkmate and shipwreck, that modern man, like a bird with a broken pinion, cannot again soar to the heavens, that is most characteristic of our day? All these theories, I think, are based on a logical confusion between different levels of language; they are three hybrid fusions of science and metaphysics. By the disjunction of the two levels, by distinguishing between two senses of history, the first obtainable by an empirical study of the facts and the other following an act of faith, I think it will be possible to avoid the

difficulties that the second interpretation otherwise involves. But the conservative theory, I shall now try to show later on, rests completely on an Aristotelean picture of reality; it turns history, as Burkhardt confessed, into a 'last religion' and tradition and continuity into fetishes, impregnated with a religious significance that cannot be exorcised. However, the mythical sense of the past has much superficial charm and at first it is the reasons for its attractiveness that I shall expound. The Poets, as Alexander the Great's tutor surely realised when he depreciated history in their favour, have doubtless always conveyed a deeper feeling about the past than the academic historians; for one thing, they take us back so much farther. People have always been interested in wars and love-affairs; they have always told stories about their forbears and these have been handed down, undergoing constant sea changes, from generation to generation. Historians, however, especially since Ranke, only begin to talk confidently of the past when it gets beyond the stage of myth and perhaps even of moralized chronicle. The historian feels that he cannot place too much reliance on those imaginative story-tellers of long ago, who did not need much audience reaction research to discover which tales thrilled or tickled their public, and whose dramatic sense would not, in any case, have allowed them to detract one iota of interest from their many-times-told tales by too strict an adherence to truth. The historian further extends his doubts also to those classical and medieval chroniclers who did have some respect for the sanctity of facts; they did not invent them to adorn a tale, but used them declaredly as a concrete exposition of their philosophy. Not only do Herodotus and Livy, gossip writers and rhetoricians, fall under the suspicion of critical and incredulous historians, who hold that stringent scientific principles should guide one's reconstructions of the past, but also Thucydides and Tacitus, who had a tendency to dramatise facts to exemplify such doctrines as that hubris is followed by a fall. The Rankist disciple tells us that belief is at least to be suspended till further corroboration is obtained from inscriptions, topography, potsherds, fragments and remains. Fairly certainly, the conservative feels, these will bring to light some obvious or apparent discrepancies, and from them the historian will in all likelihood claim to reconstruct what *really* took place. If his conjectures be ingenious, he will cover himself with glory and decorations, or at least earn an academic reputation for distinguished research: but it does not do much to help towards the derivation of ethical lessons. The conservative does not disapprove of the historian's researching; history is superior to a Dostoievski novel as a source book for ethics because the public is more impressed by things that really happened than by fiction; the public must, therefore,

have confidence that what the historian is saying is the truth. But for the conservative, the historian's function as researcher is clearly subsidiary to his function as teacher. Lord Acton, therefore, commits the sin of finickiness when for him St. Bede and Matthew Paris hardly qualify as worthy sources since medieval writers, he explains, 'lived in the twilight of fiction', whereas, 'the deeds of history' are 'done in the daylight'. Their documentation is chaste and uncoloured; they had no desire to demonstrate a tehsis, but they 'lived under a cloud of false witnesses' and their believing havits were too lax. Such a frame of mind does not constrict the poet's spinning of his story; he is free to take us back to the days when goddesses and mortals had love-affairs and the doings of their children created such commotion in the heavens. These stories are not only beautiful in themselves, but they give us a stronger sense of national identity than the frequently funereal parade of yawn-enforcing facts of the academic historian. This national self-consciousness is, for all true Aristotelean conservatives, the chief mark of a country's having a spiritually vitaminous sense of the fatherland's past.

Then it is easy to pour cheap satire on the heads of the German scholars piecing shreds of evidence together and the American post-graduate researchers painfully accumulating data for doctoral dissertations; who kill the fatted calf with joy when they discover some new detail which had escaped the less microscopic eyes of their predecessors and are thus enabled to hazard the guess, for instance, that the original of 'the cat which could look at a king' was the domestic pet of Hieronymous Resch whom the emperor Maximilian visited in 1517, or to conjure up with Chesterton the traditional caricature of the absent-minded professor gazing at a Roman coin while an escaped elephant pokes its head through the skylight. And doubtless it is true that though this concentrated research provides the bricks out of which the edifice will later emerge, a real sense of the past cannot be built after the fashion of the slaves constructing the pyramids. Some time a call has to be made on the imagination. By itself the raw material is either too scanty or too full. For the earlier stages of man's history, the historian has to resort to daring speculation and conjecture to fill up the picture, only parts of which are backed by evidence often barely retrieved from darkness, for the later stages a glut of facts is available thanks to the scholarly army which has raised the dust in all the libraries of the world, garnering knowledge about all aspects of human achievement from weapons of war to needlework. Where before the danger was drought, now it is drowning, but the historian's difficulty is the same. If the mind has, in Newman's words, to read through the data to the intelligible unity which binds them together or to see the design in

the varying signs of its presence, the conservative knows how often it will happen that a scholar will labour with infinite patience and care, but will, in the end, hazard a gigantic leap. And then a Sir James Frazer will need a watchdog like Andrew Lang to bend the Golden Bough back into a recognisable shape. Therefore he thinks the whole tricky business of discovering designs had better be given up as a bad job; he tends to adopt Herodotus as his patron saint and model and the Burkhardtian dictum that history consists solely of rescuing the outstanding facts from oblivion, as his motto. The past becomes a fortuitous concourse of atomistic events each being so infinitely complex that, if all its features are examined in sufficient detail, it turns out to be utterly unique. Historical events are clearly not simple instances of a universal law; therefore away with all generalisations!

A Criticism of the Conservative Theory of History

No historical writing can be done without generalisations. No more than one could list all the supposed atomic propositions of science can one construct a universal history that would furnish a complete compendium of all the specific events that have happened since the beginning of the world. No one could indeed write a complete autobiography if one wished to embalm every fleeting happening that occurred within however brief a lifetime; James Joyce had to be content with a day and Virginia Woolf with a few hours of an afternoon. Not even H.G. Wells hoped to rival that favourite character of old-fashioned preachers, the Recording Angel, the celestial bureaucrat who jots down in his insubstantial logbooks our secret thoughts and desires in readiness to present them as incontrovertible evidence against us when his colleague of the Heavenly Civil Service will blow the Last Trumpet. What the historian does is try to make as intelligent a precis as possible of such snippets of this material as are available to him. This, as Mr. Mclver has pointed out, is not to depreciate the work of the historian. The function of the Recording Angel could, after all, in a fully mechanised heaven, be performed by an electronic machine, but the historian's precis requires more than a modicum of intelligence. For he has not, as the conservatives suggest, merely to copy out a set of suitable extracts, omitting irrelevancies; but he has to summarise a complete, if necessarily small, section of the Recording Angel's hypothetical book. Though the book would itself fulfil the conservative's dream since it contains absolutely no generalisations or disposition-statements but only specific and concrete occurences, if the historian has to make his artistic summary, he cannot choose but generalise. Moreover his conclusions do not rest on a direct survey of the facts

for he has, of course, only the evidence of their past happening at his disposal, often defective, at times not even highly circumstantial, evidence that no law-court would accept as conclusive. Nonetheless, what we expect of him is the construction of as complete a picture of the past as possible by a bold interpretation of these few dubious clues. History does not result from a bare catalogue of events, but from the linking of them into a significant connected account. Hence historical judgements are classified as valid or invalid, just or unjust, but rarely as true or false. Because historical events are 'unique', it clearly does not follow any more than because every woman's face is unique, that no generalisations about them are in fact possible.

If this thesis, however, had been true, it would have proved fatal to the use of history the conservative wishes to make. If he is to draw from historical events lessons of correct behaviour, it is not enough for him to stretch the facts out like the early Wittgenstein's open chain of scientific propositions each of which described an atomic fact with no hierarchy among them; he has to assert that they share something, perhaps some mystical 'form', in common! The conservative is not really escaping the feared fallacy of repeated patterns of events; he is denying, perhaps that whole cycles of civilisation re-occur, but not that some historical situations have sufficient features in common to make possible generalisations about the type of human behaviour required to meet them adequately. The hidden postulate is really as blatant as Polonius moving behind Gertrude's arras; the conservatives have a mental picture of an unchanging reality: a steadfast human nature and an immutable order of things that persists through all change. A Christian, like Professor Butterfield, tells us that 'all epochs are equidistant from eternity'; but it is at bottom the Herodotean view that 'history' as Dr. Lowith states it, 'is regulated by a cosmic law of compensation mainly through nemesis which, time and again, restores the equilibrium of the historico-natural forces'. The overtones of economics in Lowith's language have a particular fitness here since this teleological picture of a universe whose balance is self-redressing lies behind the entire conservative temper. The static historical theory is just as false, I hold, as the static model of Adam Smith's classical economics. The conservative, like the Greeks, tends to believe that to think of the past in terms of progress represents an almost irreligious defiance of cosmic order and fate. This Herodotean belief becomes still more explicit in Thucydides. History does not change, for since man is as he always was, and will be, events that happened in the past, 'will happen again in the same or in a similar way'. Nothing really new can occur, when it is 'the nature of all things to grow and to decay'. The

Greeks handed down this doctrine to the Romans. Polybius cites Scipio's dictum after the destruction of Carthage that the same doom will fall on Rome; later he declares that history teaches 'what is best at every time and in every circumstance'. The conservative historian, however strenuous his protestations to the contrary may be, has his sense of the past deeply pockmarked by the classical cyclicism which fits in so well with the belief in the clockwork harmonies of the entire universe.

Besides, the conservative emphasis on the past enduring in the present has a distinct resemblance to Collingwood's slogan 'that all history is contemporary history'. Collingwood, following Croce, held the odd view that the history of the Peloponnesian War, for instance, was 'a mode of experience' – not referring however, as one would suppose, to the 'experience of thousands of poor devils two dozen centuries ago', but to the historian's own private experience in his Oxbridge study. This theory derives its slight semblance of plausibility from the fact that the historian's selection of facts for study is largely conditioned by contemporary interests and that to develop a real sense of the past, he has to have a degree of imaginative sympathy with it. A historian of the Middle Ages must obviously have an outlook on the Catholic Church, neither jaundiced like Dr. Coulton's nor purpled like Belloc's, nor even impossibly detached, but genuinely disposed to sympathy. If one is to understand what it really was to go on a pilgrimage to Canterbury, one must understand the purpose and meaning it had for the pilgrims. But from this truism, Collingwood deduced that 'all history is the history of thought' and that if the historian succeeded in rethinking the thoughts of those whose history he was studying, he had obtained the sense of the past. Thinking yourself into the skin of the chief actors in a historical drama is an old and valued technique for the historian, but driven beyond limits it becomes highly hazardous. The travesties of history that have resulted from picturing the fourth century Greeks as nineteenth-century Whigs, and the talk of France as 'the eternal enemy of mankind', which have, at times, resulted from reading the past too exclusively in terms of the present, have been brought too clearly into the light by twentieth century historians to deserve dwelling upon. Apart from its idealist metaphysics, the Collingwood thesis to be valid universally even as a technique requires the same presuppositions that lie behind the Conservative sense of the past: History is turned into a Platonic Heaven containing the models of which our actions are mediocre imitations.

But from a Platonic heaven, it is both easy and usual for the past to degenerate into a junk-shop full of the china-jug and broken statue and old clock collections which amuse the eccentric, an exotic garden to be

pottered about in and tentatively explored by the old and curious. History acquires all the charms of escapism; it becomes the refuge of all those who wish to flee from the unlovely present into the dreamworld of the 'good old times', to abandon the familiar, humdrum every day world and seek the horizons of a strange and hidden wonderland. The reading of history can beget for the old a pleasure similar to that which space-travel fiction provides for the very young: it takes them on a journey to a lost and distant continent with people similar, but in many ways different and superior to the men we meet in the streets of our cities: only, quite fittingly given their age group, some choose to travel forward in time, others backwards. Utopia can be placed at either end of the time process. But is this, then, all that historians are? Dreaming Alices checking dates instead of chasing white rabbits in the subterranean regions of the imagination? If one wants a different and more serious picture of the historian's activity, one has to turn to that school of historians whom I have labelled 'Radical'.

The Radical Theory of History

For us living today it has become difficult to imagine how even the greatest minds among men till less than two centuries ago could think that the past went back only six or eight millennia. After glimpsing the vast, indeed the almost boundless, perspectives of time opened by modern science, to be hemmed in within this narrow space of time produces in us a feeling like asphyxia. But it is still more suffocating to think that it was imagined that throughout this time no progress at all had taken place. For us, it is difficult to get back into the pre-evolutionary frame of mind and conjure up before the mind's eye the static picture of history. Its lifelessness makes it too dull and abhorrent for us to bear its contemplation: everything repeating itself ceaseleslys without variation or change of key. The boredom of it! 'Having climbed on to the shoulders of the ancients', said Fontanelle, 'we see further than they'. And Pascal added more profoundly that the successive generations of mankind can be regarded as the extension of a single man, always alive and learning. Therefore, I certainly think that the past has to be interpreted as a unified process of change, and not as a series of static pictures succeeding one another. But I do not think that only one such 'dynamic' interpretation is correct and final, but that several such interpretations can all be simultaneously correct. The trouble with most radical theories of the past, progressive and cyclical, is that, if their desired conclusions are to be reached, they are forced to adopt an a priori, metaphysical approach. They too, offer us deductive arguments of the type: such-and-such is the nature of

things, therefore history must develop in such-and-such a way. They claim to have discovered the open sesame to the world of hidden essences, and, in virtue of this discovery, they forecast the definitive shape of the future. But there is a second mode of approach open to the would-be philosopher of history. The arguments to be advanced in support of his theories would be of a less pretentious, inductive sort. Past history has developed in these ways; provided no new factor, uncalculated though not necessarily incalculable, intervenes, as it well might, these and these events are likely to happen. While the metaphysical approach requires that a theory be advanced as absolutely certain and that its predictions should prove incapable of falsification, this empirical approach can easily allow, because of its inductive nature, the possibility of its explanations being subsumed within other explanations of a higher level of generality or being advanced as merely probable because of the deficiency of evidence and the infant stage of our knowledge of psychology and even of being falsified by the unforeseen intervention of other factors. Such theories would only be advanced as working hypotheses, as the application of a certain conceptual apparatus to explain the past in terms of a model like those used in scientific theories. The test of such a model would be its experimental use. By considering some historical happening in its light, did one succeed or not in explaining it? Such a model clearly need not be advanced as the only possible one; in fact it is fairly obvious that as one moved from one level of generality to another, the model would have to be different, just as in physics at Newton's level of generality a certain model is suitable, but at Einstein's, which treats Newton's as a particular case, a different model becomes necessary. Thus, a theory like the Marxist, which attempts to explain the broad transformations of society from epoch to epoch in terms of changes in the methods of economic productions cannot, without a disastrous confusion of levels, be applied to explain why Smith voted for the Tory party at the last bye-election. Truth at the class level may be falsehood at the personal.

Further, I think that even at the same level of historical generality, different models can be used to convey the sense of the past. One can find parallels in history for certain distinctions Wittgenstein makes with regard to perception. First, to take the process negatively, one can fail to be aware of something because of a defective sense-organ, say, deafness; this would correspond to not possessing the facts in history. Secondly, one could be unaware of something because of, so to say, a deafness in the understanding rather than in the hearing. For instance, because of the lack of a musical ear, one can fail to recognise the theme of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. This would correspond to a failure to perceive the

causal connections between different events. So far any divergencies of view between historians would be purely factual and could be settled by empirical tests. But, thirdly, there is, in Wittgenstein's language, a failure to be aware of something that is not factual but interpretative, which he calls 'aspect-blindness'. One discerns the theme enunciated in Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, but it does not suggest 'Fate knocking at the door', or whatever it is supposed to suggest. Wittgenstein discusses several different kinds of aspect to which one could be 'blind', the most complex of which he calls 'the aspect of organisation'. This aspect changes, he says, 'as parts of the picture go together which before did not'. History is clearly a case where this can be applied: the rhapsody may then turn out to be a fugue.

Wittgenstein adds to the last remark, another: 'The substratum of this experience is the mastery of a technique'. By this he means that it is a necessary logical condition for seeing the organisational aspect of some reality that one has learnt the meaning of the conceptual apparatus one is going to apply, and the know-how of applying it. The historian, for instance, must approach his material, (though not necessarily already armed with his hypothesis), at least able to entertain the concept of the hypothesis and to apply it when it is formed. Otherwise he will simply fail to see the meaning of what he is studying; the sense of the past will never strike him. The matter is further complicated in history because there can be no historian who does not suffer in his field the equivalent of a defective sense-organ in a music critic; he must notice the theme and be struck by its meaning when he can only hear fragments, small or large, of the symphony. Hence there is a greater danger for a historical hypothesis to be falsified than for a scientific one; a historical model may turn out far more easily to be inappropriate than a scientific model. Because of this practical factor, historical theories that are advanced not as metaphysical disclosures of the hidden inner fabric of reality, but as empirical hypotheses, cannot be considered ultimate or definitive. What Burns Singer says of modern poetry, even if perhaps not always true of poetry, is certainly true of history: 'With a modern poem, even with a simple one, it will hang together in several ways, and so form several different patterns, and none of these patterns is better or more right than the others. And since you can never be sure that there is not yet another undiscovered pattern, you can never be sure that there is not a better pattern than any you have discovered'.

Yet another reason for declining to state with the radicals, optimists or pessimists, that there is only one authentic sense of the past is precisely the fact that history is not comparable to static sciences like

chemistry of the classical economics of Adam Smith, but to dynamic studies like the economic theories of growth, where allowance has to be made for the effect which a knowledge of these patterns of development has on people's subsequent conduct. This does not only make the task of prophesy on the basis of the past hazardous, but also means that no sense of the past can be considered ultimate. For does not the occurrence of each event new alter our whole understanding of the relationships between past events themselves? A striking parallel can again be found in literature, if Eliot's critical thesis is accepted that with every new addition to literature the relationships between all the old masterpieces are subtly readjusted, just as the relationships between members of a family are altered by the birth of a baby. If every generation must reclassify the great works of literature anew in order to reassess their place in tradition, likewise it is true that every new generation must rewrite the history books. The sense of the past will, therefore, differ in every age quite apart from the discoveries of new facts that are constantly being made.

Sir Lewis Namier was, I think, right when he suggested that all that the sense of the past really consisted in was the ability to place what did happen in the context of what could have happened. Since as the historical perspective enlarges, so this context widens, it follows that our sense of the past should constantly alter. A knowledge of the past does not show what determined the present, but what made it possible for it to take the shape it actually took: the present is inexplicable without it but is not a mere explication of it. The conclusion, therefore, is that the sense of the past is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition of our understand- of the present. Such historical theories as I am defending could only claim, hence, to be pointers but not proofs of what the future is likely to be like. Though a study of history so conceived cannot claim to lead to the moral betterment of its students, it does not deserve the Senecan diatribe, later eloquently echoed by Paul Valery, to the effect that it is a useless and debasing practice. To the Radical, who wishes to alter society, not to conform with the inevitable laws of history, but because he desires a different and better type of society, the sense of the past is a help towards understanding how present values came to be established. Creative action is hedged about by hundreds of conservative impediments that refuse to be brushed aside until the causes which have produced and sustained them are shown to be outmoded and invalid. The task of altering a tradition will then be seen to involve a process by which new functional values must first emerge before new ways of life can be made to supplant the old. For such Radicals therefore history is

interesting not for its isolated events but as a continuous closely-knit, developing process, because it is fruitful only by disclosing the origins and formation of the present world. Hence detailed accuracy is highly important for the Radicals, though next to negligible for the conservative so far as the political use of history is concerned.

THE CHRISTIAN THEORY OF HISTORY

Non-metaphysical historical theories, whatever their use, as Marx realised, by themselves will never lead to action since they can establish no values. Empirical investigation by itself provides no solution to the 'ultimate' questions. Like Wittgenstein, 'We feel that if all possible scientific questions were answered, the problems of life would still not have been touched upon. 'No Marxist would accept the disentangling of his metaphysical beliefs from his empirical analysis of the facts; he could not tolerate the use of his historical theory purely as a working hypothesis, possibly fallible, that could be helpful to historians in explaining the past. If the conservative theory is unpalatable today because modern man has known too many changes still to believe in an underlying stratum of permanent things, the great charm of the Marxist theory was its derivation from Hegel of the 'algebra of revolution'. By a dizzying confusion between his economic analysis of facts and his vastly comprehensive value-judgements, Marx created a picture of the world that, while claiming to be based on strictly empirical evidence, still attempted to disclose the hidden nature of the processes that lay at the heart of reality and to answer the 'ultimate questions'. Like the Conservative, he turned history into a God-like teacher of ethics.

If the past is, however, liable to be interpreted at two levels, these should be distinguished, since theories at different levels of language require different logical support. The first level of interpretation is that sought by means of theoretical models depending for their devising on the professional labours of the historian. The facts of the past are studied and perhaps a total explanation is attempted in terms of an empirically falsifiable hypothesis whose validity lies in its usefulness to explain. The second level is the metaphysical level of interpretation which, I do not think, is in principle impossible, but which involves an act of faith: it is a total vision of things which deals with historical happenings of an order which is not empirical but supernatural. Such a theory would require to be established or disproved on its own merits, but I do not think it could be a purely secular interpretation of the past. The Apostles of Progress from Voltaire to Comte and Condorcet not only inherited the logical confusion of the Christian Providentialist theory of Bossuet, but

further blurred the distinction, for while the latter was at least openly interpreting the natural in terms of the supernatural, the empirical in terms of the transcendental, the latter denied that there were two orders of concepts being handled, though clearly terms like 'Progress' were being used as disguises for mysterious, transcendental entities. Before Christianity, in fact, no philosopher had asked whether history had a meaning. As Plato might have said, historiography dealt with the sphere of change and contingency, but timeless and general truths were the province of philosophy. Yet while for Herodotus, to think of history as a march would have been to violate the rational and self-sufficient order of the cosmos, his near contemporary, Isaias, was interpreting the vicissitudes of the Jewish people in terms of a divine plan. For the Jewish prophets – the first radical historians – as Voltaire remarked: 'If a King names Cyrus becomes the master of Babylon, it is so that a few Jews shall be allowed to go home. If Alexander is victorious over Darius, it is in order to establish some Jewish second hand dealers in Alexandria'. But if Christians have to believe that Jewish history till the Incarnation can be given this joint politico-theological interpretation in the light of the covenant between God and his chosen people, Bossuet was, even if Christianity is accepted, wrong to apply the same method over every other field of human history. Christians do not claim to be an 'elected' people like the Jews, and the history of salvation is no longer linked to the history of a particular nation. No detailed correlation can any longer be established between the happenings of secular history and the divine plan of salvation. But the temptation to do it is still great. Like Eusebius of Caesarea who held that Providence had used the Imperium Romanum to pave the way for Constantine's Empire and Bossuet, who tried to interpret the history of civilisations as a Providential movement towards the establishment of Christendom, Professor Toynbee today, (though he fiercely denounces Bossuet) tells us that the downfalls of successive civilisations have the historical function of acting 'as stepping stones to a progressive process of the revelation of always deeper religious insight'. Once he held that the technological unification of the world 'may serve its historical purpose by providing Christianity with a world-wide repetition of the Roman Empire to spread itself over'; today he tends to substitute a syncretist fusion of the four great living religions for Christianity. There is clearly no support for this thesis in Christian Revelation at all. Besides it is a highly dangerous doctrine when statesmen or philosophers try to make religion and empire subservient to each other. When the destinies of nations become related to a pseudo-divine vocation and their leaders begin to talk about the historic mission of their country, then the Jews being to be

packed off to gas chambers and the white man bends to lift his burden. At best such a frame of mind leads to remarks like De Tocqueville's that to fight democracy is 'to be fighting against God Himself'.

Sacred history is no more a key to empirical history than Marxist metaphysics. The histories of the *Civitas Dei* and the *Civitas Terrena* takes place, as Augustine realized, on two different levels. The vision of the past disclosed by the Bible – though it does not dispense us from an empirical examination of the events claimed to be historical – presupposes a belief in supematural events, the *magnalia Dei* which by themselves constitute sacred history. The growth and decline of nations, the rise and fall of empires, the evolution of the means of economic production, the progress or regress of science and civilisation do not follow the same chart of development as the Kingdom of God. The *Weltgeschichte* and the *Heilsgeschichte* are different stories though they have definite points of contacts. The latter is a vision which encompasses all time, beginning with the Creation of the World, through God's choice of Israel, till the Incarnation. The advent of Christ is, however, not an outstanding fact among others, but a unqiue and unrepeatable event, an act of Redemption and resurrection in a history of sin and death. Since then the history of the Kingdom of God continues invisibly in the Church, viewed as a supernatural Body. The decisive battle against Satan has been won by the Redeemre, but, as Oscar Cullman put it, V-Day has not yet been proclaimed. Therefore Christians live in this period awaiting the Parousis, and the fulfilment of time. But even if one accepts as valid this theoligical sesne of the past, one has still to distinguish it from the empirical. No historian, *qua* historian, can recognise Christ to be the Son of God. Seen in the framework of secular history He is only the founder of a flourishing religious sect. But if by an act of faith, He is acknowledged as the Kryrios Christos, the Lord of history, a new dimension is then added to one's sense of the past. Though by empirical methods, all that can be done is the construction of doubtful hypotheses that give at best grounds for fallible expectations that something will probably happen, or perhaps, as psychology gets beyond its infact stage and the universe becomes increasingly manageable, for quasiscientific prediction, the Christian sense of the past, rejecting the stoic maxim, *nec spe, nec metu,* holds out the promise of a triumphant end. Marxists are apt to treat those as if they were displaying an unbearable puerility of mind who ask them why once the classless society is ushered in by that universal Sicilian Vespers when the expropriators will be expropriated, the dialectical principle, if it is the heart-beat of reality, should cease its production of contradictions but I think the difficulty is not only respectable but quite un-

answerable. The end of the historical process can only mean the end of the world. Secular Messianism is an illogical hybrid between Faith and Scepticism. But if history is the anvil on which God is beating out His purposes, then, as Lowith puts it, 'the interpretation of the past becomes a prophecy in reverse, demonstrating the past as a meaningful preparation for the future'. For though the two senses of the past, sacred and secular, are disparate, this does not mean that there is no interplay between the two. If Christ was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered under Pontius Pilate then the whole texture of human history has become blessed. Burkhardt in telling us of his admiration for those early Christians who in the decaying days of the Roman Empire became 'heroes of the desert' and whose extreme example he himself tried to imitate (with Victorian moderation), showed a typical cultured agnostic's misunderstanding when he said that their Christian sesse of the past had dictated their 'abandonment' of the world. For believers, however decadent and sinful the world may look, it can never deserve to be abandoned once Christ has paid for its Redemption with his blood; nor can the Christian be indifferent to the history of the world that deserved such a costly ransom. The tale of the past will still be for him a tale of suffering and sorrow, but the 'sublimity of history' is not, as for Spengler, 'its purposelessness'. By his life and death Christ has given it a purpose, and humanity a pledge of final victory. 'Man began to suffer in Hope and this is what we call the Christian era'.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE OF GOD: FRAGMENTS OF A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY*

By J.T. MC PARTLIN

I

THE re-appraisal of the place of the laity in the Church is well-known to be a task which at once arouses the suspicion and hostility of a certain type of Catholic: it earned Newman himself a formal delation to Rome for heresy,[1] and the attitude of Newman's opponents has unfortunately not disappeared with the passage of time, but remains to complicate still further an already sufficiently complex discussion. For some, to recommend a new vision of the laity is nothing less than a challenge to the authority of the Church, calling in question the collective wisdom of Catholicism which has ordained the present relationship of the two orders.

On the other hand, it is now becoming painfully evident that a great deal of our present situation is due more to historical accident than to the considered decision of the Church, and that some of the Church's collective wisdom is thereby obscured rather than expressed – for in the recent past the Church has 'appeared above everything else to be a religious organisation for practical aims, of an outspoken juridical character. The mystical element in her, everything that stood behind the palpable aims and arrangements, everything that expressed itself in the concept of the Kingdom of God, of the mystical Body of Christ, would not be perceived at once.'[2] The restoration of these hitherto obscured elements, moreover, is no merely academic question, for the needs of the modern world are now widely recognised to require a thoroughly active participation of the laity in the Church's life. In the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* Pius XII who had duly warned the laity not to leave to the clergy everything that concerns the Kingdom of God,[3] repeated his contention in an

* An abbreviated version of this paper was delivered as a public lecture in the University Theatre, Valletta, on 5th March 1964. It has been necessary in some cases to take references from secondary sources, since the originals have not been available in Malta for checking.

[1] cf. W. Ward, *The Life of John Henry, Cardinal Newman* (London, 1912), Vol. I, pp. 502-4; Vol. II, pp. 157-8.

[2] Romano Guardini, *Vom Sinn der Kirche* (Munich, 1923), p. 5.

[3] cf. Pius XII, 'Mystici Corporis', *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. XXXV (1943), p. 241.

address to the college of Cardinals soon after the end of the War[4] and later, on October 14th 1951, reminded the First World Congress of the Lay Apostolate that all are adults in the realm of grace.[5] Contemporary Catholic theologians have devoted a great deal of attention to the laity, seeing the determining factor of their condition as their *situation in the world*, their commitment to the glorification of God *through* the work of the world.[6] There is no solution for the world's problems to be deduced directly from Catholic dogma, and little genuine place for the layman who conceives his responsibility simply as a duty to be pious and foster the Church's good reputation: without men to labour with their hands there is no building up of a commonwealth, and no support for the unchanging world of God's creation.[7]

The place of the layman in the Church is therefore peculiarly amenable to historical analysis. It belongs to the ever variable impact of the Church on the world, to the Church as a fully and genuinely human phenomenon, subject to change and to that detachment from the past which 'is just as much a matter of duty as integration. Christianity is not finally identified with any of the types of culture in which it is successively embodied... each successive Christendom will be only provisional, and transitory; garments to be put away when they are worn out.'[8] Here perhaps more than anywhere else, we must use the more and more precise techniques with which historians and sociologists are providing us, in an effort towards a sensitive discrimination among the human complexities of the Church which will prevent us from adding our own prejudices to the accumulated prejudices of the past.[9] But in the last resort historical or

[4] 'The faithful, and more especially the laity, are in the front line of the Church's life: it is through them that she is the vital principle of human society. In consequence they, they above all, ought to have an ever more clear consciousness, not only of belonging to the Church, but of *being* the Church, that is, the community of the faithful on earth under the guidance of its common head, the Pope, and of the bishops in communion with him. They are the Church; and therefore from the earliest days of her history the faithful, with the approval of their bishops, have joined together in particular societies interested in the very various manifestations of life.' (Pius XII, allocution of 20th February 1946. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. XXXVIII, 1946, p. 149).

[5] cf. *Actes du Ier Congrés mondial pour l'apostolat des laïcs* (Rome, 1952), Vol. I, p. 49; Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church* (tr. Donald Attwater, London, 1957), pp. 49, 357; E. Suhard, *Priests among Men* (Eng. tr., Notre Dame, Ind., 1960), pp. 64-8.

[6] cf. Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp. 1-21; Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations* (Eng. tr., London, 1962-), Vol. II, pp. 319-52.

[7] cf. *Ecclesiasticus*, xxxviii, 35-9.

[8] Jean Daniélou, *The Lord of History* (tr. Nigel Abercrombie, London, 1958), p. 26.

[9] cf., e.g., R. Hernegger, *Ideologie und Glaube: Volkskirche oder Kirche der Glaubigen* (Nuremberg, 1959).

sociological analysis can only confront us once more with the mystery of the incorporation of all Christians in Christ, a mystery which is rooted in the central problems of Incarnation and Redemption and has coloured the very way in which those problems are expressed.[10] 'Au fond, il n'y aurait qu'une théologie du laicat valable: une ecclésiologie totale.'[11]

II

The close relationship between the Lord and His community is unmistakable in the whole Biblical exposition of His messianic work, dominated as this is by the essentially communal conception of the 'Day of the Lord', the time when God will impose upon mankind a new unity, derived from the unity of His own will;[12] and although the mystery of the Word made flesh is fundamental to the New Testament,[13] the earliest Christians may even have been more familiar with the idea of the New Jerusalem, the coming heavenly city, than with the doctrine of the Messiah as such: at least, where later controversies were concerned with Christ's person and nature, the first Christologies sought to determine His *function* within the corporate movement of the history of the People of God.[14] St. Paul in particular attempted to reveal in sacred history a progressive concentration from mankind into one people, from one people into a 'remnant', and from this 'remnant' into one man, Jesus Christ, in whom the mediations of grace known in the Old Testament in the separated ministries of King, Priest and Prophet are brought together in fulness,[15] to be followed by an inverse movement as Christ's community, in so far as He takes form in it[16] through a variety of conditions and offices,[17] carries salvation to the ends of the earth, uniting all men, Jew and Gentile alike, in one

[10] cf. E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ* (2nd ed., Paris, 1936), Vol. I, p. 25; T.F. Torrance, *Conflict and Agreement in the Church* (London, 1958), Vol. I, pp. 11-17.

[11] Yves Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat* (Paris, 1953), p. 13.

[12] cf. H.H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel* (London, 1956), pp. 177-201; R. Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom* (tr. John Murray, Edinburgh-London, 1963), pp. 30-40.

[13] cf. *Jn.*, iv, 10; xvii; *Acts*, ii, 38; viii, 20; *Rom.*, v, 16-17; viii, 32; *I Cor*, ii, 12; *Eph.*, ii, 8; *Heb.*, vi, 4; *II Peter*, i, 4.

[14] cf. O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (tr. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall, London, 1959), p. 4.

[15] cf. *Deut.*, xvii, 14-xviii, 22; *Jer.*, viii, 1; *I Tim.*, ii, 5; Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 22, a. 1, ad 3; J.H. Newman, *Sermons on Subjects of the Day* (London, 1869), pp. 52-6; F. Prat, *La théologie de S. Paul* (38th ed., Paris, 1949), Vol. II, pp. 198 ff.

[16] cf. *Gal.*, iv, 19

[17] cf. *Rom.*, xii, 3-8; *I Cor.*, xii.

Body.[18]

In describing the Church as the 'Body' (σῶμα) of Christ St. Paul was putting forward a new and daring conception, since in pre-Christian Greek σῶμα does not mean a society or community as its Latin or English equivalents may do. He was pointing his readers not so much to the group of Christians as to the one Christ Himself, who in His death once for all entered the sanctuary as High Priest, eternally pleading our cause before the throne of God,[19] and who in His resurrection has been enthroned as Lord over all creation,[20] so that, by the sending forth of the Spirit, He may bring all things into the movement in which He lives His life as the mighty Son of God, spreading His rule throughout the cosmos until ultimately, when the era of salvation has reached its term, He ceases to function as Saviour and delivers up His kingdom to the Father, 'so that God may be all in all.'[21]

We are caught up, therefore, in a 'dialectic of being and doing', since God's work is already done and still to be done: all the substance of it has been given us in Jesus Christ, and yet it has still to be carried out by us.[22] We, 'upon whom the fulfilment of the ages has come',[23] and who are already citizens of heaven, yet 'await from heaven our deliverer to come, the Lord Jesus Christ'.[24] The world, created and sustained by God, and with its end in Him,[25] has indeed been ransomed by Christ from the bondage of man's sin, but 'the created universe in all its parts groans in a common travail to this present hour',[26] and only in glory will it achieve the restoration which in the Old Testament is associated with the deliverance of the redeemed:[27] we are called upon, that is, to live in a world

[18] cf. *I Cor.*, xii, 13; *Gal.*, iii, 26-8; *Eph.*, ii, 11-22; J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen, 1925), p. 303; E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, Vol. I, pp. 73, 92; Vol. II, pp. 188 ff., 468.

[19] cf. *Heb.*, ix, 11-12, 24; *Rev.*, vii, 15; xxi, 22; B.F. Wescott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1902), pp. 201-30; F.X. Durrwell, *The Resurrection* (tr. R. Sheed, London, 1960), pp. 136-48.

[20] cf. *Mt.*, xxviii, 18; *Eph.*, i, 20-2; *Col.*, ii, 10; F.X. Durrwell, *The Resurrection*, pp. 108-24.

[21] *I Cor.*, xv, 24-8; cf. F.X. Durrwell, *The Resurrection*, pp. 124-36; R. Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom*, pp. 292-8.

[22] cf. Yves Congar, *Divided Christendom* (tr. M.A. Boufield, London, 1939), pp. 69, 96-7, 103; *Esquisses du mystère de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1953), pp. 26, 29-30; 'Sacerdoce et laïcat dans l'Eglise', *Vie intellectuelle*, December 1946, p. 11.

[23] *I Cor.*, x. 11; cf. *II Cor.*, iv, 10-11.

[24] *Phil.*, iii, 20.

[25] cf. *Rom.*, xi, 36; *I Cor.*, iii, 22-3; viii, 6.

[26] *Rom.*, viii, 18-24.

[27] cf. *Ps.* xcvi, 11-13; xcviii, 7-9; Is. xxxv, 1-10; xli, 18-20; xliii, 19-21; xliv, 21-8;

which is not our own, and to live, therefore, by a morality which takes account of the interval between our own time and the consummation of all things in Christ. 'The two ages, so to speak, overlap, lie alongside one another, and fight one another in the world and in the soul of every Christian.'[28]

It is just this duality of times – consecrated, as we shall see, in the distinction between baptism and the Eucharist[29] – which creates the Church and, with regard to her sociological structure, radically distinguishes her from every society that is purely human or earthly. God works all things together for good to those that love Him,[30] and it has been His good pleasure to unite under a new head (ανακεφαλαιοσθαι) all things in heaven and on earth:[31] the Lord of creation is also Lord of the Church, the reconciler of all things with God,[32] and as Lord of both the Church and the world He sends us, the Church, to make all nations His disciples[33] – a work which must be completed before the coming of the End,[34] the point at which 'the present *Kyrios Christos* reveals Himself not only as Lord of the Church but also as Lord of the cosmos.'[35] The new creation has begun at Christ's resurrection and begun in us,[36] for though flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God[37] yet 'since John the Baptist

xlix, 13; lv, 12-13; *Hosea*, ii, 18; P. Benoit, *Exégèse et théologie* (Paris, 1961), Vol. I, pp. 65-153; H. Sasse, 'Κοσμος', *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, Stuttgart, 1933-), Vol. III, pp. 882-96; F.M. Braun, 'Le "monde" bon et mauvais dans l'évangile johannique', *Vie spirituelle*, Vol. LXXXVIII (1953), pp. 580-98; N.A. Dahl, 'Christ, Creation and the Church', *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge, 1956), pp. 422-3.

[28] L. Newbigin, *The Household of God* (London, 1953), p. 119; cf. *I Cor.*, vii, 29-31; A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London, 1953), p. 104.

[29] cf. *Catechismus Romanus*, II, vii, 23; M. Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik* (Munich, 1952), Vol. IV/1, pp. 130 ff.

[30] cf. *Rom.*, viii, 28.

[31] cf. *Eph.*, i, 10; *Col.*, 16-17.

[32] cf. *Eph.*, i, 22-3; *Col.*, i, 18-20.

[33] cf. *Mt.*, xxviii, 18-20.

[34] cf. *Mt.*, xxiv, 14.

[35] O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, p. 326; cf. 'La caractère eschatologique du devoir missionaire et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul', *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, 1936, pp. 210-11; R. Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom*, pp. 284-317; L. Cerfaux, 'Le titre "Kyrios" et la dignité royale de Jésus', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Vol. XI (1922), pp. 40-71; Vol. XII (1923), pp. 125-53.

[36] cf. *Is.*, lxv, 17-18; *II Cor.*, v, 16-vi, 2; *Gal.*, vi, 15; *Eph.*, ii, 10, 14-15; iv, 24; *Titus*, iii, 5.

[37] cf. *I Cor.*, xv, 50.

God is incarnate'[38] and Christ Himself has become the acting subject of our lives.[39] 'The Church is, so to speak, the atonement becoming actual among men in the resurrection of a new humanity',[40] 'not merely *a* society, men associated with God, but the divine *societas* itself, the life of the Godhead reaching out to humanity and taking up humanity into itself.'[41] The Church becomes, in St. Irenaeus's phrase, 'the whole body of the work of the Son of God'[42] – a participation in the work of Christ such that the history of His Church and the lives of His faithful people are acts of the biography of the Messiah, who 'has an independent existence just as much as each of those who are His, but is Himself only in the σῶμα. Without this He would not be what His name indicates',[43] the Saviour of a saved people. The members of Christ 'are what they are because the Church is what it is':[44] in it they participate in His death and resurrection, becoming, thus dedicated to the increase of Christ's life and dominion, what St. Peter describes as

> 'a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a consecrated nation, a people (λαὸς) God means to have for Himself.'[45]

It is unfortunate that so many standard textbooks of dogmatics, in their anxiety to emphasise the special nature of Holy Orders, should speak of a *sacerdotium improprie dictum* when discussing this attribution of 'royal priesthood' to the Church as a whole.[46] The Biblical doctrine certainly does not allow any suggestion that this corporate priesthood is merely figurative or metaphorical. On the contrary, 'it is the whole Christian community, united with the Apostles and Prophets as in one complete organism, which renders a spiritual cult to God.'[47] In the New Tes-

[38] Yves Congar, *Divided Christendom*, p. 91.
[39] cf. *Gal.*, ii, 20; F.X. Durrwell, *The Resurrection*, pp. 218-19.
[40] T.F. Torrance, 'The Atonement and the Onenes s of the Church', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. VII (1954), p. 268.
[41] Yves Congar, *Divided Christendom*, pp. 48-9.
[42] Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, 1; cf. *Adversus Haereses*, I, viii, 4.
[43] F. Kattenbusch, 'Der Quellort der Kirchenidee', *A. von Harnack: Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freunden* (Tübingen, 1921), p. 145; cf. G. Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Guttersloh, 1929), pp. 218, 228, 306; E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, Vol. I, pp. 109-53, 276, 290; Vol. II, pp. 91-4, 107, 123, 128, 276, 280; T.W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (2nd ed., London, 1943), pp. 211-34.
[44] Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik* (Munich, 1932-), Vol. 1/2, p. 1.
[45] *I Peter*, ii, 9; cf. *Ex.*, xix, 5-6; *Rev.*, i, 6; v, 9-10; xx, 6.
[46] cf., e.g., Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments* (5th ed., St. Louis, 1926), Vol. II, pp. 256 ff.
[47] L. Cerfaux, 'Regale Sacerdotium', *Receuil L. Cerfaux* (Paris, 1954), Vol. II, p. 303.

tament 'the priestly dignity and honour belongs first and exclusively to Christ the Lord, to the personal Christ. In the second place it belongs to the whole Christ, which is the totality of those who compose His mystical Body and therefore share His life and priestly dignity. Such is the sequence of design in the divine plan of redemption: redeemed mankind as a new race under the New Adam. Only after that does the question come up who within the community of the faithful has a special share in the priestly function of Christ, who properly speaking is the organ through which the community performs those acts for which a special power is necessary. And only then does the priest, who by the imposition of hands has received that special power, come to the fore.'[48]

The word λαὸς normally designates, in the Greek Old Testament, the Chosen People, the holy nation with whom, according to the Prophets, God has graciously sealed a pact of friendship and fidelity,[49] while outside remain the Gentiles, confirmed in their sin of unbelief. In the New Testament λαὸς sometimes means simply 'the crowd', but the Apostles, particularly St. Paul, took up again the specific sense of the term in applying it to the Christian Church: God has visited the Gentiles to take from among them a people (λαὸς) to bear His name,[50] and now the faithful, who have come together from every tongue and tribe, are no longer contrasted with other nations but stand as the embodiment of Christ's action of reconciliation of man to God, the inner circle of the *regnum Christi* which must eventually extend itself over the outer circle of those who, whether Jew or Gentile, yet remain in their unbelief.[51] Baptised with Him who in His baptism was declared Son and Servant of God,[52] we have received a new life as ourselves sons of God whose birth comes 'not from human stock, not from nature's will or man's but from God',[53] and as

[48] J. Jungmann, *Liturgical Worship* (New York-Cincinnati, 1941), p. 38; cf. 'Christus-Gemeinde-Priester', *Volksliturgie und Seelsorge* (ed. K. Borgmann, Colmar-im-Elsass, 1943), p. 27.

[49] cf. *Jer.*, vii, 13, 25; xi, 7; xxv, 4; xxvi, 5; xxix, 19; xxxii, 33; xxxv, 14; xliv, 4; *Hosea*, xi, 8.

[50] cf. *Acts*, xv, 14.

[51] cf. H. Strathmann, 'λαὸς', *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. IV, pp. 32-9, 49-57; P. Dabin, *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans les livres saints* (Paris, 1941), pp. 30-43, 180-97, 223-4; O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time* (2nd ed., tr. Floyd V. Filson, London, 1962), pp. 185-90.

[52] cf. *Is.*, xlii, 1-4; *Mt.*, iii, 17; *Mk.*, i, 11; *Heb.*, i, 1-14; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, pp. 66-8; D.M. Stanley, 'The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christiam Soteriology and its Transposition by St. Paul', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. XVI (1954), pp. 394-5.

[53] *Jn.*, i, 13.

servants also of God[54] within a community which, through its baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost, has itself become the Servant of God.[55] We must grow, therefore, towards our Head, to a mature manhood, 'measured by nothing less than the full stature of Christ', as the whole Body, 'bonded and knit together by every constituent joint, grows through the due activity of every part'.[56]

With Christianity there had thus appeared a conception of individuality and personality which had been unknown in the ancient world: the Christian as *Christophoros*, the *anima in ecclesia*, is the recipient of *charismata* of the Spirit which are given to be constitutive of the Church, itself a charismatic work, and can be judged only by the confession 'Jesus is Lord'.[57] In the Church the Spirit institutes authority and diffuses life through it, while maintaining, at the heart of the institution, His perfect freedom to act upon souls as and when He wills.[58] The Church's authority cannot emancipate itself from the life-giving Spirit without degenerating into the tyranny of those kings of the Gentiles who yet call themselves benefactors of their people,[59] and the different offices and competences mentioned in the New Testament, even the office of Apostle, are interpreted there not in terms of power or assertiveness but as forms of service, included within the διακονία which is the Christian life itself.[60] As a prominent Russian Orthodox theologian has put it, therefore, 'all

[54] cf. D.M. Stanley, 'The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology and its Transposition by St. Paul', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. XVI (1954), pp. 412-20.

[55] cf. W.F.J. Ryan, 'The Church as the Servant of God in Acts', *Scripture*, Vol. XV (1963), pp. 110-15.

[56] *Eph.*, iv, 13-16; cf. E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, Vol. I, pp. 184, 364; Vol. II, p. 86; R. Schnackenburg, 'Christian Adulthood according to the Apostle Paul', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. XXV (1963), pp. 354-70.

[57] cf. Ernest Käsemann, 'Gottesdienst im Alltag der Welt (zu Röm. 12)', *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (Berlin, 1960), p. 171: Eduard Schweizer, 'πνεῦμα', *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. VI, p. 422.

[58] cf. Yves Congar, 'Le Saint-Esprit et le Corps apostolique, réalisateurs de l'oeuvre du Christ', *Reuvue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*. Vol. XXXVIII (1937), pp. 24-48; A.M. Dubarle, 'Prophétisme et apostolat dans le Nouveau Testament', *Vie spirituelle*, Vol. LXXXIII (1948), pp. 413-28.

[59] cf. *Lk.*, xxii, 25.

[60] cf. N.W. Beyer, 'διακονέω', and K.H. Rengstorf, 'μαθητής', *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. III, pp. 81-93 and Vol. IV, pp. 417-65; Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (London 1958), p. 291; H. Küng, *Strukturen der Kirche* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1963); P.F. Palmer, 'The Lay Priesthood, real or metaphorical?', *Theological Studies*, Vol. VIII (1948), pp. 574-613.

Christians are clothed with the sacred rank of laymen':[61] they share, as members of the λαὸς working out their salvation in this life, in the priestly quality of Christ, in that 'by virtue of their baptism [they] have received the capacity to make an offering in Christ and with Christ.'[62]

The age of the Fathers also was specially marked by a belief in the co-operation of the whole Body in its own growth, and the presence of Christ in all the decisive acts of His community was expressed in such positive terms as *inspirare, inspiratio, revelare* and *revelatio*, freely used where we would talk more guardedly of an 'assistance' or 'help' of the Holy Spirit.[63] The distinction between a religious culture reserved for the clergy and a profane culture allowable to the laity had not yet made its appearance, for while the bishop was assigned a position of high authority[64] it was the mark of a good bishop to recognise his full corporeity with the Christ-bearing *ecclesia*,[65] the faithful who performed mystically the work of reconciliation of sinners which he himself performed sacramentally.[66]

> 'I have made it a rule,' wrote St. Cyprian, 'ever since the beginning of my episcopate, to make no decision merely on the strength of my own personal opinion without consulting you [the priests and deacons] and without the approbation of the people.'[67]

'Patristic theology considered the ordering of the Church into ministry

[61] Sergius Bulgakov, 'The Hierarchy and the Sacraments', *The Ministry and the Sacraments* (ed. R. Dunkerley, London, 1937), p. 109.
[62] E.J. DeSmedt, *The Priesthood of the Faithful* (New York, 1962), p. 21,
[63] cf. Yves Congar, *La Tradition et les tratitions* (Paris, 1960), pp. 151-60; J. Crehan, 'Patristic Evidence for the Inspiration of Councils', a paper read at the Fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 1963, shortly to be published in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* series.
[64] cf. Ignatius, *Magn.*, iii, 1-2; vi, 1; *Tral.*, ii, 1; Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, 2-3; J. Lécuyer, 'Episcopat et présbyterat dans les écrits d'Hippolyte de Rome', *Recherches de science religieuse*, Vol. XLI (1953), pp. 30-50.
[65] cf. Ignatius, *Tral.*, iii, 1; Cyprian, Ep. xxxiii, 1; xxxiv, 4; lxvi, 8 ('unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesia in episcopo'); F. Hofman, *Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustinus* (Munich, 1933), pp. 268-75; H.I. Marrou, *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 1938), pp. 383-5; Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp. 230-57; J. Ratzinger, *Volk und Haus Gottes in Augustins Lehre von der Kirche* (Munich, 1954), pp. 142-3; P. Rinetti, 'Sant' Agostino e l'Ecclesia Mater', *Augustinus Magister* (Congrès international augustinien, 21st-24th September 1954, Paris, 1954), Vol. I, pp. 827-43.
[66] cf. K. Rahner, 'La doctrine d'Origène sur la Pénitence', *Recherches de science religieuse*, Vol. XXXVII (1950), pp. 47-97, 252-86, 422-56.
[67] Cyprian, Ep. xiv, 4.

and laity to be of divine appointment, and did not find this to be incompatible with the priesthood of the whole Church.'[68]

III

The Church, therefore, as visualised by the New Testament and the Fathers, is a royal and priestly community, designed to permeate mankind like a leaven, separating the living elements from the dead remnants of fallen nature and recapitulating the world in the oneness of God,[69] for through the Spirit Christ lives in her to bring all things into subjection to the Father: she is the Body of Christ in process of self-formation, *ecclesia congregans et congregata, convocans et convocata*, both *Heilsanstalt* and *Heilsgemeinschaft*, at once the community in which salvation is realised and the means of calling to salvation[70] – or, as Bede puts it, 'every day the Church brings forth the Church'.[71]

By baptism we are drawn into the Church, given an 'existential obligation' to follow our orientation towards God,[72] and so 'made' by the Church, who is truly the mother of the living, bringing them forth into the life of the Spirit,[73] and with whose prophetic office we are endowed by the complementary sacrament of confirmation, in which the strength (δύναμις) of the Holy Spirit is given specifically for the witness of Christ to the external world.[74] Here it is that we, in turn, begin to 'make' the Church

[68] S.L. Greenslade, 'Ordo', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. IX (1956), p. 162.

[69] 'It does not mean that there is a calculable number of men who are at peace with themselves; it means that the oneness of God triumphs over the whole questionableness of the Church's history.' (Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, tr. E.C. Hoskyns, London, 1933, p. 396.)

[70] cf. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, xii, 6; Migne, P.L., xlii, 263; Yves Congar, *Divided Christendom*, pp. 51, 75-80; *Lay People in the Church*, pp. 22-32; 'Sacerdoce et laïcat dans l'Eglise', *Vie intellectuelle*, December 1946, pp. 6-39; C. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* (Paris, 1941-51), Vol. I, pp. 910-11, 1103-4; 'La nature du corps de l'Eglise', *Revue thomiste*, Vol. XLIX (1948), pp. 122-205; Yves de Montcheuil, *Aspects de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1946), pp. 64 ff.; H. de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church* (tr. Michael Mason, London, 1956), pp. 69-73; Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Eng. tr., London, 1957), pp. 174-95.

[71] Bede, *Explanatio Apocalypsis*, 2; Migne, P.L., xciii, 166.

[72] cf. E. Schwarzbauer, 'Der Laie in der Kirche', *Theologische Praktische Quartalschrifte*, Vol. XCVII (1949), pp. 28-46, 107-33.

[73] cf. Yves Congar, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Eglise* (Paris, 1950), pp. 442-4, 454.

[74] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 72, a. 5; M. Laros, *Confirmation in the Modern World* (London, 1938), pp. 17-35; Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp. 258-308; 'Rhythmes de l'Eglise et du monde', *Vie intellectuelle*, April 1946, pp. 6-22; J. Crehan, 'Ten Years' Work on Baptism and Confirmation', *Theological*

ourselves, and more especially when we draw together her diverse elements in the Eucharist, offering to God 'the mystery of ourselves'[75] by forming in space and time a 'scaffolding' for the building up of the Body of Christ.[76]

For the New Testament writers, in the Eucharist 'there is concretised, so to speak, the present's entire situation in redemptive history',[77] in that the solemn meal in which Christ is present with His people points both backward to the Last Supper and forward to the Messianic Banquet to be eaten in the Kingdom of God: in virtue of the past act of God in Christ it is a door opened in heaven, the point at which the *Kyrios Christos* establishes His community by making His work in it already complete, so that it is present by anticipation at the eschatological gathering of the peoples round the sacrificed Lamb.[78] Christian worship, therefore, 'by no means consists only in preaching and reading of the Scripture in accordance with the synagogue pattern. Rather, the specifically Christian feature in the primitive Christian assemblies manifests itself in its clear goal, the building up of the Body of Christ.'[79] The great bulk of Patristic writings developed this same theme of the Eucharist as the sacrament of ecclesial unity: the whole service, with its prayers and its reading of Scripture, the preaching and the offertory, was covered by the one term 'Eucharist' and considered, in this totality, as offered by the Church as a whole, the consecrated Host symbolising that other Body of Christ in which all the faithful participated;[80] and in the Middle Ages, when the unity of the Body of Christ was considered to be the *res* of the sacrament of the Eucharist,[81] some theologians brought the point home by applying the terms 'mystical Body' to the Eucharist and 'real Body' to the Church: the Body present in the Eucharist was truly and indeed present, but present mystically, symbolically, in order to cause the 'real'

Studies, Vol. XVI (1956), pp. 494-515; D.M. Stanley, 'The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism', *Theological Studies*, Vol. XVII (1957), pp. 169-215.

[75] cf. Augustine, Serm. 272.

[76] cf. M. Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik*, Vol. IV/1, pp. 572-3.

[77] O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, p. 156.

[78] cf. *Heb.*, ii, 9-10, 14-15; iv, 14-16, v, 7-10; *Rev.*, ivff.; F.X. Durrwell, *The Resurrection*, pp. 319-22.

[79] O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, p. 73.

[80] cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, x, 6; Serms. 229, 272; Leo I, Serm, 63; E.G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (2nd ed., London, 1947), p. 297; E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, Vol. I, pp. 298, 431-4, 469-76, 498-507; Vol. II, pp. 24-6, 113-16; J.A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite* (tr. Francis A. Brunner, rev. Charles K. Riepe, London, 1959), pp. 3-22.

[81] cf. Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, lib. IV, d. 8; Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 73, a. 3.

unity of the Church which does not point to any reality beyond itself, being in itself communion with God.[82] The hammering out of the formula of transubstantiation, by establishing the use of the word 'real' to describe the sacramental presence of Christ in the Eucharist, naturally overthrew this earlier terminology, but it was not by any means intended to destroy the underlying conception, for St. Augustine's doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ, which had influenced St. Anselm, Peter Lombard, Hugh of St. Victor and St. Bernard in the 12th century,[83] continued to influence St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure and St. Albert the Great in the 13th.[84] It became, indeed, one of the most profoundly examined concepts of the Middle Ages, expressed sometimes with an excessive desire to leave no part of the human body unexploited in giving every group and institution and office its place within the Church.[85]

St. Thomas Aquinas gave order and cohesion to the scheme by developing the concept of the different forms of participation in Christ's priesthood signified by the sacramental character[86] and by continuing to see the 'spiritual benefit' of the Eucharist as 'the unity of the mystical Body'.[87] The whole Christ is contained in this sacrament,[88] and under both spe-

[82] cf. Innocent III, 'Cum Martha circa', 29th November 1202: Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (ed. K. Rahner, Frieburg, 1952), 414; Bessarion, *De sacramento Eucharistiae*, Migne, P.G., clxi, 496; B. Leeming, *Principles of Sacramental Theology* (London, 1956), pp. 254-6, 371-8.

[83] cf. Anselm, *Meditationes*, q, i, 5; Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, lib. III, d. 13; Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis*, ii, 2; Migne, P.L., clxxvi, 416; J. Beumer, 'Zur Ekklesiologie der Frühscholastik', *Scholastik*, Vol. XXVI (1951), pp. 364-89; Yves Congar, 'L'esclésiologie de S. Bernard', *S. Bernard Théologien; Actes du Congrés de Dijon, 15-19 Septembre 1953* (Rome, 1953), pp. 136-90.

[84] cf. M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas Aquinas von der Kirche als Gotteswerk* (Regensburg, 1903); W. Scheerer, *Des sel. Albertus Magnus Lehre von der Kirche* (Freiburg, 1928); R. Silić, *Christus und die Kirche; Ihr Verhältnis nach der Lehre des hl. Bonaventura* (Breslau, 1938); A. Piolanti, *Il Corpo mistico e le sue relazioni con l'Eucaristia in S. Alberto Magno* (Rome, 1939); J. Gieselmann, 'Christus und die Kirche nach Thomas von Aquin', *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. CVII (1926), pp. 198-222; Vol. CVIII (1927), pp. 233-55; A. Lang, 'Zur Eucharistielehre des hl. Albertus Magnus: das Corpus Christi verum im Dienste des Corpus Christi mysticum', *Divus Thomas* (Fribourg), Vol. X (1932), pp. 257-74; Yves Congar, 'L'idée de l'Eglise chez S. Thomas d'Aquin', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Vol. XXIX (1940), pp. 31-58.

[85] cf. J. Sauer, *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes und seiner Ausstattung in der Auffassung des Mittelalters* (Freiburg, 1902), p. 36; H.O. Taylor, *The Mediaeval Mind* (5th ed., London, 1930), Vol. II, p. 305.

[86] cf. B. Leeming, *Principles of Sacramental Theology*, pp. 230-50; E. Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament* (Eng. tr., London, 1963), pp. 191-223.

[87] Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 73, a. 3; cf. a. 4; q. 65, a. 3; q. 82, a. 9, ad 2.

[88] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 76, a. 1.

cies,[89] but *nullo modo localiter*: the Body of Christ is present in the Eucharist in an altogether different way from that in which bodies are ordinarily present in space, not through its own proper occupation of space but through its association with the species of bread and wine which themselves occupy space.[90] St. Thomas's doctrine of transubstantiation cannot, therefore, be described as materialistic, and participation in the Eucharist is not merely the consumption of the Body of Christ at a particular place and time. Containing Christ, the sacrament contains 'the whole mystery of our salvation', relating us to the passion of Christ in the past, to the one Church of Christ in the present, and to the eternal blessedness and glory which Christ has won for us in the future.[91] To be a Christian is to share in 'something which has happened, which is happening, and which will happen',[92] and St. Thomas, 'whose interpretation of the times of the Christian economy is far better than that of more recent scholastics',[93] distinguished three successive stages or states of interior religion: under the Old Dispensation man had relation, by faith, with the promised heavenly benefits and the means to attain them, as things *to come*; the blessed in heaven have relation to these same benefits and their means as *present*, enjoyed realities; and we, who are under the New Law but in the space between the comings of Christ, have relation with those benefits, by faith and hope, as things yet to come, but Jesus Christ, the means of their attainment, has been given and is with us.[94] Since in every sacrament Christ gives us a particular union with Himself, each of the sacraments gives grace in so far as it is related, and preparatory, to the Eucharist, the perfection, consummation and end of all the other sacraments.[95] In the consummation of Christ's triumph the Church will no longer have need of the Eucharist as we know it, and the whole ecclesial apparatus of powers and external means will have disappeared in face of the ultimate reality which is the oneness of the Church with Christ in love;[96] but in this world there must be within the

[89] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 76, a. 2.
[90] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 76, a. 5.
[91] Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 83, a. 4.
[92] Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt* (tr. O. Wyon, London, 1939), p. 494.
[93] Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p. 63.
[94] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Ia-IIae, q. 103, a. 3.
[95] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 63, a. 6; q. 65, a. 3; q. 72, a. 12, ad 3; q. 73, a. 1 and a. 3; q. 75, a. 1; M.de la Taille, *Mysterium Fidei* (2nd ed., Paris, 1924), pp. 573, 583.
[96] cf. *Rev.*, xxi, 2-3, 22; Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, 61, a. 4; q. 63, a. 1, ad 1; a. 3, ad 3; a. 5, ad 3; *In IV Sent.*, d. 24, q. 1, a. 1, ad 3; Cajetan, *In Ia-IIae*, q. 33, a. 4, n. 2; H.de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum: l'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au moyen*

Church a clerical or institutional priesthood which is defined by the sacrifice of the altar and the religious service of the Christian community in sundry other ways.[97] This is not at all to say that the priest receives his authority from the community and not directly from God – a thesis censured by Pius XII[98] and sufficiently disproved by the fact that a priest separated from the community of the Church by heresy, schism or excommunication can still validly celebrate the Eucharist *in persona Christi*[99] – but this form of priesthood is an office, a function, rather than a state of life, and traditional theology has always been careful to differentiate the office from the man who holds it.[100] The clergy owe their special standing to the fact that they are, in virtue of their ordination, instruments of the Lord who came not to be ministered to but to minister: in so far as the properly sacramental work of the Mass is concerned, they celebrate *in persona Christi*, while the offering of prayer, the sacrifice of praise, is done *in persona Ecclesiae*.[101] The laity, for their part, have also a priesthood, rooted in the priesthood of Christ through the sacraments of baptism and consecration – not, indeed, a priesthood which allows them to perform the functions proper to the clerical priesthood, but a priesthood which unites them, in faith and love, with Christ and with each other in a spiritual offering.[102]

IV

Thus, as in Patristic, so in mediaeval theology, the testimony of each Christian, witnessing to the Gospel in his heart, is a recurrent theme, the common supposition of the theologians who have elaborated this idea being that the Gospel in the heart of each Christian and the Gospel in the mind of the Church are one and the same – that just as there is a correspondence in the Body of Christ between head and members, so there is a correspondence between each of the members and the whole Body. 'Christian spirituality has not to choose, therefore, between an "interior" and a "social" tendency', for 'all its authentic forms in their extraordi-

âge (2nd ed., Paris, 1944), pp. 227 ff.; Eugen Walter, *Das Kommen des Herrn* (Stuttgart, 1948), Vol. I, pp. 38-9, 90 ff.

[97] cf. Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, lib. IV, d. 24.

[98] cf. Pius XII, 'Mediator Dei', *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. XXXIX (1947), p. 553.

[99] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 82, a. 6; M. de la Taille, *The Mystery of Faith* (tr. J. Carroll and P. J. Dalton, London, 1950), Vol. II, pp. 338-400.

[100] cf. G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (tr. R. F. Bennett, Oxford 1940), pp. 47-50.

[101] cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, IIIa, q. 82, a. 6.

[102] cf. P. Dabin, *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne* (Brussels, 1950), pp. 294-302.

nary variety will share in both.'[103]

With the development into the Middle Ages of hierarchical conceptions of society and the world,[104] it was natural that Christians should place an increasing reliance on the description of the Church also in hierarchical terms, even though the actual word 'hierarchy', which is non-Scriptural, was first introduced into current usage only by the pseudo-Dionysius, writing towards the end of the 5th century A.D.;[105] but even so Christianity did not set up a class of *perfecti*, uncontaminated by the world, leaving to the mass of *credentes* the inevitable sinfulness of earthly life: the earlier mediaeval writers erected, alongside the institutional hierarchy of clergy and laity, a second structure controlled by no institutional element but solely by the working of the Spirit and the standing of each individual in the sight of God.[106] The picture was complicated by cross-currents of lively debate on such subjects as the relative value of the contemplative life of the monk and the active life of the secular priest,[107] and monasticism did tend to institutionalise some part of the 'spiritual' hierarchy, entailing as it did a certain depreciation of the world from which the monk had withdrawn into his community;[108] but monasticism was considered by its founders and earliest legislators to be no more than the Christian life lived to its highest degree in a community which

[103] H. de Lubac, *Catholicism* (tr. Lancelot C. Sheppard, London, 1950), p. 188; cf. pp. 83-106; *Histoire et Esprit* (Paris, 1950), pp. 295-335; *Exégése médiévale* (Paris, 1959), Vol. II, pp. 498-548; Yves Congar, *La Tradition et les traditions*, pp. 41-182; G. Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence: The Nature of Theology according to St. Bonaventure* (St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1954), pp. 80-102; P. Dabin, *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne*, pp. 69-328; J. Ratzinger, *Die Geschichtstheologie des hl. Bonaventura* (Munich, 1957) pp. 63-78.

[104] cf. J. Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (tr. F. Hopman, London, 1924), pp. 46-55; Ruth Mohl, *The Three Estates in Mediaeval and Renaissance Literature* (New York, 1933); Sylvia Thrupp, *The Merchant Class of Mediaeval London* (Chicago, 1948), pp. 288 ff.; E. Lousse, 'Les caractères essentiels de l'état corporatif médiéval', *Etudes classiques*, Vol. VI (1937), pp. 203-23.

[105] cf. J. Stiglmayr, 'Uber die Termini Hierarch und Hierarchie', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Vol. XXII (1898), pp. 180-7.

[106] cf. G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, pp. 42-7; H. de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church*, p. 72.

[107] cf. G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, pp. 50-6. The early mediaeval writers were never quite able to reconcile in a twofold hierarchy the three orders or degrees of *praelati, contemplativi* and *conjugati* – a threefold division which Origen and Augustine saw adumbrated in the archetypal figures of Noah, Daniel and Job (cf. Origen, *In Ezechielem*, iv, 4-8; P.G., xiii, 699-704; G. Folliet, 'Les trois catégories de chrétiens', *Augustinus Magister*, Vol. II, pp. 631-44).

[108] cf., e.g., John Chrysostom, *In Matt.*, homs. 8-9; Migne, P.G., lviii, 645, 652 ff.

was specially attempting to create in its own life the community or *ecclesia* of the Lord.[109]

The monastic outlook was not uniform either in place or in time, but the belief that monasticism was the pilgrim part of the city of God, and that 'the true monk must be a stranger on earth',[110] remained fairly constant throughout the Middle Ages. According to St. Bernard 'man is an exile. He no longer inhabits the land of his birth... As God made him, he was a noble creature – *nobilis creatura* – and he was so because God created him to His own image. Disfigured by original sin, man has in fact exiled himself from the Land of Likeness to enter into the Land of Unlikeness: *regio dissimilitudinis*. There we find the first inversion of order from which all the evil has arisen. Conversion reversed, conversion for ever "execrable", by which man exchanged the glory of the divine image for the shame of the earthly image, peace with God and with himself for war against God and against himself, liberty under the law of charity for slavery under the law of his own self-will. We might go still further and say that man, by that conversion, has exchanged heaven for hell: a word in which all the foregoing is summed up, for hell is at once self-will, and its consequence, unlikeness to God, and war set up between creature and creator.'[111] Mystical contemplation, however, is a participation and a return. 'Der Mensch ist gottentsprungen und gottsüchig'[112] – a conception

[109] cf. R. Garrigou-Lagrange *Perfection chrétienne et contemplation selon S. Thomas d'Aquin et S. Jean de la Crois* (7th ed., Paris, 1923), Vol. I, p. 149; Cuthbert Butler, *Western Mysticism* (2nd ed., London, 1926), pp. 65-92; O.M. Porcel, *La doctrina de San Gregorio Magno y la 'Regula monachorum'* (Washington, 1951), p. 61; E. Gilson, *Les metamorphoses de la Cité de Dieu* (Paris, 1952), p. 36; H.J. Diesner, *Studien zur Gesellschaftslehre und sozialen Haltung Augustins* (Halle, 1954); E. Delaruelle, 'Le travail dans les règles monastiques occidentales du IVe au IXe siècle', *Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique*, Vol. XLI (1948), p. 53; A. de Vogüe, 'Le monastère, église du Christ', *Commentationes in Regulam S. Benedicti* (ed. B. Steidle, Rome, 1957), pp. 25-46.

[110] H.F. von Campenhausen, *Die asketische Heimatlösigkeit im altkirchen und frühmittelalterlichen Mönchtum* (Tübingen, 1930), p. 8; cf. Yves Congar, 'Eglise et Cité de Dieu chez quelques auteurs cisterciens', *Mélanges offerts à Etienne Gilson* (Toronto-Paris, 1959), pp. 173-202.

[111] E. Gilson, *The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard* (tr. A.H.C. Downes, London, 1940), p. 43; cf. Bernard of Clairvaux, *De diversis*, Serm. xlii, 2; Augustine, *Confessions*, vii, 10; J. Leclercq, 'S. Bernard et la théologie monastique du XIIe siècle', *S. Bernard Théologien: Actes du Congrès de Dijon, 15-19 Septembre 1953*, pp. 7-23; P. Salmon, 'L'ascèse monastique et les origines de Citeaux', *Mélanges S. Bernard: XXIVe Congrès de l'Association bourguignonne des sociétés savants, Dijon 1953* (Dijon, 1954), pp. 268-83.

[112] Hugo Rahner, 'Das Menschenbild des Origens', *Eranos Jahrbuch*, Vol. XV (1947), p. 239.

with its roots in Plato and the Bible,[113] developed extensively by the Greek Fathers,[114] and through Augustine[115] transmitted to the leaders of mediaeval monasticism in the West. Thus in the writings of St. Odo of Cluny (c. 924-42) we find monasticism represented as the utmost tip of the *ecclesia* growing towards God, the realisation of the ideal Pentecostal Church. It is the Spirit manifested in the Church at Pentecost which alone can heal the schism in mankind created by original sin, and monasticism, as the continuation of Pentecost, is a return to the original state of man by a repudiation of this world for the sake of the next: asceticism, summed up in the threefold vow of poverty, chastity and obedience, is the means whereby man returns to paradise; the liturgical round represents the praise of the Creator which will be the perpetual work of those in heaven; and the communal life of the monks reflects that of the angels before the throne of God.[116]

This was to be taken as the pattern not only for those who dwelt in the cloister but for secular priests and laymen as well: the return to the original state of man was the goal not for monks only but for all, and the monastery stood as the model for the whole of mankind in its struggle for perfection and salvation. The early monastic writings certainly recognised that monasticism is a particular solution, a way to which not all are called, and that lay people engaged in the most secular occupations can equal and even surpass the ascetics in holiness, since the authority of the monk is a charismatic one, ultimately the authority of the Holy Spirit Himself, visibly operating through the *vir Dei*, and in this respect no difference in levels of sanctity can be taken as automa-

[113] cf. C.G. Rutenber, *The Doctrine of the Imitation of God in Plato* (Philadelphia, 1946); A.J. Festugière *Contemplation et vie contemplative selon Plato* (Paris, 1950); L. Köhler, 'Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei Lehre, Genesis, i, 26', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, Vol. IV (1948), pp. 16-22; K.L. Schmidt, 'Homo Imago Dei im alten und neuen Testament', *Eranos Jahrbuch*, Vol. XV (1947), pp. 149-95.

[114] cf. Jules Gross, *La divinisation du chrétien d'après les Pères grecs* (Paris, 1938); Henri Crouzel, *Théologie et l'image de Dieu chez Origène* (Paris, 1956).

[115] cf. H. Sommers, 'L'image de Dieu et illumination divine: sources historiques et élaboration augustinienne', *Augustinus Magister*, Vol. I, pp. 450-62; V. Capanaga, 'La deificacion en la Soteriologia augustiniana', *Augustinus Magister*, Vol. II, pp. 745-54.

[116] cf. Rose Graham, 'The Relation of Cluny to Some Other Movements of Monastic Reform', *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XV (1914), pp. 179-95; J. Leclercq, 'L'idéal monastique de S. Odon d'après ses oeuvres', *A Cluny: Congrès scientifique, 9-11 Juillet 1949* (Dijon, 1950), pp. 227-32; K. Hallinger, 'Zur geistigen Welt der Anfänge Klunys', *Deutsche Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, Vol. X (1953-4), pp. 417-45.

tically separating the monastery from the outside world;[117] but at the same time the monastery was the centre and the ideal, and throughout the Patristic period and a great part of the Middle Ages 'there were not two "spiritual lives", one for the ascetic, the other for the ordinary Christian. There was only one, and that was monastic.'[118]

The Middle Ages, therefore, witnessed a persistent series of attempts to provide the secular clergy and the laity with some means of approximating to monasticism in the greater or less degree. The earliest and least worthwhile of these was the *conversio ad succerendum*, whereby lay benefactors of monasteries were allowed to take the habit on the point of death,[119] but there was a gradual evolution of more satisfactory forms of participation in the religious life in the friars of St. Francis and St. Dominic, and in the 'Third Orders' associated with both.[120] The doctrine of the conversion of man to the image of God, moreover, had a considerable influence on all ideas of reform and renewal, for some conception of perfection was necessary to every mediaeval political theory,[121] and it was to be expected that Joachim of Flora (1145-1202), conceiving the new and last age of the Church, the age which should be under the dominion of the Spirit and of Love, should conceive it as an age of *viri spirituales* living a monastic form of life, in place of the married men who had dominated the Age of Law and the clergy of the Age of Grace.[122] It is now established that Joachim found a following not only among the 'Spiritual' Franciscans but also among monks, with whose whole outlook he had much in common;[123] but in any case, whether Joachist or not, and whether monastic or not, the great sense of eschatological expectancy

[117] cf. Rufinus, *Historia monachorum*, 16; M. Viller and K. Rahner, *Aszese und Mystik in der Vaterzeit* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1939), pp. 276 ff.; O. Casel, 'Benedikt von Nursia als Pneumatiker', *Heilige Uberlieferung: Festgabe I. Herwegen* (Münster, 1938), pp. 96-123.

[118] P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne* (Paris, 1931), Vol. I, p. x; cf. A. von Harnack, *History of Dogma* (Eng. tr., London, 1896-9), Vol. V, p. 10; H. B. Workman, *The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal* (Oxford, 1924), p. 4; G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge, 1923-8), Vol. I, p. 89.

[119] cf. G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, Vol. I, pp. 90-4, 382-3, 476-81.

[120] cf. K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God* (London, 1931), pp. 360-2.

[121] cf. E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton, 1957), p. 144n.; G. B. Ladner, 'Der mittelalterliche Reform-idee und ihr Verhältnis zur Idee der Renaissance', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, Vol. LX (1952), pp. 31 ff.

[122] cf. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millenium* (2nd ed., London, 1962), pp. 99-102.

[123] cf. E. Benz, 'La Messianità di San Benedetto: contributo alla filosofia della storia di Gioacchino da Fiore', *Richerche Religiose*, Vol. VII (1931), pp. 336-53.

which was characteristic of the later Middle Ages was moulded, in whatever perverse and degraded forms, by the monastic ideas of the world gone over to the Gospel and the creation of the perfect man in the perfect society.[124]

No doubt it was entirely natural that piety 'should radiate outwards from the monastery. As the Church looked to the theologian for the formulation of her doctrine, so she looked to the monk, who had ordered his life in such a way as to find the greatest room for prayer, for expert guidance in the ways of devotion.'[125] But monasticism as an institution is something rather different from monasticism as the summit of the lay life: in practice there is a radical distinction between the monk and the non-monk which none of the mediaeval expedients could overcome, and the late-mediaeval apocalyptic movements, attempting to carry a monastic spirituality to the world at large, betrayed themselves by their sheer fantasy, or fell into extremes of antinomianism. The essential structure of the monastic life ordered towards the daily round of prayer, the *opus Dei*, could not be effectively transferred outside the institution, and the creation of the Cluniac movement as an incipient monastic 'Order' merely served to emphasise the divergence of monastery and world: the Cluniac ideal 'a été avant tout de soustraire les âmes aux dangers du siècle en les jetant dans les monastères clunisiens.'[126] Even the more workable

[124] cf. K. Burdach, 'Der Dichter des Ackermann aus Böhmen und sein Zeit', *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation* (Berlin, 1926-32), Vol. III/2, pp. 131 ff.; Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millenium*; H. Grundmann, 'Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlicher Anschauung', *Kultur und Universalgeschichte: Walter Goetz zu seinem 60. Geburtstage* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1927), pp. 91-107.

[125] K.E. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, pp. 359-60.

[126] A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne* (Louvain, 1927), Vol. I, p. 43. Père de Lubac has traced the process by which the monastery adopted to itself the Spiritual texts applicable to the Church, and shows how the monastic life came to be regarded as the Holy City, 'Jerusalem', over against the 'Babylon' of the world, with the specific *conversio morum* marking not so much the transition to faith as the entry into the cloister, the *vita vere apostolica*. Many writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries opposed *communiter vivere to saeculariter habitare*, and considered the laity (*conjugati*) to be members of the Church *secundum indulgentiam*, capable of being saved *in extremo per misericordiam Dei* (cf. H. de Lubac, *Exégése Médiévale*, Vol. II, pp. 571-86; Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp. 8-13). The Cluniac movement was especially notable as a strong effort towards reform centred entirely on the restoration of the *opus Dei* and not at all concerned with what went on outside the cloister. 'Le mouvement clunisien est exclusivement monastique et il ne pénetrera guère l'Eglise séculière. S. Odon et ses successeurs ont remis la règle bénédictine en vigeur dans les abbayes qu'ils ont réformées; il ne semble pas qu'ils aient essayés d'entrainer l'episcopat à tenter la même oeuvre d'assainissement.' (A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, Vol. I, p. 41.)

and satisfactory compromise later achieved by the friars could not fully redress the balance which had been disturbed at this time, especially when the Cluniac separation of the religious life from the world was reinforced, not long afterwards, by another strong effort at reform, the Gregorian, dedicated to entirely different aims and ideals.[127]

V

The momentous changes of the centuries after Constantine brought on a state of recurrent crisis in which there was little opportunity for reflection on the permanent value of the expedients which the Church found immediately useful in the struggle for her very existence; and when she emerged, in the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, to the vast task of theological, social and administrative reconstruction the whole horizon of her thinking had become different. No one in the New Testament period had anticipated a situation in which the State would consist of Christians, would be governed by Christians or run on Christian lines. 'It was hardly thought possible in New Testament times that Emperors and other rulers might actually be converted to Christianity... and the changes which Imperial conversion might entail, not alone in the Christian attitude towards the Emperor, but in the whole ecclesiastical polity, were not envisaged in the most ambitious Christian speculation of the first and second centuries.'[128] 'The Middle Ages, however, witnessed the expansion of the Church to a comprehensive, unifying and reconciling social whole, which included both the sociological circle of religion itself and the politico-social organisations. In its own way, therefore, it realised in practice the ideal of the Republic of Plato, conceived as an individual State – that is, the rule of the wise and the friends of God over an organic, many-levelled social entity, and also the ideal of the Stoics, whose universal commonwealth was to embrace the whole of mankind, without distinction, in one universal ethical kingdom.'[129]

The age of mediaeval Christendom was a sacral age, in which unity of faith was a prerequisite of political unity and churchmen sought to realise the divine *respublica* on earth, to establish the Church as what

[127] cf. E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser* (Halle, 1892-4), Vol. II, pp. 445-65; L.M. Smith, 'Cluny and Gregory VII', *English Historical Review*, Vol. XXVI (1911), pp. 21-31.
[128] K.M. Setton, *The Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century* (New York, 1941), p. 17; but cf. H. Chadwick, 'Justin Martyr on Church and State', a paper read at the Fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 1963, shortly to be published in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* series.
[129] Ernest Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (tr. O. Wyon London, 1931), Vol. I. p. 203.

Gerbert (Pope Sylvester II, 999-1003) once described as *sanctissima societas humani generis.*[130] Christendom had indeed a dual aspect corresponding to the twofold nature and destiny of man, consecrated (allegedly) in the teaching of Christ, and visibly expressed in two separate administrations headed by Pope and Emperor respectively;[131] but to conceive these two in irreconcilable duality, as a 'Church' and a 'State' as we know them today, is to transpose a modern idea into an alien mediaeval setting.[132] In the mediaeval period men naturally did not fail to distinguish between spiritual and temporal, sacred and secular, and their taste for strong contrasts did much to create an illusion of necessary and constant antagonism,[133] but prelates like Becket and Langton 'have attracted attention precisely because they were exceptional, not typical':[134] the basic frame of reference was the social unity of the *respublica Christiana*, and the same writers who emphasised the opposition which from time to time arose between the spiritual and secular administrations were in reality much more conscious of belonging to the same, single society, a single community founded upon the will of God as both *ecclesia* and *respublica.*[135]

Nevertheless, conflicts between the secular and the spiritual officers of the one Christian community did frequently occur, and the reform movement begun by St. Leo X (1049-54) and continued by St. Gregory VII (1073-85) represents a decisive turning point in the history of ecclesiological speculation, dramatically marked, in the so-called 'Investiture Contest', by a head-on collision of Empire and Papacy.

Gregory VII was a man 'filled with a dynamic power which brought on

[130] cf. Gerbert, Ep. 79.

[131] cf. *Mt.*, xxii, 21; J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Eglise et de l'Etat au temps de Philippe le Bel* (Louvain, 1926), p. 1.

[132] cf. F.W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* (Cambridge, 1898), p. 73; G. LeBras, 'Le privilège de clergie en France dans les derniers siècles du moyen âge', *Journal des Savants*, N.S., Vol. XX (1922), p. 259.

[133] cf. G. LeBras, 'Le privilège de clergie en France dans les derniers siècles du moyen âge', *Journal des Savants*, N.S., Vol. XX (1922), p. 164.

[134] C.R. Cheney, *From Becket to Langton: English Church Government, 1170-1213*, p. 2.

[135] cf. J.N. Figgis, 'Respublica Christiana', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd series, Vol. V (1911); J. Courtney Murray, 'Governmental Repression of Heresy', *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America* (Chicago, 1948), pp. 56-7.

[136] R.W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London, 1953), p. 239; cf. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum* (ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 1887-9), Vol. II, pp. 322-3.

him accusations of dark practices',[136] and controversy has raged about his character and intentions ever since his first appearance as a prominent figure in the Roman Curis, but it is probable that he 'came to his papacy more with a sense of mission than with a wish for power'.[137] He was not even the leading theorist in his own circle, and the study of canonical law and institutions, by confirming his dependence upon a long tradition of ecclesiastical legislation, has revealed in him little of the innovator; but, in a world in which, apparently, 'Simon Magus possessed the Church', he was compelled to forego his desire to make his soul in the peace and quiet of the monastic life and take upon himself the burden of wide-ranging action to recover the Church for its proper mission. He fought not for himself personally but, like St. Anselm of Canterbury and St. Thomas Becket who followed him, for the destruction of simony and the rectification of the morals of the clergy, and for the Church as a divinely ordered society, working out by its life and authority the purposes of God.[138]

Gregory described himself as one who above all things loved equity and righteousness (*aequitatis et justitiae praestantissimum amatorem*),[139] and the word *justitia* occurs more than two hundred times in his extant writings:[140] clearly it meant more to him than a mere neutral equity. 'It is *theological* justice, that which results from incorporation into Christ by the sacraments, by sanctifying grace, by the observance of the divine commandments, by the banishment of sin in all its forms',[141] and Gregory could not tolerate that the *corpus Christi quod est fidelium congregatio*[142] should bear so little the marks of its constitutive principle as it did when he first assumed his pontificate.[143] Even so, however, Gregory moved

[137] J.P. Whitney, *Hildebrandine Essays* (London, 1948), p. 71.

[138] cf. A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, Vol. I, pp. 59-60, 366-8; 383-8; Vol. II, pp. 108, 111, 119, 309-16, 409-13; P. Fournier and G. LeBras, *Histoire des collections canoniques en Occident* (Paris, 1931), Vol. II, pp. 4-15; H.-X. Arquillière, *S. Grégoire VII* (Paris, 1934), pp. 113-20; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London, 1955), pp. 262-3, 299-309; M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III* (Paris, 1956), pp. 396 ff.; A. Nitschke, 'Die Wirksamkeit Gottes in der Welt Gregors VII', *Studi Gregoriani*, Vol. V (1956), pp. 115-219; Yves Congar, 'L'Eglise chez S. Anselme', *Spicilegium Beccense*, Vol. I (1959), pp. 371-99; Karl F. Morrison, 'Canossa: A Revision', *Traditio*, Vol. XVIII (1962), pp. 121-48

[139] cf. Gregory VII, *Monumenta Gregoriana, Registrum*, i, 1.

[140] cf. H.-X. Arquillière, *S. Grégoire VII*, p. 261.

[141] H.-X. Arquillière, *S. Grégoire VII*, p. 270.

[142] Gregory VII, *Registrum*, vi, 10.

[143] Many curious anomalies had arisen from the great weight of secular responsibility that had been thrust upon the ecclesiastical organisation during the Dark Ages. Ordericus Vitalis mentions a French prelate who, while preserving the

with intelligent moderation and pastoral purpose, without any desire to subvert the authority of the German Emperor or any of the other secular princes whose interests were so closely involved: he was no extremist, no rigid legalist or slave to a formula,[144] and his celebrated decree on the ceremonial by which lay magnates invested bishops with their offices was intended simply 'to remove all suggestion that the ecclesiastical office, the spiritual functions, could be conferred by a layman',[145] while later he threw away his political advantage by refusing, after the specious penance of the Emperor Henry IV at Canossa in 1077, to take sides for or against the royal penitent – an act which lost him the support of Henry's rebellious German subjects.[146] But when he did come into conflict with the Emperor he would make no fundamental concessions on the principle of *justitia*, the divine law expressed through the system of ecclesastical legislation, and in a letter to the Bishop of Metz in 1076 he argued 'that the conception that any man could be exempt from ecclesiastical jurisdiction was intrinsically absurd, for it would mean that he was outside the Church, and alien from Christ.'[147]

No doubt some elaboration of ecclesiastical law in these terms was necessary to curb the pretensions of secular rulers, for as the hierarchy of the spiritual life was modified by the fact that it contained monks, so, in a sacral society, the institutional hierarchy was modified by the fact that it contained kings. As a layman, the king could exercise none of the powers reserved to the clergy, but he stood as the secular leader of the specifically Christian society, and at least until the 11th century he was generally considered to have a special mission from God: in him God's ruling will was believed to be particularly active, and the Church, through

strictest celibacy as a bishop, was nevertheless married in his capacity as a secular baron in needs of heirs to inherit his property and office. 'It was a recognised thing – although against laws divine and ecclesiastical – that spiritual offices should be sold; a tainted bishop infected his diocese; bishops lived as barons and sometimes as bad barons at that; when clerical marriage was common, bishops and priests tried to hand on their offices to their sons or families. And so the disease spread: the Church seemed about to lose its power, because it was losing the spirit by which it should live.' (J.P. Whitney, *Hildebrandine Essays*, p. 7.)

[144] 'It is the custom of the Roman Church,' he wrote to William the Conqueror in March 1078 (*Registrum*, v, 17), 'to tolerate some things, to turn a blind eye to some, following the spirit of discretion rather than the rigid letter of the law.'

[145] Z.N. Brooke, *Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy* (London, 1939), p. 17.

[146] cf. A. Fliche, *L'Europe occidentale de 888 à 1125* (Paris, 1930), pp. 403-4

[147] R.W. and A.J. Carlyle, *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West* (London, 1928), Vol. IV, p. 187; cf. Gregory VII, *Registrum*, iv, 2.

her ceremonies of coronation and consecration, recognised the resultant ennoblement of his person.[148] Under Charlemagne the Church in the Frankish dominions had become a sort of Imperial Church, and Charlemagne himself had been 'king and priest', 'ruler of the people of God', 'propagator of the faith', 'father of the Church', 'Christ's vicar upon earth' – and, above all, the Lord's Anointed, whom God alone, who had set him up, could again cast down.[149] Since Charlemagne's time kings as well as Popes had made appeal to the royal and priestly figure of Melchizedek,[150] and in face of kings who claimed to be 'vicars of Christ' in respect of Christ's kingship,[151] Gregory VII found it necessary to emphasise the essential difference between the pontifical *auctoritas* and the mere *regalis potestas* of the secular ruler, whose office can exist only in a fallen world, where the aberrations which result from original sin require the correction of the equally unnatural domination of one man over another by physical force.[152] The king – and *a fortiori* the Emperor – as a Christian is subject to the decrees of the Roman Church, and as an *amator justitiae* (the classical mediaeval definition of a king) must bow to the judgement of those who are functionally qualified to determine for society its function in justice. The criterion of a Christian king is his usefulness (*utilitas*) to the Christian society in applying the principles of justice, and a king not so useful is no real king[153] – indeed, he may have his kingship taken away from him by the Pope,[154] whose authority as judge in spiritual things gives him also the right of judgment in those temporal matters which condition the ordering of the Christian society towards

[148] cf. G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, pp. 56-60.

[149] cf. A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (4th ed., Leipzig, 1904-20), Vol. II, pp. 71 ff.; L. Halphen, *Charlemagne et l'empire carolingien* (2nd ed., Paris, 1949), p. 122.

[150] cf. *Gen.*, xiv, 18; *Ps.* cix, 4; *Heb.*, vii, 1-2, 10-11, 15, 21; J. Hashagen, *Staat und Kirche vor der Reformation* (Essen, 1931), pp. 504-5; J. Leclercq, *Jean de Paris et l'ecclésiologie du XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1942), pp. 99 ff.; G. Martini, 'Regale Sacerdotium', *Archivio della reale deputazione di storia patria*, Vol. LXI (1938), pp. 1-116.

[151] cf. Smaragdus, *Via Regia*, 18; Migne, P.L., cii, 933, 958; Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi Imperatoris*, MGH Scriptores, xi, 260; Peter Crassus, *Defensio Regis Henrici*, 7; MGH Libelli de Lite, i, 450; G.B. Ladner, *Theologie und Politik vor dem Investiturstreit* (Vienna, 1936), pp. 60-1, 154-5; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, pp. 397-403.

[152] cf. Gregory VII, *Registrum*, iv, 2; viii, 21; Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, xi, 1; xiv, 28; xv, 5, 7; xvi, 3-4; xvii, 6; xviii, 2.

[153] cf. Gregory VII, *Registrum*, viii, 21; ix, 3.

[154] cf. Gregory VII, *Registrum*, ii, 5; vii, 14a.

justice.[155] Gregory did not claim for the Papacy a *normal* direct rule over the secular affairs of the Christian society; but to declare that the Roman Church is the repository of *justitia* and that a Pope may depose Emperors 'is real theocracy, and all the attempts which have been made to deprive Gregorian thought of this characteristic will always come up against this short but formidable formula.'[156]

VI

Since the Gregorian reform movement was supported by a powerful wave of canonical studies, with the foundation of many new law-schools – including that of Bologna, where from this time forward Roman and canon law were studied together – and the advance of research, which brought to light a great number of texts to be studied, classified, harmonised and synthesised,[157] it is easy to argue that this building up of the foundations of Papal power imposed a dictatorship upon the Christian community, or turned it into a totalitarian state;[158] but we may easily misunderstand the mediaeval canonists by applying to them concepts which they themselves had not developed,[159] and it is impossible to grasp the meaning of canon law unless we see it in its relation to the unique nature of the society it regulated and served: it is because the institution functioning, like or-

[155] cf. Gregory VII, *Registrum*, i, 63; ii, 45; iii, 31; iv, 2.

[156] H.-X. Arquillière, *S. Grégoire VII*, p. 134; cf. W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, pp. 272-309; M. Pacaut, *La théocratie* (Paris, 1957), pp. 79 ff.

[157] cf. W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, pp. 359-81; P. Founier, 'Un tournant de l'histoire du droit, 1060-1140', *Revue d'histoire du droit français et étranger*, Vol. XL (1917), pp. 129-80; J.T. Gilchrist, 'Canon Law Aspects of the Eleventh-Century Gregorian Reform Programme', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. XIII (1962), pp. 21-38.

[158] cf. e.g., G.G. Coulton, *Mediaeval Panorama* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 5.

[159] cf. M. de Wulf, 'L'individu et la groupe dans la scolastique du XIIIe siècle', *Revue néo-scolastique de philosophie*, Vol. XXIII (1920), pp. 341 ff.; E. Lewis, 'Organic Tendencies in Mediaeval Political Thought', *American Political Science Review*, Vol. XXXII (1938), pp. 849-76; F. Brentano, 'Canonical Juristic Personality', *The Jurist*, Vol. I (1941), pp. 66-73; A.M. Stickler, 'De ecclesiae potestate coactiva materiali apud magistrum Gratianum', *Salesianum*, Vol. IV (1942), pp. 2-23, 97-119; 'De potestate gladii materialis secundum "Quaestiones Bambergenses" ineditas', *Salesianum*, Vol. VI (1944), pp. 113-40; 'Il potere coattivo materiale della Chiesa nella riforma Gregoriana seconda Anselmo di Lucca', *Studi Gregoriani*, Vol. II (1947), pp. 235-85; 'Der Schwerterbegriff bei Huguccio', *Ephemerides Iuris Canonici*, Vol. III (1947), pp. 201-42; 'Il "gladius" nel registro di Gregorio VII', *Studi Gregoriani*, Vol. III (1948), pp. 89-103; W. Ullmann, 'Delictal Responsibility of Mediaeval Corporations', *Law Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXIV (1948), pp. 79-96.

ganised secular society, by means of legislative, executive and judicial procedures is one aspect of the mystical Body of Christ that we cannot interpret canon law as a merely accidental set of rules, independent of, or even incompatible with, the substance of the Christian community.[160] 'The papal-hierocratic scheme is a gigantic attempt to translate Scriptural and quite especially Pauline doctrine into terms of government',[161] and the leading figures of the early stages of the canonist revival did not attempt to define the mystery by extending their legal theorisings to the Church as a whole: such writers as Stephen of Tournai and Johannes Teutonicus refer to the doctrine of the mystical Body in specifically theological terms, drawn not from the sources of Roman law but from the Fathers of the Church.[162]

Gradually, however, all the characteristic features of classical Roman law and administration stamped themselves upon the Church, and Gregory VII's successors must come under some suspicion of having 'bartered spiritual leadership for temporal rule, the legacy of St. Peter for the fatal dower of Constantine.'[163] From the 11th century onwards there was a growth of authoritarian concepts of varying importance in the different spheres of Church life – the idea of the priest as 'governing' his parish, and the bishop as *judex ordinarius* in his diocese, of the Church as 'Queen' of mankind and the Pope as 'sovereign' – and authority, especially Papal authority, was borrowing heavily from the terminology, insignia and ceremonial of the Imperial Court.[164] Where Gregory VII had emphasised, in

[160] cf. S. Kuttner, 'Some Considerations on the Rôle of Secular Law and Institutions in the History of Canon Law', *Scritti di sociologia e politica in onore di Luigi Sturzo* (Bologna, 1935), Vol. II, pp. 356-7.

[161] W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, p. 448; cf. M. Roberti, 'Il *corpus mysticum* di S. Paolo nella storia della persona giuridica', *Studi in Onore di Enrico Besta* (Milan, 1939), Vol. IV, pp. 37-82.

[162] cf. Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 134-5.

[163] A.L. Smith, *Church and State in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1913), p. 245.

[164] cf. J. Hashagen, *Staat und Kirche vor der Reformation*, pp. 503-5; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, pp. 310-43, 359-81; J.B. Sägmüller, 'Die Idee von der Kirche als Imperium Romanum im kanonischen Recht', *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. LXXX (1898), pp. 50-80; A. Mayer Pfannholz, 'Gregor VII und Heinrich IV im Lichte der Geistesgeschichte', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Geistesgeschichte*, Vol. II (1936), pp. 153 ff.; 'Der Wandel des Kirchenbildes in der Geschichte', *Theologie und Glaube*, Vol. XXXII (1940), pp. 22-34; 'Das Bild der Mater Ecclesia im Wandel der Geschichte', *Pastor Bonus*, Vol. LIII (1942), pp. 33-47; T.M. Parker, 'Feudal Episcopacy', *The Apostolic Ministry* (ed. K.E. Kirk, London, 1946), pp. 351-6; P.E. Schramm, 'Sacerdotium und Regnum im Austausch über Vorrechte: eine Skizze der Entwicklung zu Beleutung des "Dic-

his decree of 1075 and even in his more advanced legislation of 1078 and 1080, the illegitimacy of ceremonies which seemed to confer spiritual powers, later Popes and canonists attacked all subordination of bishops to the secular authority, even in respect of their temporalities. There were precedents to the contrary, but the common canonical opinion set aside any lay jurisdiction over clerics which resulted from a cleric's tenure of secular office, and no distinction was drawn between ecclesiastics engaged in directly spiritual duties and those who might be described, in the mediaeval phrase, as *clerici clericaliter non viventes* – the large number of ordained, or at least tonsured, men occupied in purely secular business.[165] More and more advantages, too, were being found in applying to the Church the concepts of the secular law of corporations,[166] until it came to the point at which the supernatural element in the Church could conveniently be restricted to the original imparting of authority to her by Christ, while in all other respects she could be completely comprehended in the concepts applicable to all other societies: for the canonists the Church is not the continuing flow of Christ's life through the Christian community but, for all practical purposes, a purely human society, a *universitas personarum* as conceived in Roman law, differentiated only by the divinely superimposed hierarchical authority.[167] 'The mediaeval Church was a state. Convenience may forbid us to call it a state very often, but we ought to do so from time to time, for we could frame no acceptable definition of a state which would not comprehend the Church. What has it not that a state should have? It has laws, lawgivers, law courts, lawyers. It uses physical force to compel men to obey its laws. It keeps prisons. In the thirteenth century, though with squeamish phrases, it pronounces sentence of death. It is no voluntary society. If people are not born into it, they are baptised into it when they cannot help themselves. If they attempt to leave it, they are guilty of the *crimen laesae maiestatis* and are likely to be burnt.'[168]

tatus Papae" ', *Studi Gregoriani*, Vol. II (1947), pp. 403-57; R. Elze, 'Das "Sacrum Palatium Lateranense" im 10. und 11. Jahrhunderten', *Studi Gregoriani*, Vol. IV (1952), pp. 27-54.

[165] cf. Z.N. Brooke, *Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy*, pp. 16, 21; R. Génestal, *Le 'Privilegium Fori' en France du Décret de Gratian à la fin du XIVe siècle* (Paris, 1924), Vol. I, p. 195.

[166] cf. Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory*, pp. 135-41.

[167] cf. O. von Gierke, *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht* (Berlin, 1868-1913), Vol. III, pp. 252-4; P. Gillet, *La Personnalité juridique en droit ecclésiastique* (Malines, 1927), pp. 41-4.

[168] F.W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, p. 100.

VII

A sound theological investigation of the mystery of the Church might have modified this description by reinstating the Patristic emphasis on the coinherence of Christ and the Christian in the mystical Body, but the very vigour of canonist studies, and the technical procedures by which the canonists collated and mastered their Biblical and Patristic sources, gave them the attraction of freshness and progress in the eyes of the early schoolmen. 'Not that all the scholastics were jurists... But they were men of their time. Not a few took pride in showing that the Christian doctrine could be expressed *ad apices juris* as well as any other science, in terms of contracts, divine decrees, promises, etc.'[169] Thus the hermeneutics of Ivo of Chartres and Bernold of Constance played a decisive role in the beginnings of scholasticism,[170] and though the 13th century remains in this respect largely an unexplored period, yet 'the very strictures of Rogen Bacon or Dante on the legalistic spirit which led the clergy to run to the law schools in search of a canonist's promising career, the very railings of the satirists against the ambitious, greedy, artful canon lawyers, reflect in a way the actual truth that in the mediaeval world canon law was an all-pervading social and cultural power.'[171]

Very little work has been done on the absorption of canonistic material by St. Thomas himself,[172] but it is clear that the question of the relations obtaining between the Christian, the Body of Christ and the institutional Church simply did not present itself to him in the terms used by the Fathers. No doubt St. Thomas, were he alive today and as conscious of the theological needs of our time as he was of those of his own, would have developed further the ecclesiological texts which abound in his writings. His whole account of the movement of the rational creature towards God implies a doctrine of the Church for which a modern Aquinas would find ample room between the treatise on the Incarnation and the treatise on the sacraments in the *tertia pars* of the *Summa Theologica*.[173]

[169] E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, Vol. II, p. 60; cf. J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XIIe siècle* (2nd ed., Louvain, 1948), pp. 416-547.

[170] cf. M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* (Freiburg, 1911), Vol. II, pp. 86, 213 ff.; 302-3.

[171] S. Kuttner, 'The Scientific Investigation of Mediaeval Canon Law: The Need and the Opportunity', *Speculum*, Vol. XXIV (1949), p. 494.

[172] cf. A. Darquennes, 'La définition de l'Eglise d'apres S. Thomas d'Aquin', *L'organisation corporative du moyen âge à la fin de l'Ancien Régime* (Louvain, 1943), pp. 1-53; I.T. Eschmann, 'The Notion of Society in St. Thomas Aquinas', *Mediaeval Studies*, Vol. VIII (1946), pp. 1-42; W. Ullmann, *The Mediaeval Papacy: St. Thomas and Beyond* (Aquinas Society Paper No. 35, London, 1960).

[173] cf. A. Gardeil, *La crédibilité et l'apologétique* (Paris, 1912), p. 220; Yves Congar, *Esquisses du mystère de l'Eglise*, p. 61.

But, as a historical fact, St. Thomas never wrote a formal treatise *de Ecclesia* and scarcely at all attempted to state the ecclesiological significance of the juridical and institutional elements of the Church, for the precise reason that he took these elements almost for granted, sometimes to the detriment of his argument: his account of the rights of Jewish parents over their children, for instance, clearly implies a positive doctrine of freedom of conscience,[174] but his discussion of unbelief as such is concerned almost entirely with the Church's right (and duty) to limit the freedom of unbelievers. 'Indeed, in the eighteen articles devoted to the topic of unbelief, the very word "conscience" does not once occur.'[175] St. Thomas's concept of the Church, moreover, has two central phases, the theocentric and the Christocentric, and although 'the second aspect is in no wise minimised or blurred by the first', yet St. Thomas does focus attention on the first, and 'has thrown into relief the theological or theocentric phase before the "Christ" or "Christocenric phase".'[176] Nor is Christology explicit in his account of the ordered universe and man's place in it. Although he does argue that Christ is the centre of the universe, this doctrine 'is mentioned only in strictly Christological questions, or in commentaries on Scripture where the reference is unmistakable'.[177]

Mediaeval theologians naturally continued to believe in the majesty of Christ, the ruler of the universe, and in the royal, prophetic and priestly power centring in Him,[178] and Augustine, with his conception of the strug-

[174] cf. Eric D'Arcy, *Conscience and its Right to Freedom* (London, 1961), pp. 145-56.

[175] Eric D'Arcy, *Conscience and its Right to Freedom*, p. 180.

[176] Yves Congar, 'The Idea of the Church in St. Thomas', *The Thomist*, Vol. I (1939), p. 340; cf. *Esquisses du mystère de l'Eglise*, pp. 69-70.

[177] John H. Wright, *The Order of the Universe in the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Rome, 1957), p. 214. As Fr. Wright says, 'one cannot reasonably complain that a man does not say everything that can be and needs to be said on a question. It is enough that he has made a great positive contribution and pointed the way for others to follow.' This does not, however, in any way alter the content of St. Thomas's works as presented to contemporaries.

[178] cf. Bonaventure, 'In Lucam', ix, 34; *Opera* (ed. Quaracchi), Vol. VII, pp. 226-7; J. Leclercq, *L'idée de la royauté du Christ au moyen âge* (Paris, 1959); 'La royaute du Christ dans les lettres des papes du XIIIe siècle', *Revue d'histoire du droit français et étranger*, Vol. LXV (1942), pp. 112-20; 'Le sermon sur la royauté du Christ au moyen âge', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litteraire du moyen âge*, Vol. XIX (1943-5), pp. 143-80; 'L'idée de la royauté du Christ au XIVe siècle', *Miscellanea Pio Paschini* (Rome, 1948), pp. 405-25; 'L'idée de la royauté du Christ pendant le grand Schisme et le crise conciliaire', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, Vol. XXIV (1949), pp. 249-65; 'L'idée de la seigneurie du Christ au moyen âge', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, Vol. LIII (1958), pp. 57-68.

gle of the two cities and the idea of world ages, had almost forced mediaeval thought into a historical mould,[179] but the conclusion seems inescapable that the scholastics, who were committed to reason and debate rather than contemplation as the method of attaining truth, failed to give this doctrine the full eschatological reality which had been accorded it by the earlier, usually monastic writers.[180] For them the spiritual life was less organically linked with the corporate furtherance of Christ's work towards its consummation,[181] and the corporate organisation of the spiritual life was the more easily abandoned to legal regulation. 'The Fathers had endeavoured to produce in the Christian the consciousness of his own ethical responsibility, to make him act in the spirit of the Bible... The new tendency, on the other hand, went towards simplifying and facilitating the action of the individual by relieving him of the compulsion to deliberate with himself on the best ways and means of fulfilling his moral duty as a Christian. Instead the Church took upon itself the burden of prescribing in detail how in each particular situation the Christian had to act.'[182]

This change of attitude certainly marks a distinct epoch in the history of monasticism: we may indeed think that the whole movement of monastic reform in the 13th century 'had in it a fundamental flaw – a flaw that ran through so much of the official religious achievement of the time, even through the work of Gregory IX, of Innocent IV, of Grosseteste and Haymo of Faversham: the substitution, that is, of a legal, calculated, logical programme, apparently capable of rapid and complete execution, for the ardour of a call to the ideal, based not upon law but upon love.'[183] The layman's condition, however, was even worse, since canon law defines function and competence within the Church in terms of one's state of life and must therefore describe a layman as 'one who has no part in the

[179] cf. G. Amari, *Il concetto di storia in Sant' Agostino* (Rome, 1951); W. Lipgens, 'Die Bekenntnisse Augustins als Beitrag zur christlichen Geschichtsauffassung', *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift*, Vol. II (1951), pp. 164-77.

[180] cf. S. Vismara, *Il concetto della storia nel pensiero scolastico* (Milan, 1924); T. Gregory, 'L'escatologia cristiana nell'aristotelismo latino del XIII secolo', *Richerche di storia religiosa*, Vol. I (1954-7), pp. 108-19.

[181] For this reason a prominent American Jesuit has argued that 'a lay theology should be built on the pre-Thomistic, Augustinian theory and its formulae.' (John Courtney Murray, 'Towards a Theology for the Layman: the Pedagogical Problem', *Theological Studies*, Vol. V (1944), p. 363.)

[182] H.H. Gluny, *History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon* (Cambridge, 1933), p. 77.

[183] M.D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* (Cambridge, 1948-59), Vol. I, p. 25.

power of jurisdiction and especially of Holy Order.'[184] The lay condition was increasingly represented as a concession to human weakness, a state from which those who shared in it could not properly take part in the specifically Christian achievement of building together the Body of Christ in this world. Their function was simply to carry out dutifully the tasks of a lower, this-worldly plane of existence:

> 'These are allowed to possess temporal goods, but only what they need for use, since nothing is more wretched than to set God at naught for the sake of money. They are allowed to marry, to till the earth, to pronounce judgment on men's disputes and plead in court, to lay their offerings on the altar, to pay their tithes. And so they can be saved, if they do good and avoid evil.'[185]

There is nothing in this text from Gratian of the Pauline idea of Christ Himself as the *subject* of the Christian's life, and in nearly all the other great monuments of mediaeval canon law the lay Christian is considered exclusively as the *object* of ecclesiastical administration – hence the judgment of a great German legal historian that 'the Catholic Church is the Church of the clergy. The Pope, the bishops and the priests constitute the Church. According to canon law, the laity appear to be only rearguard members, while the clergy alone are members with full rights. The laity form simply the people who must be guided and taught.'[186]

VIII

The creation of such a Church polity at this time proved to be singularly unfortunate in practical terms, quite apart from any inherent defects. The period which gave canonical law and institutions their distinctive Western form saw also, with the growth of trade and the rise of communal government, the emergence of what 'from the beginning showed that characteristic of being an exclusively lay culture' – an urban civilisation in which the lay spirit was 'allied with the most intese religious fervour' as can be seen from the 'innumerable religious foundations with which the cities abounded', but which resisted the hierocratic ideology in all its forms. The piety of the laity, developing out of contact with clerical learning in a society which preserved its independence by active opposition to clerical rule, 'showed itself with a naiveté, a sincerity and a fear-

[184] A. Vermeersch and J. Creusen, *Epitome Juris Canonis* (4th ed., Malines, 1929), Vol. I, pp. 154-5; cf. Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp. 13-15.
[185] Gratian, *Decretum*, VII, xii, 1; cf. Humbert, *Adversus simoniacos*, iii, 9; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, pp. 265-71.
[186] Ulrich Stutz, *Der Geist des Codes Juris Canonici* (Stuttgart, 1918), p. 83.

lessness which easily led it beyond the bounds of orthodoxy. At all times, they were distinguished above everything else by the exuberance of their mysticism. It was this which, in the eleventh century, led them to side passionately with the religious reformers who were fighting simony and the marriage of priests; which, in the twelfth century, spread the contemplative asceticism of the Beguines and Beghards; which, in the thirteenth century, explained the enthusiastic reception which the Franciscans and Dominicans received. But it was this also which assured the success of all the novelties, all the exaggerations, and all the deformations of religious thought. After the twelfth century no heresy cropped out which did not immediately find some followers.'[187]

The effort to remove bishops from all secular control also proved impracticable, because it ignored the actual conditions of mediaeval society. 'The truth was that no conscientious government could suffer to be out of its control the conferring of offices which, besides a grave responsibility for religion – in regard to which no ruler careful of the welfare of his subjects had the right to remain disinterested – included so great an element of properly temporal government.'[188] By taking the stand it did, the Papacy was condemned to a relationship of inevitable dialectic with the secular authorities, heightened from time to time by the activities of particular 'Januses of mitre and coronet':[189] in 1087 Odo of Bayeux had been arrested, on the advice of Archbishop Lanfranc himself, not as a bishop but as a baron,[190] and later Kings of England, faced with similar problems, did not hesitate to deal with them in the same way. Thus when

[187] H. Pirenne, *Mediaeval Cities* (tr. F.D. Halsey, New York, 1956), pp. 165-7.

[188] Marc Bloch, *La société féodale* (Paris, 1939-40), Vol. II, p. 106; cf. Z.N. Brooke, *Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy*, pp. 8-11. 'From two sides the world pressed in upon the mediaeval bishop and made him less and less a pastor of souls and more and more a temporal magnate. On the one hand he was by virtue of his position a feudal lord, with similar privileges and immunities to those of his lay peers. He, like them, possessed not only broad lands and their revenues in money and kind, but also rights of private jurisdiction and even his own private army... On the other hand, the bishop, both by virtue of his local importance and through the dependence of the central government upon his learning, had duties towards the State as a whole' – in advising the Crown, serving as a minister of state or special ambassador, and so on. (T.M. Parker, 'Feudal Episcopacy', *The Apostolic Ministry*, pp. 377-8; cf. pp. 362-72.)

[189] cf. T.M. Parker, 'Feudal Episcopacy', *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 377.

[190] cf. Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (ed. A. le Prévost and L. Delisle, Paris, 1838-55), vii, 8; A.L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216* (Oxford, 1951), pp. 100-4, 136-8, 264; H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles, *The Governance of Mediaeval England from the Conquest to Magna Carta* (Edinburgh, 1963), pp. 285-6.

Pope Celestine III (1191-8) protested against Coeur-de-Lion's seizure of Philip, Bishop of Beauvais, Richard sent him the armour in which Philip had been arrested, asking whether this was the coat of a son of the Pope.[191] Such cases were, of course, exceptional, but in a feudal society where secular greatness was the Church's only guarantee of integrity attempts to enforce the full canon-law requirements of ecclesiastical independence necessarily raised almost insuperable difficulties on both sides: if the Church had a case against the secular authorities, the secular authorities might reply with considerable justice that the Church was trying to have things both ways – to retain her influence in the world and yet contract out of it. Only once, it would seem, was the issue squarely faced – in 1110 and 1111, when the unworldly Pope Paschal II proposed that the Church should renounce her temporal possessions in return for the abandonment of all secular claims to select and control the bishops. So radical a solution, however, could not be implemented, being unacceptable alike to ecclesiastics reluctant to give up worldly position and to lay magnates who wished to retain full rights of patronage and control over local churches.[192]

IX

The later canon lawyers and theologians certainly recognised that both clergy and laity belong to one Church, the unity of which is in no way compromised by a distinction between the two, and an immediate consequence of the Investiture Contest was a renewed sense that the spiritual and secular administrations of the Christian community existed in such close unity that the subversion of either must lead to chaos in the other:

> 'Videmus ... divisum regnum et sacerdotium, sine quorum concordia res humanae nec incolumes esse nec tutae.'[193]

Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141) expressed the same idea in the image of the two sides of the human body.[194] But the Investiture Contest and the growth of canon law had introduced a new element into conflicts between the

[191] cf. Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (ed. H.R. Luard, Rolls Series, 1872-83), Vol. II, p. 422; A.L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216*, p. 467.

[192] cf. T.M. Parker, 'Feudal Episcopacy', *The Apostolic Ministry*, pp. 372-4; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, p. 409; I. Ott, 'Der Regalienbegriff im 12. Jahrhundert', *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte (Kanonistische Abteilung)*, Vol. XXXV (1948), pp. 234-304.

[193] Ivo of Chartres, *Ep. ad Hugonem*, MGH Libelli de Lite, ii, 642 ff.

[194] cf. Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis*, II, ii, 2; Migne, P.L., clxxvi, 417; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, p. 437.

spiritual and secular administration, not only by raising the question of which of the two administrations was ultimately superior, but also by threatening the unity of the Christian community itself: could the unity of the *societas Christiana* be maintained if one of its two aspects claimed to be a self-contained and internally coherent institution, governed by its own laws and free from external interference? 'We should say that in the early Middle Ages, that is to say, up to the Investiture struggle – and perhaps inclusive of it – the conflict is habitually considered as between the *Sacerdotium* and [the] *Regnum* or *Imperium*, and, in nine cases out of ten at least, as taking place in the *Ecclesia*, rather than in the *Respublica*. Only in the later Middle Ages are *Respublica* and *Ecclesia* used as convertible terms for *Regnum* or *Imperium* and *Sacerdotium* respectively; and the conclusion we would draw is that, when this happens, the conception of the single society is breaking up.'[195]

There had in fact emerged a conception of two distinct societies, a 'Church' and a 'State', and where earlier writers had spoken of the two sides of one body, the fourteenth-and fifteenth-century critics of ecclesiastical authority spoke of two *bodies*, each with its own head, the Pope on the one hand and the King or Emperor on the other.[196] Kings who were expected to serve the Church in such important matters as the creation of secular legislation against the *crimen publicum* of heresy[197] could not but feel that they should themselves have a hand in the management of the Church, and not always purely for reasons of worldly ambition. The Emperor Frederick II (d. 1250) appears to have had a concern for religion that was more than mere policy, and even under excommunication he never lost the regard of genuinely pious monarchs like Louis IX of France and Henry III of England; but his conception of Christian society was the very antithesis of the hierocratic ideal, and he visualised an absorption of the 'Church' by the 'State'.[198] As the Emperors' power declined new secular rulers took their place as leaders of the opposition to hierocratic thinking, and there is at least some reason to suppose that the later mediaeval development of the notion of absolute sovereignty was in large measure a transposition into a secular context of some elements of

[195] C.N.S. Woolf, *Bartolus of Sassoferrato: His Position in the History of Mediaeval Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 104.

[196] cf. H. de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum: l'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au moyen âge* (2nd ed., Paris, 1944), p. 133.

[197] cf. G. de Vergottini, *Studi sulla legislazione imperiale di Frederico II in Italia* (Milan, 1952), pp. 97 ff., 179 ff., 265 ff.

[198] 'Sans cesser d'être une puissance politique, l'impérialisme est devenu un dogme religieux.' (J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Eglise et de l'Etat au temps de Philippe le Bel*, p. 43.)

the canonical theory of the Papacy.[199] Thus when Philip the Fair of France (1285-1315) reminded Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) that *ecclesia non solum est ex clericis, sed etiam ex laicis*,[200] the French monarchy, raised on the ruins of municipal freedom, had become a sort of counter-Church, relying on the divine character of kings and a long tradition of anti-Papal polemic, and evolving, in the hands of Philip's lawyers, a well-organised policy 'with the sole object of setting the Pope aside, absorbing the episcopate and placing the whole Church in the hands of the civil power.'[201]

Against the assertiveness of such a secular Papacy Boniface proclaimed yet again the unity of the one Christian society. 'Contre ce dualisme menaçant, il insistait sur l'unité de l'Eglise. Affirmer l'indépendance du pouvoir temporel, c'était imiter à la fois les manichéens et les grecs schismatiques, et introduire la division dans le monde et l'Eglise. Devant le danger crée par Philippe le Bel et ses partisans, Boniface VIII, Mathieu d'Acquasparta et Gilles de Rome appliquaient aux adversaires du pouvoir pontifical la réfutation opposée jadis aux manichéens.'[202] The Christian society whose unity Boniface affirmed, however, was one in which, notoriously, the laity were hostile to the clergy,[203] in which kings should not imagine that they were not subject to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy,[204] and in which it is necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff (*porro subesse Romano pontifici, omni humane creature declaramus, dicimus, et diffinimus omnino esse de necessitate salutis*).[205]

[199] cf. O. von Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages* (tr. F.W. Maitland, Cambridge, 1900), p. 36.

[200] qtd W. Ullmann, *Mediaeval Papalism: The Political Theories of the Mediaeval Canonists* (London, 1949), p. 214.

[201] J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Eglise et de l'Etat au temps de Philippe le Bel*, p. 118; J. Michelet, *Histoire de France* (Paris, 1868), Vol. VII, p. 14; H. Wieruszowki, 'Vom Imperium zum nationalen Königtum', *Historische Zeitschrift*, Vol. XXX (1927), pp. 21, 91, 179.

[202] J. Leclercq, *Jean de Paris et l'ecclésiologie du XIIIe siècle*, p. 109; cf. Boniface VIII, 'Unam Sanctam', *Registrum* (ed. Digard, Faucon, Thomas and Fawtier, Paris, 1884-1931), 5382; Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 468-9.

[203] cf. Boniface VIII, 'Clericis Laicos', *Registrum*, 1576; R.W. and A.J. Carlyle, *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, Vol. V, pp. 376-9; T.S.R. Boase, *Boniface VIII* (London, 1933), pp. 138-56.

[204] cf. Boniface VIII, 'Ausculta Fili', *Registrum*, 4424; R.W. and A.J. Carlyle, *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, Vol. V, pp. 385-91; T.S.R. Boase, *Boniface VIII*, pp. 301-10.

[205] cf. Boniface VIII, 'Unam Sanctam', *Registrum*, 5382; J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Eglise et l'Etat au temps de Philippe le Bel*, pp. 150-5, 394-405; R.W. and

What, in practice, Boniface intended by this last celebrated assertion of his Bull *Unam Sanctam* is difficult to determine,[206] but certainly his efforts did not inhibit the development of the State, either in theory or in practice, as a quasi-ecclesiastical entity: the Church conceived primarily as a self-contained institution, hierarchically dominated by the Papacy, was fighting a losing battle against the secular society increasingly discovered in the pages of Aristotle, who 'had shown, not in any way polemical and quite independent of thirteenth-century actuality... that there was a *societas humana*... fundamentally different from the *societas Christiana*. It grows from below, from the household, the village and larger entities into a self-sufficing community formed by the natural impulse of men to live in it... Into the one *societas* man comes through the working of the social instinct; into the other *societas* man comes through the sacramental act of baptism.'[207] Already by the end of the first quarter of the 14th century this *societas humana* had received its complete Aristotelian justification as a structure of government from the physician Marsiglio of Padua (c. 1275-1342), in whose *Defensor Pacis* 'there is nothing left of the Thomist idea that the State, however "sovereign", is subject to an eternal and absolute order of values, expressed in the body of Divine and Natural Law. The State is the source of Law, and its Law has to be obeyed not only because it is the only rule to be endowed with coercive power, but because it is in itself the expression of justice.'[208] What Marsiglio had created in theory, practical administrators had already accomplished in fact, and their often ecclesiastically-trained minds lent to the secular state those nuances of usage and conception which made it more effective than any merely theoretical claims would have done. In England, for instance, 'we cannot fathom that subtle and pervasive process, by which the *regnum* conveyed to itself so much of the

A.J. Carlyle, *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, Vol. V, pp. 391-2; T.S.R. Boase, *Boniface VIII*, pp. 315-37.

[206] 'Among Boniface's bulls it has a distinctive position. It is for him curiously impersonal, though an early tradition has ascribed it completely to his composition. The whole form and wording of it is as of a general statement detached from any particular circumstances', and it bases 'the claims of the Papacy to final sovereignty... on the divine origin of that power, not on any particular necessities, nor even historical precedents... In *Unam Sanctam* we find only a solemn statement, on the grounds of revealed faith, of the supremacy of the spiritual power, and it would be quite possible to accept a comparatively moderate view of the manner in which that supremacy was to be excercised.' (T.S.R. Boase, *Boniface VIII*, pp. 318-19.)

[207] W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, p. 455.

[208] A.P. d'Entréves, *The Mediaeval Contribution to Political Thought* (Oxford, 1939), p. 63.

jurisdiction, power and wealth of the *sacerdotium* in the sixteenth century, unless we take account of the conscience with which episcopal chancellors invested and endowed the king in chancery. If the state acquired a conscience, there was no knowing what might not happen to the Church. Educated by the Church, and moved by its conscience, the state might even develop a religion of its own.'[209]

X

Nor, in the sixteenth century, was the emergence of the secular state the only danger which confronted the Church. Canonistic thinking had established among Papalists and Imperialists alike[210] the conception of the Church as a *congregatio politica*,[211] as a *monarchia clericalis et spiritualis*,[212] a *regnum*[213] characterised by a hierarchical structure of 'preachers and hearers, rulers and subjects',[214] a Church 'of' the faithful in the sense that they are the recipients of the ministrations of the clergy and subject to the judicial power of their prelates.[215] This in itself produced its own reaction, for Protestants and their sympathisers accused Catholics of equating the Church with the hierarchy,[216] inaugurating an age in which 'while some tended to see the Church actualised in a priesthood without people, others came to see it as a people without a priesthood.'[217]

Luther had a particularly strong sense of the vocation which results from baptism,[218] and already in the early stages of the theological reorien-

[209] A.F. Pollard, *Wolsey* (2nd ed., London, 1953), p. 65; cf. J.N. Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1914) *Studies in Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1916).

[210] 'Marsiglio recognises as fully as James of Viterbo that this *Ecclesia* or Church is a true *regnum*, and that its government is monarchical and regal; he even admits that the bishop of Rome is in a limited sense supreme within it in matters within its lawful competence.' (C.H. McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West*, New York, 1932, p. 309). Cf. the anonymous *Quaestio in utramque partem*, 5, and Jean de Paris, *De potestate regia et papali*, 3, both ed. in M. Goldast, *Monarchia S. Romani Imperii* (Frankfurt, 1611-14), Vol. II, pp. 103, 111-12.

[211] cf. Aquinas, *In IV Sent.*, d. 20, q. 1, a. 4.

[212] cf. Alexander of St. Elpidius, *Tractatus de ecclesiastica potestate*, i, 7.

[213] cf. James of Viterbo, *De regimine Christiano*, i, 1.

[214] James of Viterbo, *De regimine Christiano*, i, 3.

[215] cf. Augustinus Triumphus, *Summa de ecclesiastica potestate*, xxiii, 1.

[216] cf. Martin Luther, *Werke* (ed. Weimar, 1883-), 1, 656; George Gillespie, *Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland* (1646), 1; *A Treatise of Miscellany Questions* (1649), p. 35; A. Krauss, *Das protestantische Dogma von der unsichtbaren Kirche* (Gotha, 1876), p. 70.

[217] Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p. 12.

[218] cf. G. Wingren, *Luthers Lehre vom Beruf* (Munich, 1952).

tation consequent upon his interview with Cajetan in 1518 he was making clear that God calls us to all the states and occupations of everyday life, and not simply to some states which are distinctively Christian or spiritual while others are not.[219] Before long he had made the necessary precision of denying that there is a special priestly state in the mediaeval sense, for all those who partake of the sacraments with faith are priests,[220] and the state of the clergy is one state among many, an office on the same level as any other office;[221] and by the end of the 1520's he had articulated his thought in the well known Lutheran conception of Church, Household and Polity, each one a hierarchy or 'holy order' founded in God's Word, and all three subordinate to the 'common order of Christian love' which applies to all men at all times.[222] It was the just glory of the Protestant Reformers, therefore, 'that they brought into lay life, into everyday life, the holiness which had formerly been kept in the cloister; that they denounced the distinction between an ordinary goodness and morality, just sufficient for salvation, and a higher morality available only to churchmen; that they restored dignity and Christian value to the various activities of secular life, and particularly to man's trades and professions.'[223]

Nevertheless, for Luther, as for Zwingli and Cranmer, 'the Church was hardly more than civil society gone over to the Gospel and acknowledging the rule of Christ: a people, not an institution',[224] and Luther's interpretation of the *congregatio fidelium* as 'the priesthood of all believers'

[219] 'God has ordained several states (*stend*), in which men are to learn to exercise themselves and to suffer. To some He commanded the state of marriage, to some the spiritual state, and to others the ruling state. He ordered them all to toil and labour to kill the flesh and accustom it to death, for baptism has made the rest of this life, to all those who are baptised, a very poison and hindrance to its work.' (Martin Luther, Sermon on Baptism (1519), *Werke*, 2, 734.)

[220] 'Therefore all Christian men are priests, the women priestesses, be they young or old, masters or servants, mistresses or maids, learned or unlearned. Here there are no differences unless faith be unequal.' (Martin Luther, Sermon on the New Testament (1520), *Werke*, 6, 370.)

[221] cf. Martin Luther, 'An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation' (1520), *Werke*, 6, 48; 'De abroganda missa privata' (1521), *Werke*, 8, 429.

[222] cf. Martin Luther, 'Vom Abendmahl Christi Bekenntnis' (1528), *Werke*, 26, 504; K. Köhler, 'Die altprotestantische Lehre von den drei kirchlichen Ständen', *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, Vol. XXI (1886), pp. 193-231.

[221] Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p. 13.

[224] Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p. 36; cf. A. Farner, *Die Lehre von Kirche und Staat bei Zwingli* (Tübingen, 1930), pp. 7 ff.; E. Foerster, 'Fragen zu Luthers Kirchenbegriff aus der Gedankwelt seines Altes, *Festgabe J. Kaftan* (Tübingen, 1920), pp. 87-102. Cf. also E. Brunner, *Das Missverstandnis der Kirche* (Zürich, 1951).

has been criticised by Protestant theologians of other traditions, on the ground that 'it carries with it a ruinous individualism' and does not give adequate expression to the corporate activity of the members of Christ in building together His Body in this world.[225] In many ways this was a direct consequence of Luther's central doctrine of grace, which he refused to see actualised in any of its individual recipients, for fear that it might seem to raise man to God's level and obliterate a proper awareness of the divine condescension: he 'feels himself to be the herald of theocentric religion against all egocentricity whatsoever', and his 'main objection to Catholic piety is always this, that it *puts man's own self in God's place.*'[226] In this respect Luther 'is not so much the man in whom Augustinianism finds its fulfilment as the man who vanquishes it',[227] for he could not accept that merging of the love of God for man and the love of man for God in a doctrine of charity which 'made Augustine the founder of the Catholic doctrine of grace.'[228] Faith, therefore, cannot be for Luther a faith informed by love, but must necessarily be 'pure' faith, *fides informis*, justifying in so far as it is a recognition of the love from God's side which accomplishes everything in Christ. There can be no human work towards making over the world to God, for 'repentance and amendment are no more able than righteousness to move God to love',[229] and even when a man does good to his neighbour 'he is only the tube, the channel, through which God's love flows.'[230] Luther's theology of grace clearly leaves no room for a theory of justice in our everyday lives,[231] and there can be little profoundly theological sense of community when the regulation of human affairs, in so far as they are under man's control, at best produces no greater good that the restriction of evil.

XI

Calvin's doctrine, with its much more dominant and insistent sense of

[225] cf. T.F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood* (Edinburgh, 1955), p. 35.
[226] A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love* (2nd ed., tr. P.S. Watson, London, 1953), p. 682.
[227] A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love*, p. 562.
[228] A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love*, p. 531.
[229] A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love*, p. 80.
[230] A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love*, p. 735.
[231] 'Protestant Christianity has had [no theory of this-worldly justice] for some three hundred years past. That may sound a bold statement; it can, unfortunately, be proved. It is doubtless one of the main reasons why the Protestant Church is so unsure of itself in questions of social order, economics, law, politics and international law, and why its statements on these subjects are so haphazard and improvised that they fail to carry conviction.' (Emil Brunner, *Justice and the Social Order*, tr. O. Wyon, London, 1938, p. 7.)

Christ's victory, its emphasis that 'it is to triumph that we are summoned',[232] presents a more balanced and satisfactory theology of the Christian life. In 1536, the date of the first edition of his classical *Institutes*, Calvin had as yet scarcely considered the Church except under its invisible and hidden aspect, and his conception practically coincided with that of Luther,[233] but his studies in law under the leading French jurist, Pierre de l'Estoile, and the almost equally brilliant Italian, Andrea Alciati,[234] had already given him a strong sense of the reality of the human community, and he modified his earlier theology under the influence of Bucer, seeing the visible Church more and more as binding upon *us* (because instituted by God), though not inhibiting God's freedom to act as He wills; and as, in the weakness of our fallen state, an instrument of our vocation and an aid to our sanctification.[235] The visible Church, the earthly community of God, is one with the invisible Church,[236] awaiting its stable condition (*stabilis ecclesiae conditio*) in the renovation (*instauratio*) and the perfection of order (*integritas ordinis*) which are promised for the time of the final manifestation of Christ.[237] The visible Church thus takes its place naturally in the eschatology of triumphant hope[238] which Calvin had substituted for the Lutheran eschatology of suffering faith.[239]

This essential structure of Calvinist theology was transmitted to, and maintained by, his followers abroad: the Scottish Reformers, for instance, were from the first opposed to any form of Anabaptist 'Church of the Saints' which sought to distinguish the elect from the non-elect in this world,[240] and even the religious strife of the seventeenth century did not

[232] John Calvin, *Institutes*, II, xv, 4.

[233] cf. H. Strohl, 'La notion de l'Eglise chez les Réformateurs', *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, 1936, pp. 297 ff.

[234] cf. E. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin: les hommes et les choses de son temps* (Lausanne-Neuilly, 1899-1927), Vol. I, pp. 141 ff.

[235] cf. John Calvin, *Institutes*, IV, i, 1, 4-5; iii, 2; J. Courvoisier, *La notion de l'Eglise chez Bucer* (Paris, 1933), pp. 135 ff.; W. Niesel, *Die Theologie Calvins* (2nd ed., Munich, 1957), pp. 174-200.

[236] cf. A. Lecerf, 'La doctrine de l'Eglise dans Calvin', *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, 1929, p. 259.

[237] cf. John Calvin, Comm. in Mk., xv, 43 and Lk., xxiii, 51, *Opera* (Corpus Reformatorum, Brunswick-Berlin, 1863-1900), Vol. LXXIII, p. 788; Comm. in Acts, ii, 17, *Opera*, Vol. LXXVI, p. 31.

[238] cf. T.F. Torrance, *Kingdom and Church: A Study in the Theology of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1956), pp. 90-164.

[239] cf. T.F. Torrance, *Kingdom and Church: A Study in the Theology of the Reformation*, pp. 7-72.

[240] Writing to Cecil in 1552, Dudley mentioned, among the reasons for offering the bishopric of Rochester to John Knox, his belief that Knox would be 'a great

produce in Scotland a genuine separatist movement.[241] But in proclaiming a visible Church the Calvinists were showing themselves to be the successors not of the Catholic tradition simply, but of that precise form of it which had been represented by Gregory VII and Boniface VIII: Calvin and Knox in fact renewed and strengthened the mediaeval ideal of an authoritative ecclesiastical civilisation – a *kirchliche Zwangskultur* in Troeltsch's phrase[242] – though perhaps, in their local emphasis, having more in common with Savonarola's Florence than with the Papal-hierocratic ideal as such.[273] Calvin's doctrine of the relationship of Church and State[244] can easily be misunderstood, since 'he took great care to define his own position in opposition to the Roman teaching'[245] and emphasised that the spiritual and secular powers should be complementary in their own proper spheres; but if he did not at any time suggest that the civil magistracy should be under the tutelage of the Church this was simply because of his different conception of divine authority, for he certainly required conformity of civil legislation to *the Word of God*, and in the case of Servetus laboured mightily to defend the right of the civil magistracy to punish, even with death, offences against revealed truth.[246] The discordance of this doctrine with the belief that faith cannot be coerced naturally caused difficulties, but Calvinist ingenuity could overcome anything: Samuel Rutherford of St. Andrews (1600-61) argued that, while a saving knowledge of Christ cannot be achieved 'by dint and violence of the sword' and a Christian magistrate cannot, therefore, command the outward performance of religion as a service to God, yet he can punish neglect of churchgoing as a social offence, since it gives scandal to those who lead 'a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty'.[247]

confounder of the anabaptists lately sprung up in Kent' (qtd E. Percy, *John Knox*, London, 1937, p. 154).

[241] An attempt was made to set up a separatist 'gathered Church' at Aberdeen in 1652, and a communion service was held at Marischal College; but the event was wholly exceptional, and the group concerned soon abandoned their idea of forming themselves into a separate Church (cf. G.D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland*, Cambridge, 1937, p. 106).

[242] cf. E. Troeltsch, *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt* (3rd ed., Munich, 1924).

[243] cf. J.W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1928), pp. 67-70.

[244] cf. M.-E. Chenevière, *La pensée politique de Calvin* (Geneva, 1938), pp. 243-71.

[245] F. Wendel, *Calvin: The Origins and Development of his Religious Thought* (tr. P. Mairet, London, 1963), p. 305.

[246] cf. J.W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 81-9.

[247] S. Rutherford, *A Free Disputation against pretended Liberty of Conscience* (London, 1649), pp. 50-2; cf. Geddes MacGregor, *Corpus Christi: The Nature of*

Calvinism was thus a religion not of democracy but of pulpit admonition and constant spiritual control. Calvin had maintained that

> 'as no town or village can be without a governor and without police, so also the Church of God... has need of a certain spiritual police'

and although he at once added that this spiritual police 'is quite different from an earthly police',[248] the power of the clerically-ordered Calvinist community terrified many non-Calvinists: for one German Lutheran writer of the seventeenth century 'the Calvinist dragon' was 'pregnant with all the horrors of Mohammedanism'.[249] The example of Scotland shows that a Calvinist discipline could perform an invaluable social function, creating order out of chaos through the very vigour of its insistence on the observance of a common code of Christian morality,[250] but in the more highly developed polity of England Calvinism absorbed 'and to some extent was corrupted by) some elements of the native theology of Tyndale and the martyrologist John Foxe to produce the distinctive Puritan 'Covenant Theology'[251] which in the seventeenth century raised the theocratic ideal so high that it finally broke, leaving English Nonconformity as a much more secular leaven of change in a much more secular society.[252]

the Church according to the Reformed Tradition (London, 1959), pp. 91-5.

[248] John Calvin, *Institutes*, IV, xi, 1.

[249] qtd C.V. Wedgwood, *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1944), p. 42.

[250] Indirectly, the Presbyterian clergy 'were rendering to their country a political service of no common order... In Scotland it was by the Presbyterian clergy that the middle classes were organised, and the organisation thus given them enabled them to throw off the yoke of the feudal nobles and ultimately to assert their own predominance. It was with little thought of the political result of their rule that the clergy strove to maintain themselves in the position to which they had been elevated. To them the support of religion was all in all, and, strict as they were in the matter of doctrinal orthodoxy, their strictness was still greater with respect to the observance of the Ten Commandments. They strove by means of church discipline, enforced in the most inquisitorial manner, to bring a whole population under the yoke of the moral law... It was not a rule for those alone who sought counsels of perfection, whilst the mass of humanity was left to content themselves with a lower standard of morality. In Scotland there was to be a parity of moral law as there was to be a parity of ministerial office. The fierce ruffians who in the sixteenth century had reddened the country with the feuds of noble houses, the rude peasants who wallowed in impurity, were made to feel the compulsion of a never-resting, ever-abiding power, which pried into their lives and called them to account for their deeds as no lay government, however arbitrary, could venture to do.' (S.R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War, 1642-49*, London, 1893, Vol. I, pp. 226-7.)

[251] cf. J.G. Moller, 'The Beginnings of Puritan Convenant Theology', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. XIV (1963), pp. 46-47.

[252] The work of the Puritan preachers was not cancelled out, but it was diverted

In practice the Reformers had taken back more than they had given. Their emphasis on parity of status between laymen and clergy – what Tillich calls the 'radical laicism' of Protestantism[253] – has not notably solved the problem of the manner of the co-existence of the two orders, since the Protestant ministry, though not in theory yet in many features of psychological attitude and sociological structure, is no more than a metamorphosis of the former 'clergy'. It might be said, with some disparagement, that 'what Protestantism did to the religion of Western Europe was simply to substitute a clericalism of the Word for a clericalism of the Sacrament. Whereas the Catholic had been accustomed to come to church to be edified by seeing the priest celebrate the Mass, the Protestant came to church to be edified by hearing the minister preach the sermon; and the preaching of the sermon, no less than the celebration of the Mass, was a purely cerical performance.'[254]

XII

The appearance of Protestantism, however, had quickly provoked Catholics to define their positions in opposition, and thereby to give a new hardening to the ecclesiology which since the thirteenth century had been worked out in a markedly belligerent spirit. 'And even while they were at work, built they or loaded or carried loads, it was one hand to work with and one closing still on a javelin; nor was there ever a workman but must build with his sword girt at his side.' And feeling themselves now *separati in muro*, Catholic theologians felt it necessary to have the means of sounding alarm ready at hand: *clangebant buccina iuxta me.*[255] Much of our

into other channels. 'The outcome of all their striving in pulpit and press was to be the triumph of their teaching and the disappointment of their expectation... They aroused not in the humble and poor in spirit alone but in men of many conditions in an expanding world and a changing society a quickened consciousness of life and power within themselves, a sense of participating in the designs of providence, an expectancy of great things to come. The result was not reformation but the emergence of an articulate vernacular public, free from any of the inhibitions and impediments of customany attitudes and sanctions.' (W. Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*, New York, 1955, pp. 332-3).

[253] cf. Paul Tillich, *The Protestant Era* (London, 1951), p. 174.

[254] E.L. Mascall, *The Recovery of Unity* (London, 1958), pp. 5-6; cf. p. 7: 'It is important to notice that, just because this clericalist attitude is the result of an unconsciously accepted bequest from the Middle Ages and is not the logical corollary of a consciously adopted theological position, it can be found strongly entrenched even in religious bodies whose doctrine of church order might seem to exclude it.'

[255] *Nehemiah*, iv, 17-19; cf. Yves Congar, 'La pensée de Moehler et l'ecclésiologie orthodoxe', *Irénikon*, Vol. XII (1935), p. 324.

classical theology *de Ecclesia* was conceived controversially, as a reply to the Reformation, and therefore concerned itself primarily with affirming and defending what the Protestant party denied. The doctrine of the mystical Body of Christ and the profound supernatural reality of the Church were assuredly not forgotten, and were indeed partially reinstated after something of an eclipse;[256] but sixteenth century theological treatises dealt in particular detail with the significance of the Church as rule of faith, of hierarchical powers, and of the Church's objectively constituted external and juridical machinery, as in Bellarmine's celebrated definition:

> 'The Church is the society of men united by the possession of the same Christian faith and participation in the same sacraments, governed by the only Vicar of Christ on earth, the Pope of Rome.'[257]

Such great apologists as Bellarmine and du Perron say nothing of the relationship of the Church and the Eucharist which was central to the consciousness of the Church in Patristic and mediaeval theology,[258] and the *sacerdotium regale* of the faithful is reduced by Bellarmine to an exclusively spiritual priesthood,[259] while other theologians set themselves to the task of defining certain visible 'notes' or 'properties' by which the true Church might be identified.[260] Ecclesiology had become, and remained for generations, mainly a defence of the episcopate and the Papacy, fixed in a set pattern in which, as Père Congar observes, the question of authority is so predominant that the whole treatise is more like a 'hierar-

[256] cf. F.X. Arnold, *Grundsätzliches und Geschichtliches zur Theologie der Seelsorge* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1949), pp. 80, 115 ff.; J. Willen, 'Zur Idee des Corpus Christi mysticum in der Theologie des 16. Jahrhunderts', *Catholica*, Vol. IV (1935), pp. 75-86.

[257] Robert Bellarmine, *Controversiae*, ii, 3: *de Ecclesia militante*, 2 (ed. Cologne, 1619, col. 108); cf. J. Eck, *Apologia pro principibus catholicis* (Ingolstadt, 1542); Peter Canisius, *Opus Catechcticum* (Cologne, 1577), c. 3, q. 9, p. 131. Cf. also A. Ottaviani, *Institutiones Iuris Publici Ecclesiastici* (3rd ed., Rome, 1947), Vol. I, pp. 157-62.

[258] cf. H. de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum: l'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au moyen âge*, pp. 291-2.

[259] 'Se tenant sur le terrain de la controverse antiprotestante, il est assez naturel que Bellarmin ait réduit le sacerdoce royal à sa conception exclusivement spirituelle: il ne le met en rapport ni avec l'onction du Christ ni avec le rite confirmatoire de la chrismation, pas plus qu'avec la participation des fidèles au sacrifice de la messe, quoique la tradition antérieure et même les autres contre-réformateurs aient souvent opéré et souligné de tels rapprochements.' (P. Dabin, *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne*, p. 389; cf. pp. 328-454).

[260] cf. G. Thils, *Les notes de l'Eglise dans l'apologétique depuis la Réforme* (Gembloux, 1927).

chology' or a treatise in public law than an ecclesiology.[261] Laymen could gain significance only through their exercise of secular authority, and Bellarmine set a fashion for believing that all disputed points regarding the laity *ad disputationem de magistratu politico revocari possunt* – 'son *De laicis* n'est conçu qu'en fonction des graves problémes politico-religieux soulevés par les prétensions du pouvoir séculier, par le péril musulman et la répression des hérétiques'.[262]

This emphatically governmental conception of the Church – reinforced, even as late as 1863, by the canonistic usage which described the Church as 'a state'[263] – did little to foster among the faithful a sense of the wholeness of the Church. Already as a by-product of the reaffirmation of the powers of the clerical priesthood in the Mass 'the layman's rôle at the august sacrifice tended to be regarded as that of a mere spectator or hearer – terms reserved in the early Church for the inquiring pagan or catechumen'[264] – and the later history of popular prayer and the cure of souls is in many respects the history of a gradual disengagement of the individual Christian life from the corporate worship of the Body of Christ at every level, the dissolution of the believing, praying people into a series of individuals pursuing private pieties under the protection of a Church that they do not affect and are not expected to affect.

The modern parish mission, for instance, has usually been founded on a model perhaps appropriate to the eighteenth-century Neapolitan countryside in which St. Alphonsus Liguori created it, but certainly designed primarily to send people to the confessional and therefore set in a pattern of sermons and spiritual exercises on the themes of mortal sin, death, judgment and hell, with particular reference to the evils of sacrilegious confession, the unhappiness of sin and the occasions thereof, the effi-

[261] cf. Yves Congar, 'L'ecclésiologie, de la Révolution française au concile du Vatican, sous le signe de l'affirmation de l'autorité', *L'ecclésiologie au XIXe siècle* (Paris, 1960), pp. 77-114; 'Getting beyond the Ecclesiology of the Counter-Reformation', *Orate Fratres*, Vol. XXII (1947-8), pp. 502-3.

[262] P. Dabin, *Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans la tradition ancienne et moderne*, p. 389.

[263] 'We affirm, therefore, that the Church should be defined as a government and a state, for it is a true society, subsisting by itself and ordained to one end, by means of laws and shepherds proper to it, whence it draws its essence and its form.' (Guglielmo Audisio, *Diritto pubblico della Chiesa e delle genti Cristiane*, Rome, 1863, Vol. I, p. 25.) Cf. Robert A. Graham, *Vatican Diplomacy: A Study of Church and State on the International Plane* (Princeton, N.J., 1959), p. 221.

[264] Paul J. Palmer, 'The Lay Priesthood: Real or Metaphorical?', *Theological Studies*, Vol. VIII (1947), p. 575: cf. J.A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, pp. 106-9.

cacy of prayer and the example of our Lady.[265] The catechisms and works of pastoral theology of the same period develop these emphases under the debilitating influence of the Enlightenment, to produce an anthropocentric elevation of morality over faith: these works have little or nothing to say of the whole faithful people co-operating in the work of sanctification and the praise of God, precisely because they have a weakened grasp of the reality of grace itself, the mystery of Resurrection and Second Coming. The whole exposition is based on man's duties, the methods and techinques of avoiding sin and damnation under the guidance of 'the Church', and the mystical aspect of the Christian community is obscured because the saving act of God (which fundamentally *is* the Church) has been pushed out from the centre of moral theology.[266]

XIII

Contemporary Catholic theology has thus come to feel a need for restatement of two principal themes as the basis for a recovery of the doctrine of the Body of Christ in a form comprehensible to the modern world. In the doctrine of grace, since Trent 'emphasis has chiefly been laid, in theological teaching and devotional literature, on the moral and humanist side, to the detriment of the more Augustinian aspect of the Church's doctrinal heritage. Luther was wont to complain that Augustine was not taken more seriously. Those who, after Luther's time, tried to do so, very soon found themselves driven into a corner where the least indication of rigidity looked like heresy, because of their failure to fit authentic Augustinianism into scholastic categories quite uncongenial to it, and even the Thomists had some difficulty in clearing themselves from the accusation of Calvinism. Let us make no mistake, it was Molinism that triumphed in the end, itself opening the way to probabilism, which had not been discredited by its early misfortunes, so that we have on the whole, in theology and piety alike, a great emphasis on man's own moral

[265] cf. P. Hitz, *To Preach the Gospel* (tr. Rosemary Sheed, London, 1963), pp. 106-17; cf. p. 120: 'Coming to them from the New Testament, what one finds striking about these sermons is that they lack the Biblical historical structure, the centring upon Christ's Pasch, the orientation towards the Parousia, and the richness of mystery, that mark the apostles' kerygma.'

[266] cf. P. Hitz, *To Preach the Gospel*, pp. 117-30; A. Schrott, *Seelsorge im Wandel der Zeiten* (Graz-Vienna, 1949), pp. 113-50; F.X. Arnold, *Grundsätzliches und Geschichtliches zur Theologie der Seelsorge*, pp. 65-154; 'Das Gott-menschliche Prinzip der Seelsorge in pastoralgeschichtlicher Entfaltung', *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. CXXIII (1943), pp. 99-133; Vol. CXXIV (1944), pp. 57-80; M. Ramsauer, 'Der Kirche in den Katechismen', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Vol. LXXIII (1951), pp. 129-69, 313-46.

activity and a less marked sense of the supreme theocentrism of the great tradition, in fact, a one-sided working out of the Catholic heritage.' Similarly 'it has come about, especially since the end of the eleventh century, that the idea of the Church as the perfect *societas* and as a hierarchical and monarchical organism, has been progressively brought to the fore, and, in particular from the fourteenth century onwards, conflict with Gallican jurists led theologians to formulate more and more definitely the powers of the Church in this world and the prerogatives of the successors of St. Peter. Finally, since the sixteenth century, in the face of Protestantism and all its denials of the visible and human elements, apologists, controversialists and theologians (and the last are too often synonymous terms) have forcibly stressed the hierarchical and outward features of the Church, and the same reasons have led them to place preponderant emphasis on its juridico-social aspect... The [first] Vatican Council itself was obliged to some extent to carry on this one-sided development, since the tragic circumstances of July 1870 allowed of their defining only a part of the dogma of the Church which had, however, been very fully envisaged in a preparatory *schema*.'[267]

Of course, the trend of Catholic theology to one-sidedness in these respects has been not heretical but merely unhealthy, and there has often appeared, even at the heart of developments which now seem to be retrogressive, a movement of control and moderation which restricts the effect of wider movement in which it appears. For instance, 'the widespread assumption that there was one single canonistic theory of Church government which was adequately reflected in the works of such publicists as Giles of Rome or Augustinus Triumphus does scant justice to the richness and diversity of canonistic speculation in this field.'[268] The application of corporation theory to the Church could not only support but also limit the Papal-hierocratic ideal, subjecting the Pope to the common law of the corporation of which he was the head; and we are beginning to discern a well-established and orthodox tradition to that effect, considerably developed already in the twelfth century and leading naturally to the appeal to the underlying authority of the *congregatio fidelium* by which the Conciliarist reformers sought to heal the Great Schism in the Papacy (1378-1417).[269] Although the Conciliarists were

[267] Yves Congar, *Divided Christendom*, pp. 31-3. The *Schema de Ecclesia Christi* presented to the Fathers of the first Vatican Council on 21st January 1870 states that the primary characteristic, the very essence, of the Church is her quality as the mystical Body of Christ (cf. J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Paris-Arnhem-Leipzig, 1903-27, 1i, 539).

[268] Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory*, pp. 12-13.

[269] cf. Gratian, *Decretum*, xl, 6; Innocent III, *Sermones*, Migne, P.L., ccxvii, 656;

never able to escape from the *impasse* created by the need to have Papal legitimation for the Council whose jurisdiction over the Pope would allow it to determine which of the existing claimants to the Papacy, if any, was to be recognised by the whole of Christendom,[270] Conciliarism survived, in Spain and elsewhere, not as a theory but as a practical instrument of reform: the Spanish bishops did not much concern themselves with the theoretical question of Papal authority, but they saw in frequent General Councils a means of forcing the Papacy and the college of Cardinals to abide by reforming measures,[271] and the great sixteenth century Spanish political theorists – Victoria, de Soto, Suarez and Molina – discussed Papal power in a subdued manner precisely because they saw it, though of divine and not popular origin, as analogous to the government of a secular state and therefore requiring to be treated with the reservations and qualifications necessary to any structure of government.[272] The authors of the standard history of mediaeval political thought, weighing the importance of mediaeval conflicts for the European tradition of political theory, urge us to see, behind the unfamiliar points of dispute and the apparent struggle of one authoritarian system against another, a new recognition that there are aspects of human life which are not ultimately subject to external law or external authority, and that even the Church, for all her function of protecting the religious experience of her members, cannot herself place any final limitation on the Christian's individual relationship

Nicholas Cusanus, 'De concordia catholica', *Opera* (Basle, 1565), Vol. XVIII, p. 741; F. Zabarella, *Tractatus de Schismate* (ed. Shardius, *De jurisdictione, auctoritate et praeeminentia imperiali,* Basle, 1566), p. 708; V. Martin, *Les origines du Gallicanisme* (Paris, 1939), pp. 9-17; W. Ullmann, *Origins of the Great Schism* (London, 1948), pp. 183 ff.; Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory;* H.-X. Arquillière, 'L'appel au Concile sous Philippe le Bel et la génèse des théories conciliaires', *Revue des questions historiques,* Vol. XLV (1911), pp. 23-55.

[270] The Conciliarists 'were determined to unite the Church by giving it a single head, but precisely in order to bring about that result they had to assume that the Church could act as an effectively united organism even when it lacked such a head, to maintain, in effect, that the powers of the whole Church could be exercised by an authority other that the Pope... It seemed that Christendom could only be given a single Pope by a procedure which implicitly denied the unique competence of the Papacy; the steps necessary to end the Schism involved an attack on the very institution that had always been regarded as the indispensable keystone of ecclesiastical unity.' (Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory,* p. 240.)

[271] cf. H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent* (tr. E. Graf, Edinburgh-London, 1957-) Vol. I, pp. 41-2.

[272] cf. Bernice Hamilton, *Political Thought in Sixteenth-Century Spain* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 69-97, 164-6.

with God in service and worship.[273] It was therefore entirely in keeping with the mediaeval tradition that Catholic reformers of the sixteenth century should grapple with the monolithic legal system of the mediaeval Church as something which in some respects had hindered the spread of Christ's kingdom. Thus, in its *Consilium de emendenda Ecclesia*, presented in consistory on 9th March 1537, Pope Paul III's select committee – which included Cardinals Contarini, Pole and Sadoleto – felt it necessary to single out, as the first cause of the disorders which had provoked the new religious crisis, the flattery of the canonists who had told Popes that their word was law:

> 'Ita quod voluntas pontificis, qualiscunque ea fuerit, sit regula qua eius oparationes et actiones dirigantur; ex quo proculdubio effici ut quicquid libeat, id etiam liceat. Ex hoc fonte, sancte pater, tamquam ex equo Troiano, irrupere in ecclesiam Dei tot abusus et tam graves morbi, quibus nunc conspicimus eam ad desperationem salutis laborasse.'[274]

Nevertheless, conflicts are not important solely for the theory they establish; they also impose a form and a style on the society in which they arise, and we should not be blind to the defects of mediaeval Christendom which revealed themselves in the same conflicts. 'The transformation of Christianity itself into the established religion of a "sacral" society for a millenium after the conversion of Constantine was an anomaly which produced many anomalies, as well as all that we call Christian civilisation. Not least of these anomalies was the Inquisition and the *De haeretico comburendo* ... Yet the 'sacral' ideal has its attractions and the mediaeval ideal of the synthesis of Church and State is so impressive that we have been slow to see that it was an anomaly rather than a norm. But its departure should be a matter of rejoicing rather than for the nostalgic regrets of the apologists of the "Europe is the Faith" school.'[275] To espouse the sacral ideal would not merely be impractical for the modern world, but would run a serious risk of distorting the very conception of the Christian community – for 'whatever qualities might characterise a society which acknowledged God as its Supreme Sovereign, as did the human society of the Middle Ages, neither sin nor death were done away with, or could be done away with, by such a society. It seems, therefore,

[273] cf. R.W. and A.J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, Vol. III, pp. 6-9; Vol. V, pp. 451-5.
[274] cf. B.J. Kidd, *Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford, 1911), p. 308; H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, Vol. I, pp. 423-5.
[275] Victor White, 'Religious Toleration', *The Listener*, 30th July 1953.

that to confuse the bringing about of such a society, of such a state of the present world, with the coming of the Kingdom of God is to make a great mistake. The result of such a mistake must be the deterioration of the whole idea of the Kingdom, an impoverishment that takes away from it almost all its evangelical content.'[276] We have already seen how attempts to establish a theocratic society, whether by mediaeval canonists or by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Calvinists, have generated their opposite: they may develop a tremendous power to shape the history of a country or a continent, but we can rarely say that their achievement shapes human society nearer to the will of God.

The need for today seems to be for a sense of Christian community which does not conceal the relation of sacred and secular by uniting them in a subordination of the latter to the former. 'Only since the end of sacral Christendom, with its monastic and clerical set-up, have we been able to get the full measure of the extent and requirements of the secularity of things and of the fidelity we owe them',[277] and for a century and a half some of the most notable Catholic clergy and laity have struggled to establish the rights of the secular against 'the canonical point of view' which 'has increasingly taken over the mind of the clergy and become the essential determinant in their attitude to pastoral matters.'[278] 'We must dare to say that, in principle, a legalistic way of understanding the Gospel, on condition that it keeps itself within reasonable limits, is perfectly defensible and that it is also a means of progress; only we must also say it is palpable that between the Christian religion and law the correspondence is not complete, and all the verities of our doctrine are not equally susceptible of finding in law the kind of exposition which suits them. Our union with Christ in particular, pregnant with charity and piety, differs to the point of contrast from the rigidities with which the codes deal, and the legalistic spirit does not tend to speak of that union with fulness and force.'[279]

Modern theology, stemming from Moehler and Newman, has taken as one of its principal concerns the endeavour to show that there is no inherent contradiction between Christianity and any truly human value, and that the human ideal finds its completion in the man who is not closed in upon himself but open to God's gift of Himself in grace.[280] It has deve-

[276] Louis Bouyer, *Life and Liturgy* (Eng. tr., London, 1956), p. 259.
[277] Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p. 100.
[278] Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp. xxvi-xxvii.
[279] E. Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ*, Vol. II, p. 152.
[280] cf. J. Mourroux, *The Meaning of Man* (New York, 1948); J. Maritain, *True Humanism* (5th ed., London, 1950).

loped with increasing depth a criticism of any ecclesiology which tends to ignore the individual *charismata*,[281] and it has restored the doctrine of the mystical Body of Christ, in which the varying *charismata* receive their corporate completion in the saving act of Christ who, through the Spirit, lives in each of them. 'It may be said that the visible elements in the notion of the Body of Christ have receded in order to give an ever greater place to the invisible elements – the union of men with Jesus Christ either by sanctifying grace or by the grace of predestination.'[282] Recent discussions of the Petrine office and the collegiality of the episcopate even suggest a reform of the Catholic administrative outlook which would conform the Church's external structure more closely to its mission of incorporating all men in Christ,[283] and now that the kings and princes are gone who represented the lay people in all the Councils up to Trent, we may hope for a new system of representation of the corporate 'royal priesthood' in the present Council.[284]

The *schemata* and miscellaneous proposals before the second Vatican Council are many and varied. It is not clear that the Fathers will be able to deal with more than a fraction of them. We do not even know whether we may see the elementary reform of canon law whereby what the clergy have a duty to give will be re-defined as what the laity have a right to receive.[285] It is certain, however, that the will to reform and adapt, even though it proceed from the highest authority and mobilise prelates and theologians in its service, cannot become alive and effective without the co-operation of the lay people at large.[286] It is certain, too, that the Church cannot carry out any fruitful mission to the modern world if her lay members share within her what so many share outside her – the consciousness of being disinherited.[287] It is not enough for the Church to claim to give life and to favour lay initiative, nor even to be able to produce show-piece laity, which has never been difficult. The demand is for something both larger and deeper. As Paul Claudel says: 'The proof of bread is that it nourishes, the proof of wine is that it inebriates; the proof of truth is life; and the proof of life is that it makes one live.'[288]

[281] cf. K. Rahner, *Das Dynamische in der Kirche* (Freiburg, 1958), pp. 38-73.
[282] C. Liliane, 'Une étape en ecclésiologie', *Irénikon*, Vol. XIX (1946), p. 134.
[283] cf. K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *The Episcopate and the Primacy* (Eng. tr., (1962); H. Küng, *Strukturen der Kirche*, pp. 206-308.
[284] cf. H. Küng, *Strukturen der Kirche*, pp. 75-104.
[285] cf. Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp. xxv-xxvi.
[286] cf. Yves Congar, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Eglise*, p. 280.
[287] cf. A.G. Hebert, *The Form of the Church* (London, 1944), p. 68; W. Nutting, 'The Church's Proletariat', *Orate Fratres*, Vol. XXIII (1948-9), p. 70.
[288] Paul Claudel, *Positions et Propositions*, Vol. II, p. 136; qtd H. de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church.*

FIVE POEMS

By J. AQUILINA

ON A DISTINGUISHED DIPLOMAT

Here lies the skull not of Yorick but of a faithful man of rank
Who served the government of the day with exemplary loyalty,
Won confidences, distinctions, garters and medals galore,
From the highest authorities of the land and even from Royalty.
He was what one would call a very successful man of career.
To prosper so much he had to be terribly shrewd,
Cheating at the highest level for the sake of his masters;
By training, therefore, a hypocrite, though never vulgar or rude,
Till God had pity on him, relieved him of his monotonous duty,
And through the Gates of Death introduced him for the first time
To the ultimate Vision of Honesty and Beauty.
Here ends our rhyme.

Sweet passer-by
Stop for a while;
Turn not your back on the
Buried diplomat
But
Pray God for him and for all diplomats who cheat at high level,
That His favourite Angel, St. Michael, may save them from the Devil.

6.7.1958

THE CHASE

I chase a magnificent bird, blue-plumaged,
Red-breasted and heaven-eyed,
Swifter of nimble feet than wind, or
Romping clouds edged with
The tapestries of intricate lights.
I came all the way chasing it out of breath
With arms outstretched, camouflage of trees;
Calling it back with whistle, like a cuckoo,
But the bird flies on, to reach the wall
Of the outside garden before it grows dark,
And beyond
In time to go down,
With the setting sun:
My sunset – the sunset of the Bird of Youth.

14.1.1963

YOUTH AND AGE

Guard them well, those pirate treasures
That are your eyes;
Crackless mirror of Youth's pleasures:
Lovers' prize.

Guard them well, those garden creepers
That are your hands:
Intertwining avid feelers,
Shy demands.

Guard them well, those raven tresses
That are your hair
Falling down like warm caresses:
Laugh off cares!

Guard them well, those two curved petals
That are your lips.
Youth's own springs, like burning metals,
Jerk your hips.

Guard your Youth, and guard it whole –
Youth is magic.
Stir the embers, fan the coal –
Age is tragic.

19.3.1964

DEATH

Death should have eyes and pity, should have ears;
Eyes to admire the wonders of man's brains;
And ears to catch the thrill of sweet refrains
Which soothe the feverish brow, dispelling fears.
Death should have hands to feel the falling tears
Which flow from babies' eyes like silver grains;
To feel the lightness, or the weight of chains
Which bind our hands and feet, the thrust of spears.

But death, alas, is made of different stuff,
Made of the nerveless stuff of which are made
The soil we tread upon, hard flint and steel.
Death is the Hungry Beast at large, wild, gruff,
Pursuing Man and Time around a Wheel,
Of which all living nature is afraid.

3.4.1964

THE ESCAPE

"Stop now while you can! This is a long way
From the mountain you spied in the distance.
Do you know this is the Mansion of Despair,
The Mansion of the Thief
Who robs the eye of its iris
And the Rainbow of its seven sashes,
Whose regalia are the Seven Loots of Sin,
The Word and the Flesh,
The lust of the swine?"

Yes, I know – I know that God and I,
Moving in opposite directions
Like two thunderous winds
Have parted company; got out of each other's way.
I neither hear Him nor see Him in my mind's eye,
And when I cry I doubt if my shout
Falls into His bosom; but I know
That He still lights the Traveller's Torch on His mountain,
Sends urgent signals from His turrets
To the Valley of Despair,
But here, where evil spirits congregate
Like shadows at sunset,
Multiplying like the viruses of Cancer,
I cannot yet espy the Traveller's Torch
Lighting the wasteland and marshlands,
Lighting the long way back,
Because beyond the valley that holds me in thrall
There are crags and cliffs
Which tear the flesh of the knees.
I must be left alone now to study the layout
Of the Mansion of the Thief
Who robs the eye of its iris
And the rainbow of its seven sashes.
Pray God send me from his *Seven Workshops*
A ladder, hooks and spanners with a very long rope
To help me escape:
And of your goodness, God,
Take me back!

23. 4. 1964

L'INFLUENCE DE LA FEMME SUR LA LITTERATURE FRANCAISE

La poésie de cour: Marie de France, première poétesse francaise

By BIANCA FIORENTINI

DES le XIe siècle, les chansons de geste exercent leur rayonnement sur toute l'Europe. Il s'agit, pourtant, de récits qui ne sont souvent que la déformation de l'histoire. Charlemagne, le grand empereur «à la barbe fleurie» devient le chevalier de Dieu. La rude foi finit et voici l'amour, mais un amour qui indigne par sa grossièreté.

Le thème de l'amour, qui dans les chansons de geste n'a qu'un rôle secondaire, tient une grande place dans la littérature du Moyen Age. Deux traditions contraires se développent pourtant en ce qui concerne l'amour: la tradition gauloise, antiféministe, et la tradition idéaliste tendant à l'exaltation de la femme. Chez les auteurs des fabliaux, les femmes sont des êtres inférieurs parés de tous les vices. Mais, grâce à un changement dans les moeurs de la classe noble, grâce à la vie de cour et grâce enfin aux habitudes introduites par la propagande religieuse, le prestige des femmes s'accroît, de plus en plus, dans les divers milieux sociaux. Voilà donc qu'à la dérision s'oppose le culte de la femme: d'un côté, le «Roman de Renart»; de l'autre, la «Table Ronde».

L'intervention des femmes ramène à l'étude de l'amour, au souci de purifier la passion, à un intérêt tout nouveau pour l'analyse des sentiments et pour les nuances. Il va de soi que cette intervention élève sensiblement le niveau des moeurs. En effet, dans les cours royales, dans l'aristocratie du temps, les dames imposent une politesse raffinée, sensible à cette peinture minutieuse des mystères du coeur, qui annonce déjà les salons des Précieuses et «La Princesse de Clèves».

Les rapports individuels se nuancent de douceur et d'élégance et les femmes, prenant conscience de leur force, revendiquent leurs droits. Souvent le prestige de leur haute naissance, leur rôle littéraire, l'éducation qu'elles ont reçue, justifient leur influence, qui tend à s'exercer de plus en plus. Parmi les éléments de la nouvelle doctrine «courtoise» l'un des plus importants est la discipline de la passion sous le déguisement de l'entière soumission spirituelle du chevalier à la dame. L'amour de la femme devient le prix d'une laborieuse conquête, mais il s'agit d'amour «de tête» qui est «un art, une science et une vertu».

Des poètes anglo-normands et français s'emparent de cette nouvelle inspiration et écrivent à l'usage d'un public aristocratique: ils peignent les tableaux de la vie élégante et aristocratique, les fêtes, les tournois, les moeurs chevaleresques et nous donnent souvent d'intéressants détails sur la vie mondaine de cette époque encore assez mal connue.

Bien plus que dans le Nord, la femme joue un rôle considérable dans la création de la poésie provençale. L'art des troubadours (langue d'oc), qui se forme à la fin du XIe siècle, comprend d'abord presque toutes les passions humaines, puis il est restreint à l'exaltation de la femme. C'est grâce à la reine Aliénor d'Aquitaine – petite fille de Guillaume IX, reine de France et d'Angleterre – et à ses deux filles, Marie de Champagne et Aélis de Blois que Paris, Reims et Blois deviennent, au commencement du XIIIe siècle, des centres de poésie «courtoise». Les goûts littéraires des troubadours pénètrent dans les milieux aristocratiques du Nord et la femme gagne une place d'honneur dans la société. La Cour devient le foyer le plus important de la propagation du nouvel idéal poétique qui tend à codifier ses règles de conduite. Et c'est précisément cet idéal qui devait, après des siècles, éblouir l'Hôtel de Rambouillet et donner lieu à la poussée d'idéalisme qui aboutit à la Préciosité. Le «Lancelot» de Chrétien de Troyes – de cet écrivain le plus populaire de la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle – représente l'idéal chevaleresque. Les écrivains rivalisent entre eux et leurs brillantes réunions sont bientôt imitées ailleurs.

La masse prodigieuse d'oeuvres qui en résulte comprend des romans assez amples et des compositions plus brèves (de cent à mille vers), tristes et tendres – consacrées à des récits d'amour – qu'on appelle «lais», où la prose parlée alterne avec les vers chantés qu'accompagne le son d'une petite harpe celtique, la «rote». Les «lais», les romans de Tristan, les Romans de la Table Ronde, les romans du Saint-Graal répondent à un nouveau besoin de la société.

En vérité, la littérature du Moyen Age est très abondante. La dégradation des chansons de geste engendre des oeuvres diverses: les unes tirent leur origine des Croisades («cycle de la Croisade»); les autres des littératures antiques («cycle de l'Antiquité»). Mais les plus nombreuses forment le «cycle breton» qui offre à la littérature une source merveilleuse de rêve et de poésie. Il s'agit des récits des «trouvères» que des chanteurs ambulants, les «jongleurs», chantent dans les fêtes avec accompagnement de vieille (violon). Les harpeurs bretons propagent ainsi, dans la France du Nord, les aventures de leurs héros: Tristan et Yseult, Arthur et Guenièvre, Lancelot, Perceval.

Pourtant, si à l'auteur du «Chevalier à la Charrette» on doit les plus anciens romans arthuriens, nous devons à une femme, et précisément à

Marie de France, le plus ample recueil de «lais» qu'on possède – composé paraît-il de 1160 à 1170 environ. Mais, qui est cette femme mystérieuse qui nous montre une âme vibrant de vérité humaine et qui nous charme encore, après tant de siècles, par ses récits ingénus et delicieux? Est-elle une dame de haute naissance, ou bien, tout simplement une jongleresse? Comment a-t-elle pu écrire à une époque où les habitudes sociales et les préjugés rendent si difficile la vie à la femme?

Malheureusement, en dépit de bien des recherches, peu de documents nous renseignent sur la vie de la première poétesse française qui demeure encore dans le domaine de l'hypothèse. Dans l'épilogue de son «Isopet» elle déclare:

Marie ai nom, si sui de France.

Donc, d'après son dire, nous savons qu'elle est française. Nous savons encore qu'elle vit à la Cour de Henri II d'Angleterre et qu'elle tient à se dire «de France». Mais si elle tient à se dire «de France», ce n'est pas probablement pour souligner la pureté de sa langue – comme beaucoup d'écrivains ont affirmé mais, peut-être, veut-elle attester tout simplement son profond attachement à sa patrie.

Marie écrit ses «Lais» et ses «Fables» en Angleterre. Elle dédie ses «Lais» à un «nobles reis, ki tant estes pruz e curteis» – qui est probablement Henri II d'Angleterre second mari d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine – et ses «Fables» à un certain «Cunte William» qui est «le plus vaillant de nul realme». Sans doute, notre poétesse est très cultivée. En effet, Marie a une bonne connaissance du latin, car elle traduit le «Purgatoire de Saint Patrice»; elle a une excellente connaissance de l'anglais car elle traduit de l'anglais son recueil de fables, l'«Isopet». Elle nous montre aussi une connaissance profonde de la poésie courtoise, mais le facteur principal que l'on remarque dans son oeuvre est surtout cette éducation raffinée qui n'est possible à cette époque, qu'au contact de la cour et de la société élégante et polie.

Ce qui nous frappe d'abord dans l'oeuvre de Marie de France c'est sa préoccupation constante de donner de la vraisemblance à ses «cuntes». Parfois elle insiste avec énergie qu'elle les a «oi», «oï cunter»:

Les contes Ke jo sai verrais.
Dunt li Bretun unt fait les lais,
Vos cunterai assez briefment.
(Guigemar)

L'aventure Ke avez oïe
Veraie fu, n'en dutez mie.
(Bisclavret)

Les aventures que j'en sai
Tut par rime les cunterai.
(Yonec)

Talent me prist de remembrer
Un lai dunt jo oï parler.
L'aventure vus en dirai
E la cité vus numerai.
(Chaitivel)

Plus n'en oï, ne plus n'en sai,
Ne plus ne vus en cunterai.
(Chaitivel)

D'après ses propres expressions, il faut donc croire que Marie raconte simplement ses «aventures» sans rien inventer. En vérité, l'oeuvre de la poétesse présente des caractères qui sont communs dans la littérature de cette époque et d'autres qui lui sont personnels: elle puise dans la masse des légendes populaires, elle emprunte ses matériaux à cette pittoresque «matière de Bretagne» qui ravit les imaginations et qui inspire aussi Chrétien de Troyes et tant d'autres, elle est influencée par le Romans d'Enéas et de Thèbes, par le «Brut» de Wace, mais elle féconde ses récits par sa pensée, par ses observations psychologiques et morales, par ses peintures minutieuses du sentiment qui nous révèlent son âme de «femme» délicate et sincère.

En général c'est l'amour, avec ses mille nuances, qui domine dans les récits de Marie, mais un amour qui est une source de rêve tout en gardant sa pleine valeur humaine. Marie excelle, dans ses merveilleuses histoires d'amour, à traduire les émotions de son âme, à exprimer ce que la passion évoque en elle de mélancolique et de troublant. L'amour que la première poétesse française conçoit est fort, sérieux, presque mystique, sans cesser pourtant d'être sensuel et basé souvent, plus ou moins, sur l'adultère (Guigemar, Equitan, Yonec, Bisclavret, Laüstic, Milun, Eliduc, Chevrefoil). Ses accents sincères, mélancolique et tendres sont assez rares dans une époque où l'originalité manque à preque tous les poètes.

Dans l'oeuvre de la poétesse il n'y a rien donc de la conception de l'amour de son époque, c'est-à-dire, des laborieux raffinements de galanterie; le chevalier n'est pas l'humble esclave de sa dame, tel qu'il apparaît dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes: les rapports entre ses personnages gardent toujours une nature simple et affectueuse:

Il la cunforte ducement
Et dit que dols n'i vaut nïent.
(Yonec)

Dans ses vers Marie n'a mis que les peines et les joies de l'amour et la tendresse de coeurs doucement épris. En vérité, les héros et les héroïnes de Marie sont des êtres charmants luttant ensemble contre le sort et ces êtres se conservent une intacte fidélité jusqu'à la mort. Voilà le caractère qui donne un charme indéfinissable à l'oeuvre de la poétesse et qui nous touche si profondément. Dans le lai du Chevrefoil (Chèvrefeuille) – le plus connu peut-être des lais de Marie – l'amour de Tristan et de la reine Yseut est comparé à la vie du chèvrefeuille qui s'attache au coudrier; si l'on veut les désunir, le coudrier meurt et meurt aussi le chèvrefeuille:

Bele amie, si est de nus:
Ne vus sanz mei, ne mei sanz vus!
(Chevrefoil)

Les rapports des amants ne sont pas toujours de la même nature: passion dévote dans le Laûstic (Rossignol), exaltée dans Les Deus Amanz – où l'amour aboutit à la mort tragique des deux héros – , pathétique dans Yonec. Souvent les jouissances des héros de Marie sont basées sur l'amour illégitime mais, même dans ce cas, l'amour n'est jamais un sentiment fugitif et la plume de notre poétesse est capable d'insinuer dans nos coeurs une puissance de séduction qui nous fait vite oublier toute infidélité. Grâce à sa délicatesse, même les amours coupables nous semblent parfaitement honnêtes et, bien loin de les condamner, ils savent mériter notre sympathie et notre respect. En vérité, nous désirons avec Marie la réunion des protagonistes après tant d'obstacles et de souffrances.

Il y a des écrivains qui reprochent à Marie les qualités générales qu'elle attribue à ses personnages. A vrai dire, elle ne leur donne jamais une physionomie vivante et concrète:

Une dame de haut parage,
Franche, curteise, bele e sage.
(Guigemar)

La dame est bele durement
E de mut bon affeitement.
(Equitain)

La dame entra al palais;
Unques si bele n'i vient mais.
(Lanval)

Li reis ot une fille bele
E mut curteise dameisele.
(Les Deus Amanz)

De haute gent fu la pucele,
Sage, curteise e forment bele.
(Yonec)

Il avait une fille bele,
E mut curteise dameisele.
(Milun)

Mut par esteit bons chevaliers
Francs e hardiz, curteis e fiers.
(Milun)

A Kardoel surjurnot li reis,
Artur, li pruz e li curteis.
(Lanval)

A première vue ses portraits n'évitent pas la monotonie car aucun caractère particulier ne précise les qualités des protagonistes de ses récits Les vertus traditionnelles de ses héros – même les qualités du Roi Arthur – correspondent, on le voit bien, à la conception poétique du Moyen Age chevaleresque. Les femmes de Marie sont invariablement «beles», «curteises», «franches» et «sages» et les chevaliers sont invariablement «francs», «hardiz» mais surtout «pruz» et «curteis»: voilà, donc, l'idéal de la dame et celui du chevalier accompli de cette époque. Mais, sous cette apparente monotonie, c'est l'analyse de l'amour qui sait donner la vie à ces êtres qui nous semblent d'abord de vapoureux fantômes au milieu d'une nature de rêve où les biches font entendre leur voix, où les hommes se transforment en oiseaux pour pénétrer par la fenêtre auprès de leurs belles. Les personnages de la poétesse française n'ont pas, il est vrai, une couleur extérieure mais ils nous font partager tant d'émotions diverses.

Avant Marie, personne n'a représenté, avec une gravité si sérieuse, les différents aspects de l'âme humaine. Marie s'occupe de démêler, d'analyser les sentiments, d'en distinguer les nuances et les sources. Elle aborde des problèmes dont elle peut-être ne soupçonne pas l'importance: ce sont ces mêmes problèmes qu'on peut trouver, au XVIIe siècle, dans les réunions de la société précieuse. Et c'est peut-être encore à son insu que le monde charmant qu'elle nous présente révèle sa nature intime par un indéfinissable parfum de sincérité et de naïveté. En effet, elle découvre et décrit les nuances qui indiquent les états et les degrès successifs de l'amour. Ses vers – il faut le reconnaître – n'ont pas d'ardeur mais on voit pourtant tout de suite que la grande affaire de Marie est de peindre l'âme humaine.

Comme dans le roman de Mme de Lafayette, la passion que Marie nous

montre, absorbe deux êtres jusqu'à la mort. En vérité, pour elle l'amour n'est ni tragique, ni ridicule, mais c'est un sentiment vrai, profond, mélancolique qui s'épanche avec une grâce charmante. Il y a plus d'un trait de ressemblance entre Marie et d'autres femmes écrivains: on retrouve les mêmes traits de sincérité dans l'oeuvre de Christine de Pisan, de Louise Labé, de Marguerite de Navarre, d'Hélisenne de Crenne ainsi que dans les «Contes Amoureux» de Mme Jeanne Flore. On retrouve le même goût d'analyse du coeur humain chez les précieuses en général et chez Mlle de Scudéry en particulier, mais il y a pourtant une différence: les analyses de Marie ne sont jamais abstraites ou desséchées – comme il arrive souvent dans l'oeuvre des Précieuses – car elle reste toujours dans la réalité. Dans le Lai d'Equitan il y a même des traits qui nous permettent de comparer l'amour de Marie à l'amour douloureux qu'on retrouve dans l'oeuvre de Racine.

Marie apporte dans la vie littéraire un fait nouveau considérable: la littérature s'achemine vers l'expression de vérité et s'oriente vers l'universel car, en vérité, aucun sujet n'est plus intéressant à développer que l'âme humaine et l'âme d'aujourd'hui, il faut le remarquer, est pareille à l'âme d'il y a mille ans. L'oeuvre de la première poétesse française est donc, à la fois, et un rêve poétique et une oeuvre profondément humaine. Elle ne manque pas même d'élévation morale. Marie abandonne les amants aux lois naturelles de l'amour; elle ne leur donne point un platonisme incroyable, mais elle peint des amants qui méritent, par la constance de leur sentiment, tout notre espect. Laissant la peinture abstraite du monde courtois et la peinture ridicule du monde bourgeois, elle développe les sentiments, elle vise évidemment à nous donner l'illusion de la vie réelle, du «fait vécu». Mais elle ne laisse guère de place aux vices et aux instincts brutaux: bien au contraire, le monde de Marie est composé d'eléments très délicats. Rien n'est, en effet, plus délicat que le lai du «Laustic» (Rossignol):

> Une dame et un chevalier s'aiment, mais la dame est surveillée car son mari est jaloux. La nuit, lorsque son mari est couché, la dame accoudée à la fenêtre, au clair de la lune, peut contempler son ami. Mais elle se lève si souvent que son mari lui en demande la raison. «C'est pour entendre chanter le rossignol» répond la dame. Son mari, furieux, tue l'oiseau. Triste et affligée, la dame prend le petit corps du rossignol et l'envoie à son ami enveloppé dans un mouchoir brodé en lettres d'or. Le chevalier comprend le désespoir de la dame et place l'oiseau dans une boîte d'or garnie de pierres précieuses.

Si on analyse le contenu de cette forme originale de l'amour dont Marie

a enrichi la littérature, il n'est pas difficile de voir que les éléments moraux dominent dans la conception de Marie. Dans l'oeuvre de notre poétesse on voit même un certain désir de purifier la passion, de la mettre au-dessus des sentiments et des conventions humaines et, en exaltant le sacrifice, de lui donner des liens éternels: voilà, donc, une oeuvre qui nous offre une grande richesse psychologique et morale, d'un souffle vraiment moderne.

L'oeuvre de la première poétesse française est une source d'inspiration à beaucoup d'écrivains au XIIIe et au XIVe siècle. Bien des lais, anonymes ou non, nous sont parvenus mais, à l'exception de quelques lais qui ont précédé ceux de Marie, les autres en sont une imitation. Gautier d'Arras – le rival de Chrétien de Troyes – reprend le sujet du lai d'«Eliduc» dans son «Ille et Galeron» (vers 1167). Jean Renart – le brillant auteur de l'«Escoufle» et de «Guillaume de Dole» – dans son «Lai de l'Ombre» (écrit semble-t-il vers 1220) s'inspire du lai de «Lanval» de Marie. Thomas – cet écrivain qui vit en Angleterre dans l'entourage de Henri II et d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine – dans la fin du roman le «Tristan en prose» (qui date du XIIIe siècle), lorsqu'il décrit la mort de Tristan et Yseut, ses vers imitent ceux du lai du «Chèvrefeuille» de Marie. Même le «Renart le Contrefait» (XIVe siècle) semble inspiré du lai du «Laustic». Mais c'est «Yonec», peut-être, le plus populaire des lais de Marie et il est devenu fameux, non seulement en France mais partout, sous le nom de l'«Oiseau bleu», immortalisé dans les «Contes nouvelles ou les Fées à la Mode» (1698) de la Baronne d'Aulnoy. Ce n'est donc pas sans raison que Marie passe pour avoir inventé le lai narratif.

Il faut remarquer pourtant que les lais qui nous sont parvenus ne nous offrent jamais la grâce et le charme de ceux de Marie. Bien que le style de la première poétesse française soit un peu grêle, malgré même quelques maladresses et quelques guacheries, elle sait donner à ce genre nouveau – qui se distingue du roman par sa brièveté – un goût inoubliable. Ses lais sont, en effet, les plus riches en suggestions, les plus goûtés du public, les plus imités.

Les fables d'animaux que Marie traduit en français dans son «Ysopet» proviennent d'Esope, des poèmes de Renart ou doivent leur matière à la tradition orale du peuple. Cette société d'animaux, créée pour amuser, nous montre, en vérité, les luttes féodales – seigneurs, savants, sorciers, vilains, bourgeois: tout passe devant nos yeux. Dans les luttes, les méfaits et les malheurs des animaux on voit des ressemblances. Les temps sont durs. Comme on remarque plus tard chez Christine de Pisan, la marque sensible de la sympathie de Marie est pour les humbles. Marie recommande aux seigneurs la justice et la modération; sur les misères

des humbles elle verse des larmes de tendresse, mais point de haine du reste. Ce qu'elle prêche ce n'est pas la rébellion contre les usages; elle veut éviter le mal ou le subir avec résignation. Elle demande aux pauvres la soumission et le sacrifice dans la vision de Dieu. Il faut prier Dieu – nous dit-elle – «que de nous face son plaisir».

Après Marie, ces histoires se multiplient et inspirent toute une littérature allégorique, satirique et morale.

L'histoire littéraire ne pourra jamais négliger cette poétesse mystérieuse – à propos de laquelle un écrivain de son temps affirme qu'elle était «mult loée» et sa «rime par tut amée» – car l'influence exercée sur tant d'écrivains lui confère une place distinguée dans la littérature. Elle n'appartient, il faut le répéter, ni à la littérature galante et emphatique, ni à la littérature triviale et burlesque: en effet, elle semble protester contre les excès et les faussetés de l'une et de l'autre. Elle enseigne les harmonies secrètes du coeur humain. On peut bien dire qu'elle a rendu un grand service à la littérature.

POETI MALTESI VIVENTI

Di G. CURMI

II. KARMENU VASSALLO[1]

CI TROVIAMO, senza dubbio, di fronte a un poeta autentico.

Perchè Karmenu Vassallo non soltanto scrive da poeta, ma pensa e sente da poeta anche quando non scrive versi, anche quando parla con gli amici.

E più sensitivo d'una lastra fotografica, ma dimentica i torti subiti in meno di due minuti; s'adombra per ogni nonnulla, peggio d'un mulo quando vede un ostacolo, ma è poi calmo e sereno più d'un tramonto estivo su tranquilli mari. Brontola sempre di tutto e di tutti, si lamenta d'ogni cosa, anche se passa una mosca, crede che i dolori e le angustie della vita siano stati creati appositamente ed unicamente per lui: ma ha un cuore d'oro, e la sua compagnia è deliziosa. E buono sino all'inverosimile, e non si può non amarlo.

Senza volerlo, tratteggiando rapidamente il suo ritratto spirituale, ho dato l'essenza della sua poesia. E se questo è vero – ed è indubbiamente vero – significa che Karmenu Vassallo è realmente poeta.

Egli cominciò il suo tirocinio letterario scrivendo in Italiano, e nel luglio del 1934 vinse un concorso di poesia bandito dalla *Gazzetta Letteraria* (Vittoria, Sicilia) coi versi *Ricordando Giacomo Leopardi,* per cui venne lodato dalla Giuria come 'poeta-filosofo dalla penna d'oro, la cui lirica è permeata di luce e di profonda dottrina.' Nel 1935 dedicò una poesia a Ada Negri e la Poetessa così lo ringraziò con una lettera in-

[1] Karmenu Vassallo nacque a Siggiewi (Malta) il 18 marzo 1913. Fu Deputato nel Parlamento Maltese dal 1945 al settembre 1946. Insegnò il Maltese al Liceo dal 1947 al 1956. Oggi è membro del Comitato Governativo per le trasmissioni scolastiche radiofoniche. Le sue principali opere sono: *Poesia:* (1) *Nirien (Fiamme),* 1938. (2) *Kwiekeb ta' Qalbi (Stelle del mio cuore),* 1944. (3) *Hamiem u sriep (Colombe e serpenti),* 1959. *Prosa: Alla taz-zghazagh (Il dio dei giovani) – critica* – 1939. (2) *Metrika Maltija (Metrica maltese),* 1940. (3) *Sant Injazju minn Loyola (San Ignazio di Loyola),* 1946. (4) *Is-Salib Imqaddes fl-Arti (Il Crocifisso nella Arte),* 1957. (5) *Mill-Art ghas-Sema (Dalla terra al cielo), e le due seguenti traduzioni:* (6) *Grajja ta' zewgt Ibliet,* dall'Inglese *A tale of two cities,* di Charles Dickens, 1950, e (7) *Riefnu,* dall'italiano *Bufera,* del Dottor Giovanni Curmi, 1956.

viatagli il 30 ottobre 1935: 'Egregio Signore, ho letto con commozione la poesia a me dedicata *Alla poetessa Ada Negri.* Col mio grazie accolga i miei voti più schietti. Devotamente, Ada Negri.'

Nella sua prima giovinezza, Karmenu Vassallo scrisse anche poesie latine, e un suo poemetto *Horrifica Chorea!* gli valse la lode di Alfredo Bartoli, il quale da Firenze cosi scrisse al Poeta il 29 ottobre 1935: 'Ella, come pare, è ancora molto giovane. Ha però dei bei versi: e i suoi esametri, in generale, sono scorrevoli ed eleganti. Coltivi sempre più e sempre meglio la Musa di Virgilio e vedrà che i suoi versi latini, a forza di esercizio, riusciranno sempre più andanti e sostenuti. Si abbia, intanto, una parola d'incoraggiamento e un saluto, anche per la cara e gloriosa Isola del miele e delle rose, e mi creda: Suo Devmo., Alfredo Bartoli.'

Naturalmente oggi Karmenu Vassallo considera queste composizioni italiane e latine come peccatucci della giovinezza, e non le ricorda più, o almeno non ne fa sfoggio.

In Maltese Karmenu Vassallo ha pubblicato tre raccolte di liriche e il titolo di ciascuna raccolta ne riflette il contenuto, e interpreta e condensa il significato morale delle liriche ivi racchiuse: *Fiamme* (Nirien), 1938; *Stelle del mio cuore* (Kwiekeb ta' Qalbi), 1944; *Colombe e serpenti* (Hamiem u Sriep), 1959.

Riporto, traducendolo naturalmente, il primo paragrafo della Premessa che egli fece alla sua prima raccolta, *Fiamme:* 'Gli scrittori nel mondo non sono stati mai pochi; però quelli che scrivono bene e con giudizio, non sono stati mai troppi; e se quelli che scrivono bene e con giudizio non sono stati mai troppi, cosa dunque si dovrebbe dire intorno al numero di coloro che sempre ed ovunque scrissero come davvero sentirono e non il contrario?'

Ho riportato questo paragrafo perchè secondo me esso rileva una delle principali caratteristiche di tutta la lirica vassalliana: la sincerità. E, davvero, Karmeno Vassallo scrive come sente.

La raccolta *Fiamme* è divisa in sei parti, e ciascuna parte porta un sottotitolo che ben interpreta il contenuto delle liriche ivi riportate: *Liberazione* (Helsien), *Esilio* (Turufnament), *Luci* (Dawl), *Amore* (Imħabba), *Scoramento* (Qtigħ il Qalb), *Io* (Jien).

Benchè tutte le liriche di questa raccolta siano forti e sostenute, e quasi tutte abbiano uno sfondo filosofico, la parte più bella, perchè più naturale, più spontanea e più rappresentative, è, secondo me, l'ultima parte, quella intitolata *Io.* E non poteva essere diversamente, essendo il Vassallo principalmente un poeta lirico: e come tale non poteva non riuscire sommo quando parla di se stesso.

Da questa ultima parte di *Fiamme* traduco – temo non sempre molto

fedelmente[2] – quattro liriche, e le riporto quasi senza alcun commento. Soltanto sottolineo che le prime due poesie rivelano potentemente la sua personalità e che questa sua personalità si basa principalmente su due fattori: il suo orgoglio di poeta e la sua solitudine. Orgoglio e solitudine che risultano poi come conseguenza naturale e logica d'un sentimento unico predominante: quello di sentirsi poeta. Perchè è questo sentimento che lo rende fierissimo, lo fa diverso dagli altri uomini e lo allontana da tutti. Infatti egli si sente quasi un dio, perchè crea dal nulla, colla sua sola fantasia, nuovi mondi e nuovi cieli.

UN ALTRO DIO!
(Alla Ieħor!)

Io mi nutro col pane del pensiero
e della vita, e l'acqua bevo eterna
dal fonte degli dei di Poesia.

Poeta anch'io, la mia mente fiamma
multicolore, e il petto un mar d'amore,
a volte anch'io mi sento un altro dio!

Poichè creai anche io dal mio nulla
e mari e cieli ed altre ed altre terre,
e mondi nuovi senza tempo e fine,

di giovanile fiamma sol nutriti
nuovi mondi che giran nei miei sogni
con mente e cuor di vate che non muore!

A..... ?
(Lil..... ?)

Cane, figlio di cani; ed il tuo cuore
sa dell'erba fangosa dei pantani...
Se non ti maledice il Creatore,
io in sua vece ti maledirò.

[2] Mi viena la voglia di riportare qui la lettera che inviai al Poeta il 17 settembre 1962 mentre traducevo le sue poesie: 'Carissimo, come tu sai, io ti ho voluto sempre molto bene. Di questi giorni però io sono arrabbiatissimo contro di te. E il bello è che tu non ci hai alcuna colpa. Sto traducendo – o almeno tentando di tradurre – alcune tue liriche. Come sono difficili a tradurre! Forse tu mi chiedi, ma perchè mi scrivi questo? Per sfogarmi, ecco, semplicemente per sfogarmi. E anche per prendere un po' di sosta in questo lavoro infame di cui mi sono sobbarcato, e per dirti che, mentre le tue liriche costituiscono una gioia per che le legge, sono una vera disperazione per chi le vuole tradurre. Ave! Gianni.'

Grullo sei tu: perchè il tuo cuore è duro;
e perchè non pietoso, non sei grande.
Io mi sento un gran re, quantunque povero;
tu, invece, schiavo sei della dovizia.

Io morrò presto; ma tu no: malvagia
erba cattiva, dicesi, non muore.
Col tuo corpo il tuo nome andrà sepolto;
nel sole il nome mio si scriverà!

Io
(Jien)

Non potevo essere altri o un'altra cosa?
Allor perchè son venuto io al mondo?
Mi risponda chi sa; io da gran tempo
Io ricerco nel libro del creato.

Non potevo esser scheggia o seme in campo?
Non potevo essere ape o un uccellino?
O pietra nel più bel tempio di Dio?
O goccia, e come goccia disseccare?

Perchè venni io? E come venni? Quale
ebber diritto i miei a procrearmi?
Obbligo quale a seminar mia vita
in un mare di spine e senza fiori?

Io non lo so. Iddio lo sa. Io vivere
devo e morire immerso nel creato:
con l'angoscia di viver come un morto,
e di restar qual son senza volerlo.

Fuoco
(Nirien)

Chi la vita mi diede il cuore acceso
e fiammante ebbe e ardente come il fuoco.
Frutto è stata mia madre dell'amore:
e figlio dell'amor son io ancora.

Come il cuor da cui nacqui il mio cuor sente:
d'amore ho il cuore, ed è il mio amore fuoco.
Non ho mai nulla, eppure nel mio cuore
tutto quello che voglio io vi ritrovo.

Sono un incendio: e questo libro mio
con versi lo forgiai che schizzan fiamme.
Specchio della mia vita è questo libro:
e bene testimonia quale io sono.

Questo non significa che non ci siano anche poesie molto belle, sia per contenuto che per ritmo, nelle altre parti in cui è diviso il volume *Fiamme,* Ecco ad esempio la seguente lirica che inizia la terza parte della raccolta, ed è intitolata appunto come il sottotitolo della stessa *Luci* (Dwal):

Vedetemi la sera
dalla finestra sporgermi e guardare,
guardare solo – o meglio cogli amici,
i miei pensieri –
le luci che nuotan negli aloni;
luci bianche
seminate su quiete città.

Che dolcezza! Che bellezza!
Chi esprimer può quel che il mio cuore sente
in quei momenti!

Sulle città cosparse quelle luci
sembrano un altro cielo pieno d'astri
che pascolano sulla terra!
Le immagino giardini tutti fiori
color di fior d'arancio e gelsomini.

Un mare sembran quelle luci:
un mar d'argento
che bacia le sponde.

In questo calmo mare naufragare
e tra luci di gioia e di bellezza
lasciatemi morire.

oppure questa altra lirica che immediatamente la segue e che porta il titolo *Sù, andiamo* (Ejja mmorru):

Sù, andiamo;
sù, andiamo;
sù, andiam noi due insieme.

Da tempo Maggio
in mezzo al verde
con voce dolce
chiama noi per tutti i luoghi.

Sù, andiamo;
sù, andiamo;
Sù, andiam noi due insieme,

Suoni tu ed io canto;
cantiam insieme e insiem suoniamo.
Terra e ciel di noi gioiscono;
con noi giubila il creato!

Sotto noi tappeti verdi;
davanti a noi danze di rose;
canti e suoni negli orecchi:
e dovunque un solo incanto!

In un Nuovo Regno andiamo; dove noi nessuno vede.
Nella Terra della Gioia, ove il dolor non ci raggiunge.
Nella Terra della Vita, dove morte non soggioga.

Sù, andiam noi due insieme,
dove spazio non esiste, dove non esiste tempo:
dove in mezzo al suono e al canto
insiem vivremo e abiteremo.

Sù, andiamo;
sù, andiamo;
sù andiam noi due insieme.

E quest'altra breve lirica: *Aprimi, mamma!* (Iftaħli, Ma!) che chiude la quinta parte del libro intitolata *Scoramento* (Qtigħ-il-Qalb):

La porta aprimi, mamma! Io busso. Aprimi.
Per morire di sete sto e di fame.
La porta aprimi, mamma!

La porta aprimi, mamma!
Raggiunto m'hanno i cani e i lupi. Aprimi.
La porta aprimi, mamma!

La porta aprima! A brani mi faranno.
Più delle iene son feroci gli uomini.
La porta aprimi, mamma!

E questa quartina che estraggo dalla lirica *Alla ragazza del mio amore* (Lit-tfajla ta' Mħabbti):

Non sai, non sai, ragazza del mio amore,
che sentir per te può cuor di poeta;
e mente accesa dalla poesia
quante innalza per te mura ed abbatte.

E la chiusa della bellissima lirica *Sempre... mai!* (Dejjem... Qatt!):

Non so... Benchè nel petto mio il canto
gorgogli sempre e niuno mai lo fermi,
gialle le mie speranze e ravvizzite
sono e saranno, e non verdeggian mai.

E la chiusa di *Solo* (Waħdi), dedicata alla poetessa Ada Negri 'poetessa italiana tutta amore per l'umanità', probabilmente come reazione alla sua poesia *Rosa Germani*[3] apparsa sul *Malta Letteraria* di Marzo 1935.

Solo mi sento, e solo rimarrò:
e non aumenterò la specie umana:
Solo mi sento, e solo rimarrò:
giovin poeta per la vita morto.

E queste due quartine di *Solo tu* (Inti biss) in cui sostiene che soltanto la giovinezza lo salvò dalla cattiveria degli uomini e dalle avversità del destino:

.....

Mi trovai tra le fiere
sotto la forma d'uomini e il vestito....
per scomparir del tutto io stavo
di viver mi restavan sol pochi attimi

.....

Mi compatì nessuno.
Chi mi promise assai, fumo mi diede.
Nessuno riconoscer mi voleva
come poeta o dei pensieri re.

Solo tu....dalla morte mi scampasti!

[3] La contadina di Trebiano che aveva dato alla luce il diciassettesimo figlio.

Riporto anche da questa raccolta l'ultima quartina di *Rinnegamento* (Ċaħda), una poesia di dieci quartine, che ottenne il primo premio nel concorso bandito dalla rivista *Malta Missionaria,* nel maggio del 1937. Dopo aver fatto un contrasto tra le bellezze naturali dell'Isola e la barbarie della terra ove si reca il missionario maltese, il Poeta conclude con questa osservazione, o meglio, con questo giustissimo commento: il sacerdote ha abbandonato la sua isola bella, l'ha rinnegata, ma per la sua opera, la terra lontana, la terra prima selvaggia e idolatra, è ora felice, perchè si è convertita al Cristianesimo:

Niun mai la rinnegò; lui la sconobbe
l'isola dolce degli aranci e rose.
Però non più atterrisce, ed alla Croce
abbracciata, felice è quella terra.

Nell'Antologia Universitaria *La Musa Maltese* (Il-Muża Maltija) il professore Aquilina così commenta *Fiamme:* 'Violento nell'ispirazione è Karmenu Vassallo che bene intitolò *Fiamme* una delle sue raccolte di poesie, fiamme d'un cuore tormentato, fiamme d'un cuore in lotta con se stesso, fiamme d'un cuore in lotta col mondo – la lotta dell'uomo che soffre, dell'uomo che fu schiacciato da quella crudeltà che affligge il cuore sensitivo d'un poeta... però la violenza di Karmenu Vassallo non è la violenza dell'odio e dell'invidia, ma di chi molto ama e si sente ferito nel suo amore.'

Stelle del mio cuore (Kwiekeb ta' Qalbi) 1944, la seconda raccolta di poesie di Vassallo, contiene principalmente versi dedicati alla moglie e ai figli. Riporto la chiusa di tre liriche.

A MIO FIGLIO HERMAN-BARUCH
(Lil Ibni Herman-Baruch)

.....

Ricordati, mio figlio, che ti chiami
Guerrier di Pace!
Quindi lotta è il tuo destino;
e Vittoria di pace è il tuo dovere!
La tua vita, com'è la vita umana,
non è che una battaglia senza fine.
Con il tuo Dio
sempre con te,
senza timor lotta, combatti e vinci,
dà gioia al tuo paese e pace e bene!

A MIA MOGLIE
(Lil Marti)

.....
..... Maria,
tu che parte di me sei divenuta,
sappi che i figli, quando noi morremo,
continueranno in lor la nostra vita,
e la trasmetteranno ai loro figli,
ed ai figli dei figli, senza fine.
Così del tutto non morremo, e sempre
l'ora benedirem che ci ha legati
con radici d'amore cosi salde –
quell' amore da cui noi dar giurammo
a Dio Santi ed alla Patria eroi.

NEL GIORNO DELLA SUA MORTE[4]
(F'Jum Mewtha)

.....
Io t'amavo davvero, ed il mio amore
continuerò ad aumentar per te:
giurai di tutto far per il tuo bene:
chè i miei sogni più belli erano in te.
Però i castelli delle mie speranze
io li ho sulla sabbia costruiti:
e caddero d'un tratto
al primo soffio di vento:
e io restai col mio sogno di follia.

C'è, tra l'altro, in questa raccolta, una poesia potente, e piuttosto lunga, da cui traduco alcune quartine:

PHTHISIS!

Giovin ti vidi, colmo il petto, il volto
acceso come fuoco,

Eri un'ammalata di tubercolosi. Assieme a te c'erano parecchie altre donne ricoverate in quell'asilo, e tutte attendevano la guarigione,

Bella ti vidi come rosa, e gli occhi
sopra di te fissai...

[4] La figlia del Poeta, Rosanna, morta il 21 aprile 1941. Aveva un mese e diciassette giorni.

Creder non volli fossi tu malata
benchè là dentro fosti.

Certo, attendendo la guarigione, tu ricordi i giorni lieti, quando, ancora sana, sognavi l'amore. Io non vorrei farti piangere, ricordandoti queste cose:

Nessuno al mondo quanto me, ti dico,
può mai, anche se vuole,
commiserarvi tanto e compatirvi,
e volveri del bene.

Ti dico esser vorrei, più che poeta,
il medico più dotto
che al mondo fosse, intento a sol trovare
rimedio a questo morbo.

Ti vorrei vedere guarita, correre per la casa affaccendata, cucire, lavare e rattoppare i vestiti e stirarli ben bene.

E preparare il desco per la cena,
perchè il marito e tu
mangiaste insieme il pane guadagnato
col suo duro lavoro.

E poi dormire e svegliarti col desiderio d'essere madre, e di sentire il vagito del primo nato.

Scordato avresti del passato l'ansie,
e mille volte e mille
benedetto colui che per guarirti
sudato avrebbe sangue.

Ma dentro ancor tu stai, sotto la cura
dell'aria e del riposo,
con la sola speranza, stolta e vana,
che tu guarisca un giorno.

La nota di tristezza che pervade le due precedenti raccolte di poesie di Vassallo la riscontriamo pure – e si fa forse anche più intensa – nella sua ultima raccolta *Colombe e serpenti* del 1959. Anche qui predomina la filosofia pessimista, per cui molti hanno chiamato Karmenu Vassallo il Leopardi maltese.

E vero che Vassallo canta spesso la tristezza e l'inutilità della vita, è vero che egli mette uno sfondo filosofico in parecchie delle sue poesie,

è vero che egli spesso inserisce versi leopardiani in principio alle sue poesie, però del Leopardi secondo me egli ha ben poco.

Anche il Leopardi, è vero, canta la vanità umana dei libri sacri, ma è una vanità delle cose terrene senza Dio. Ora, togliendo Dio dalla 'vanitas vanitatum', non si avrà più il Vangelo Cristiano, ma si avrà un Vangelo opposto, il Vangelo della disperazione. Nelle poesie di Vassallo la disperazione non c'è mai, e Dio ricorre continuamente, e spesso è circondato dalla sua corona di Angeli e di Santi.

Neanche nella metrica è Vassallo leopardiano. Raramente egli adopera l'endecasillabo sciolto, e quando lo adopera, non è l'endecasillabo leopardiano, ma caso mai quello del Monti. Per la pletora delle parole io rassomiglierei Vassallo piuttosto al D'Annunzio, e al Carducci per la forza dell'invettiva. Però aggiungo subito: per argomento, la poesia del Vassallo non ha assolutamente nulla in comune con la poesia dannunziana, e per contenuto la sua invettiva non è affatto carducciana, perchè senza punta.

Secondo me, Vassallo s'accosta al Leopardi soltanto in questa quartina che tolgo dalla poesia *L'ultima lotta* (L-aħħar Taqbida):

> Come potrei non pianger nei miei versi
> se i miei versi rispecchiano me stesso?
> Come potrei non maledir mia sorte
> e la morte desiare innanzi tempo?

Anche in questa sua ultima raccolta, *Colombe e serpenti,* Vassallo continua ad essere eminentemente poeta lirico, e molte delle sue poesie, come nelle due precedenti raccolte, sono autobiografiche. Cosi sono in gran parte autobiografiche le liriche *Ricordi della mia fanciullezza* (Tifkiriet ta' Tfuliti); *Al vento settentrionale* (Lir-Riħ Fuq), in cui ci racconta la sua vita dall'infanzia con la zia (i suoi genitori erano morti lasciandolo bambino) sino al giorno della sua vocazione sacerdotale, e quindi il ritorno a casa, e il matrimonio e la lotta per la vita, e infine l'epoca quando si diede alla politica e venne eletto rappresentante del popolo nel *Consiglio di Governo; La valle degli Olivi* (Il-Wied taż-żebbuġ), in cui lo vediamo giocare con altri ragazzi della sua stessa età, ma col pensiero già tormentato dai principali problemi della vita, tra cui quello del sesso; ed altre, come *La Musa* (Il-Musa), *Ora che...* (Issa li...); *A Gaspare Pace* (Lil Gaspare Pace).

Questa ultima lirica comincia cosi:

> Pria che alla polve il corpo rendi e l'anima
> non so, credimi, a chi,

vorrei, Gaspare Pace,
confidar le mie angosce a te a agli uomini.

Iddio creò buona ogni cosa: sono gli uomini, malvagi, che hanno trasformato il mondo in un inferno. In verità, la lotta tra il Bene e il Male, aveva incominciato anche prima della venuta dell'uomo nel mondo:

E nei cieli infuriò la prima lotta
aspra tra le più aspre,
ma le forze del male
furon da San Michele sgominate.

Poi venne l'uomo sulla terra, poi Cristo e la Redenzione:

Questo, amico, è lo specchio di mia Fede.
Ma la mia mente, a volte,
s'oscura come il sole,
e come il ciel: rigurgita di dubbi.

E farnetica e all'anima mia chiede:
Perchè sin dal principio
travolto fu il primo uomo
come travolge un turbo una farfalla?

.....

Pria che peccasser perchè Adamo ed Eva
figli non dieder salvi?

Perchè, si domanda il Poeta, l'esistenza di tanto male nel mondo? Perchè esiste l'odio, l'invidia, l'avidità? E perchè il dolore e la morte? Credere bisogna. Nella nostra Fede troviamo la risposta a tutte queste domande. Anche il Poeta, però, stregato dai sogni, era corso dietro il miraggio ingannevole della vita, ma vi aveva trovato un abisso:

Però leggera come piuma e aulente,
dal Oriente venne
e mi cullò la brezza
che Dante avea cullato e San Francesco.

Soltanto la poesia ci consola delle bruttezze e degli inganni della vita, e ci solleva in alto, sempre più in alto, al di là del fango e delle turpitudini del mondo. E il Poeta canterà, canterà assieme agli altri poeti maltesi, e spera che il suo nome non sarà seppellito assieme al suo corpo nella bara.

Tutte le liriche di questa raccolta hanno salda ossatura e largo respiro,

ma la più potente è senza dubbio quella intitolata *Al vento settentrionale,* in cui il Poeta prega il vento del Nord, che simboleggia tutto ciò che nella vita è bello, puro e nobile, di liberarlo dal vento del Sud, vento attaccaticcio, che simboleggia tutto ciò che nella vita è brutto, cattivo e ignobile.

Soffia!
Soffia, o vento desiato e benedetto!
E senza sosta soffia, e dura!
Da noi via il sonno togli e la mollezza,
e questa pesantezza della mente,
questo freddo malore
che il nostro cuore ha soggiogato
col vento di Scirocco maledetto.

.....

'In sù! Sempre più in sù!' Questo è il mio grido
e il mio desio, o Vento. E tu sollevami
teco sempre più in sù, nell'aria aperta
dove volano e cantano gli uccelli
liberamente, e luccican le stelle
nel silenzio tranquillo della notte.

Portami con te, vento del Nord, lontano lontano, dove io non oda più le voci cattive degli altri uomini, dove l'odio e l'invidia non mi possano raggiungere. Portami in un altro mondo, in un mondo lontano lontano, dove non arrivino neanche gli Sputniks, e io sia solo. solo, in un altro mondo dove non c'è dolore, non c'è paura, e neanche esiste la morte. Tu mi fai ricordare tutte le cose buone, e quindi mi fai ricordare la mia fanciullezza.

Tu mi fai ricordare il paradiso
della mia fanciullezza: i candelieri
di piombo piccolini, ma lucenti
come argento,
i fiori, e le candele dolci accese,
con i quali mio padre
rallegrarmi solea, mia madre buona
che cosi spesso pregava e piangeva.
.....

..... e mia zia,
che ogni mattino, al suon del *Pater noster,*
industre e svelta alzavasi e metteva
il caffè sopra il fuoco, e mi svegliava
un po' dopo per andare
a servir qualche messa nella chiesa
del mio villaggio cosi bella.....

Ma tutto ora è cambiato. Non solo io mi sono cambiato, si è cambiata la vita. Gli usi e i costumi sono ora tutti diversi. Ogni cosa si è cambiata per il peggio. Tutto rotola nel male. E io vorrei fuggire per sempre da questo mondo falso e corrotto, vorrei essere trasportato lontano lontano da te vento del Nord,

finchè il sole e le stelle non si sciolgano,
e la terra e l'acqua
inghiottite non siano
dal nulla e dal buio.

Benchè il concetto informatore di *Colombe e serpenti* sia il concetto pessimista della vita a cui abbiamo accennato, il volume contiene parecchie liriche ispirate da altri sentimenti e pensieri, come l'amore per la patria e per la famiglia, e l'amore per il villaggio natio.

Come molto bene osserva Wallace Gulia in un lungo, profondo ed erudito studio critico, che fa da prefazione al volume, ci sono in questa raccolta anche parecchie poesie didattiche, tra cui, in modo speciale, *Oggi* (Il-Lum), dove 'con ironia e con cinismo, e con particolari presi dalla vita, Vassallo critica, fustigando, la morale della donna che trova tempo per accudire agli affari della Chiesa e agli affari del mondo, l'invidia dei vicini e i nuovi costumi che sono entrati nell'Isola dopo l'ultima guerra e che stanno facendo sfacelo della moralità del nostro popolo'.

La società – dice Vassallo – è corrotta: non c'è più onestà, la menzogna regna ovunque, e la giustizia è ormai una cosa del passato, una cosa vecchia che viene lasciata a morire lentamente lungo la via. Nel mondo d'oggi non c'è più differenza tra il vero e il falso, perchè 'saltando dal si al no, non ti fai male in nessuna parte del corpo.' Il denaro è assoluto padrone e apre tutte le porte:

porte t'apre serrate anche d'acciaio.

Il senso materialista che pervade l'aria trascina tutti nel suo gorgo. La donna pensa solo a tingersi e a divertirsi. Va a messa, naturalmente,

e anche sente la predica che fa il buon curato, ma questa predica

a nulla serve. Il suo vangelo è uno:
dalla culla alla tomba occorre vivere.

Io considero *Colombe e serpenti* come un vero capolavoro e come l'opera più potente e significativa che ci abbia dato finora Karmenu Vassallo. E riporto qui la lettera che gli scrissi il 17 gennaio 1961 quando venne pubblicato questo volume, perchè sento che l'impressione che ne ebbi allora non era stata una semplice impressione del momento, suscitatami da una prima lettura del libro. Anche oggi, che rileggo il volume dopo più di due anni, avrei scritto al Poeta le stesse precise parole.

'Poeta e Amico carissimo. ho letto con attenzione, con amore e con vero piacere, *Hamiem u sriep* che hai avuto la gentilezza di mandarmi. Sono liriche nel vero senso della parola, e alcune, come *Lil Gaspare Pace* e *Lir-Riħ Fuq,* davvero potentissime. Hanno tutte contenuto profondo e forma robusta, e la forma aderisce sempre al contenuto. Cosa che spesso manca nella poesia modema, mentre essa è un fattore essenzialissimo, e distingue il vero poeta dal verseggiatore. Il martellio di certi versi rimane a lungo nell'anima di chi li ha letti con profondità. Con una dozzina di libri come *Hamiem u sriep* la poesia maltese non avrà nulla da invidiare alla produzione poetica delle più antiche letterature europee negli ultimi decenni.... Con la stima e l'affetto di sempre e con i più fervidi auguri di ulteriore alloro, fraternamente ti abbraccio. Giovanni Curmi'.

15 settembre 1962.

THE EVENING CLASS, 1960-1964

By RICHARD J. BECK

THE only way to write a book is to sit down and begin it; the only way to take a degree is to sit down and begin it. Realising the vital need for at least a proportion of properly-taught and adequately-qualified teachers in Malta, the Union of Teachers, under the able leadership of the late Alfred Buhagiar, approached Professor Aquilina as Dean of Arts on the feasibility of an evening degree course. Their pleas could not have fallen upon more sympathetic ears. Professor Aquilina 'sold' the idea of an evening course to the University authorities and, with the full co-operation of the university administration, and the subsequent blessing of the Department of Education, the Evening Class was launched in October, 1960.

One of the many ways in which Professor Aquilina showed his foresight and experience was in his insistence that the courses pursued should be identical with the day courses. Only in Classics were the students allowed to study Greek and Latin authors in translation instead of in the original, and this only on the understanding that no student would take Classics in his final two years; ironically enough, many evening class students developed a greater love for the Classics than their younger counterparts in the day class, probably because of their greater maturity of appreciation. Apart from Classics, every subject was taught in the same way, and every examination was identical in every respect. Thus the degrees which these students have just earned are of exactly the same value as the day degrees, and have the full authority of the Royal University of Malta behind them.

There were difficulties, of course; not all the seed could be expected to fall on fruitful soil. An evening course in Science proved to be a practical impossibility with small staffs and too limited a time for laboratory work. Even in Arts the numbers dwindled, though not by very much. And some of the losses were honourable ones, as when one of the students married one of the lecturers, Mr. David Farley-Hills! But after the first year, there was no going back. Thirty young men and women turned up regularly, four nights a week for three hours and every Saturday morning, to learn whatever anyone was willing to teach them. They did not realise how encouraging their enthusiasm, their greater maturity of judgement and depth of understanding, were to the members of the teaching staff.

The Evening Class, then, was a joint effort by keen teachers and eager learners. And the results were all that could have been hoped for. Passes in the first class in B.A. General subjects are few and far between, but in June 1964 there were more of them than there have ever been before in the university's history; and a good proportion of them had been gained by evening class students.

In other ways, too, the evening class students played their part. Some of them sat on the Students' Representative Council, others represented the University at international Congresses abroad. Some of them won scholarships and read for Honours and, subsequently, M.A. degrees. All over Malta and Gozo they are disseminating what they have learned. Best of all, perhaps, is the spirit that existed, and still exists, between those who took so eagerly and those who gave so gladly. The dinner given by the sometime students to their former teachers is symbolic of the affection and regard which prevails on both sides. It was with truth that Mr. Maxwell, secretary of the Inter University Council, observed that what the University was doing for the evening class students was one of the most important of its functions.

The Evening Course of 1960-1964 was a great success; this is proved, if further proof be needed, by the flood of applications to join its successor. One thing the University must remember is its responsibility to its graduates in helping to place them where they will be of service to the community commensurate with their new qualifications. But the greatest cause for regret is not this, but that Dr. Buhagiar was not spared to see how rich a harvest was reaped where he so hopefully had sown. May the success of this enterprise remain as a lasting tribute to his memory.

INDEX