

Servais-Théodore Pinckaers, O.P., and the Renewal of Sapiential Thomistic Theology

PAUL MORRISSEY
University of Notre Dame
Sydney, Australia

IN RECENT times there has been a call for Catholic theology to find again its sapiential vision.¹ In its latest document, *Theology Today: Perspectives, Principles and Criteria*, the International Theological Commission identifies a number of criteria for Catholic theology, the last of which considers the fact that theology is not only a science, but also a wisdom.²

In characterizing theology as a form of wisdom the Commission makes a number of points. First, wisdom is the study of the mystery of God; a study that seeks not to grasp or possess God but to be possessed by him.³

¹ Some recent examples of theologians exploring various dimensions of sapiential theology include the following: Thomas Joseph White, O.P., “The Precarity of Wisdom: Modern Dominican Theology, Perspectivalism, and the Task of Reconstruction,” in *Ressourcement Thomism: Sacred Doctrine, the Sacraments, and the Moral Life: Essays in Honor of Romanus Cessario, O.P.*, ed. Reinhard Hütter and Matthew Levering (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 92–123; Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J., “Wisdom as the Source of Unity for Theology,” in *Wisdom and Holiness, Science and Scholarship: Essays in Honor of Matthew L. Lamb*, ed. Michael Dauphinais and Matthew Levering (Naples, FL: Sapientia Press, 2007), 59–71; Reinhard Hütter, “Theological Faith Enlightening Sacred Theology: Renewing Theology by Recovering its Unity as *Sacra doctrina*,” *The Thomist* 74 (2010), 364–405; Gregory F. LaNave, “Why Holiness is Necessary for Theology: Some Thomistic Distinctions,” *The Thomist* 74 (2010): 437–59.

² International Theological Commission (hereafter ITC), *Theology Today: Perspectives, Principles and Criteria* (2012), n. 86. For background and context of this document see Serge-Thomas Bonino, O.P., *Pour Lire le document “La théologie aujourd’hui: perspectives, principes et critères”* (Paris : Cerf, 2012); both items are available on the Vatican website.

³ ITC, *Theology Today*, n. 99. A point elaborated in n. 97, “The object of theology is the living God, and the life of the theologian cannot fail to be affected by the

This leads to an understanding of theology that acknowledges the “wisdom tradition” as it spans the horizon from biblical revelation, eastern and western Christianity, and the wisdom of the saints.⁴ The Commission also stresses the vocation of the theologian and the importance of a pursuit of holiness and a life of prayer.

Theologians have received a particular calling to service in the body of Christ. Called and gifted, they exist in a particular relationship to the body and all of its members. Living in ‘the communion of the Holy Spirit’ (2 Cor 13:13), they along with all their brothers and sisters should seek to conform their lives to the mystery of the Eucharist ‘from which the Church ever derives its life and on which it thrives’.⁵

The vocation of the theologian is characterized by a particular spirituality embodied by “a love of truth, a readiness for conversion of heart and mind, a striving for holiness, and a commitment to ecclesial communion and mission.”⁶ The International Theological Commission also sees sapiential theology as providing a unifying vision. Wisdom integrates and unifies the various sciences. “The human person is not satisfied by partial truths, but seeks to unify different pieces and areas of knowledge into an understanding of the final truth of all things and of human life itself.”⁷ Thus while the individual disciplines of human knowledge (and those that exist within theology itself) are essential, wisdom “strives to give a unified view of the whole of reality. It is, in effect, a knowledge in accordance with the highest, most universal and also most explanatory causes.”⁸ In summary then, when the Commission claims that one of the criteria of Catholic theology is *sapientia*, it is encouraging a theology that seeks God in a participatory way, is rooted in the wisdom tradition, seeks holiness, is not divorced from spirituality, and integrates and unites all knowledge.⁹

sustained effort to know the living God. The theologian cannot exclude his or her own life from the endeavour to understand all of reality with regard to God. Obedience to the truth purifies the soul (cf. 1Pet 1:22), and ‘the wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, willing to yield, full of mercy and good fruits, without a trace of partiality or hypocrisy’ (James 3:17).”

⁴ Ibid., n. 99.

⁵ Ibid., n. 94.

⁶ Ibid., n. 93. However, “This special feature of the theological enterprise by no means violates the scientific character of theology; on the contrary, it profoundly accords with the latter.”

⁷ Ibid., n. 86.

⁸ Ibid., n. 90.

⁹ This approach to theology can be married to Thomas Aquinas’s. See my “The Sapiential Dimension of Theology According to St. Thomas Aquinas,” *New Blackfriars* 93 (May 2012): 309–23.

In this article I will argue that Servais Pinckaers, the renowned Dominican moral theologian, is a model of this sapiential approach to theology. The argument will proceed as follows. First, I will briefly outline three reasons why sapiential theology declined in the Catholic tradition. Second, I will situate Servais Pinckaers within the renewal of Thomistic sapiential theology in the twentieth century, especially in line with the French Dominicans Marie-Dominique Chenu and Jean-Pierre Torrell. And finally, I will outline four key dimensions of sapiential theology that are found in the work of Pinckaers.

The Decline of Sapiential Theology

For a renewal to take place there needs to have been a decline. My focus here will be on the fragmentation of theology and especially the split between theology and spirituality that occurred after the Middle Ages. The account of this decline will, of necessity, be brief; it will have the aim of showing the context of the twentieth-century renewal in the Thomist sapiential tradition, of which, I argue, Servais Pinckaers forms a part.¹⁰

There are myriad reasons that could be given for the decline of the sapiential approach to theology. I will consider three: (1) the Enlightenment and the epistemological revolution that results in a divorce between faith and reason; (2) the rise of the universities, which resulted in theology becoming an academic discipline—a change from when its natural home was in the monastery; (3) the developments in later scholasticism, especially in the work of William of Ockham, that split apart much of the unity that had existed in theology up to that point. It must be stated that there is no one sole reason for the decline of sapiential theology, nor can these three reasons be considered the only ones.

One of the principal explanations for the decline in sapiential theology can be situated in the epistemological developments of the Enlightenment.¹¹ These developments resulted in a less holistic understanding of

¹⁰ Thus my purpose here is a limited one. What I am suggesting corresponds with Pinckaers's own history of moral theology. I am passing over the contribution of the post-Thomas and Neo-Thomistic period. Michael Sherwin, in the area of moral theology, I think, very fairly sums up this contribution in his essay "The Four Challenges of Moral Theology," *Logos* 6:1 (2003): 13–26.

¹¹ John Paul II writes, regarding the Cartesian revolution in thought: "Abandoning the investigation of being, modern philosophical research has concentrated instead upon human knowing." *Fides et Ratio* §5. For accounts of the rise of modernity see Michael Buckley, *At the Origins of Modern Atheism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987), and Michael Allen Gillespie, *The Theological Origins of Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009). For an overview of the Enlightenment, see Louis Dupré, *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern*

truth where, especially since Bacon and Comte, truth is located only in verifiable *facts*.¹² Therefore, if we are to know God, it can only be through a metaphysically assured reason, the *verifiable*. This divorce of faith and reason resulted in an empty God, a God who is necessary, as Kant says, only for the autonomous subject to have some sort of grounding as a moral agent.¹³ And as Paul Griffiths rather colorfully states, Enlightenment epistemology has had profound effects on theology *tout court*:

In extreme cases these effects have included the abandonment of theology; and even in more moderate instances the result has been a Babylonian captivity in which theology has become a worshipper of alien epistemological gods and has been gagged and fettered by them so that she can only whisper where she ought declaim and hobble where she ought stride.¹⁴

Others, with some justification, argue that a sapiential approach to theology began to decline prior to St. Thomas with the rise of the

Culture (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005). For the epistemological turn and its effects on Thomism, see Fergus Kerr, O.P., *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 17–34.

¹² This development's effect on theological knowledge as sapiential is ably summed up by Ellen Charry: "Sapiential truth is unintelligible to the modern secularized construal of truth. Modern epistemology not only fragmented truth itself, privileging correct information over beauty and goodness, it relocated truth in facts and ideas. . . . Knowing the truth no longer implied loving it, wanting it, and being transformed by it, because the truth no longer brings the knower to God but to use information to subdue nature. Knowing became limited to being informed about things, not as these are things of God but as they stand (or totter) on their own feet. The classical notion that truth leads us to God simply ceased to be intelligible and came to be viewed with suspicion." Ellen Charry, *By the Renewing of Your Minds: The Pastoral Function of Christian Doctrine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 236.

¹³ "The moral life . . . leads ineluctably to religion, through which it extends itself to the idea of a powerful moral Lawgiver outside of mankind." Immanuel Kant, *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, trans. T. M. Greene and H. H. Hudson (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), 5, 6. See also Reinhard Hütter, "The Knowledge of the Triune God: Practices, Doctrine, Theology," in *Knowing the Triune God: The Work of the Spirit in the Practices of the Church*, ed. James J. Buckley, and David S. Yeago (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001), 24. For a succinct outline of how Kantian metaphysics contrasts with Thomistic metaphysics, see Thomas Joseph White, O.P., *Wisdom in the Face of Modernity: A Study in Thomistic Natural Theology* (Ave Maria, FL: Sapientia Press, 2010), 10–21. On Kant as the father of modern theology, see Garrett Green, "Kant as Christian Apologist: The Failure of Accommodationist Theology," *Pro Ecclesia* 4, no. 3 (1995): 301–17.

¹⁴ Paul J. Griffiths, "How Epistemology Matters to Theology," *The Journal of Religion* 79, no. 1 (1999): 1.

medieval university. Prior to this, theology was confined to the monastery and was integrated into the entire life of the monk and his pursuit of holiness.¹⁵ Thus theology was taken out of the context of a “pursuit of holiness” into a separate institution dedicated to knowledge.¹⁶ This is not to say that the medieval theologians “rejected” the pursuit of holiness; rather, this new institution of knowledge became the place where theology itself became segregated in the post-high-scholastic period. Thus, according to Avery Dulles, by the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, theology as it was practiced in the universities drove too sharp a wedge between the natural and supernatural orders; “The professors, absorbed in academic disputes, seemed to lose contact with ordinary Christian experience and with the original biblical heritage.”¹⁷ Edward Farley, in his extensive study into the history of different approaches to theological knowledge, also sees the disintegration beginning with the rise of the universities. Farley looks at two senses of the word “theology” in his overview. The first is theology as knowledge, an “actual, individual cognition of God and things related to God”; this cognition relies on faith and has eternal happiness as its final goal.¹⁸ Theology in this sense is a *habitus* of the human soul and was the unique way of doing theology prior to the rise of the universities. The second sense of theology as Farley sees it is theology as a discipline, a

¹⁵ Thus, St. Bernard of Clairvaux can say: “It is not disputation, it is holiness which comprehends if the Incomprehensible One can in a certain way be understood at all. And what is this way? If you are a saint, you have already understood, you know. If you are not, become one, and you will learn through your own experience.” *De erroribus Abaelardi*, 1, cited in Aidan Nichols, O.P., *The Shape of Catholic Theology: An Introduction to Its Sources, Principles, and History* (London: Burns and Oates, 2003), 290.

¹⁶ This is the argument of Mark A. McIntosh, who claims that the split between theology and spirituality begins with the decline of the monastic schools and the rise of the universities. Theology was no longer integrally linked to the entire life of the theologians; it was now joined to a separate institution dedicated to knowledge. “Theology and Spirituality,” in *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology Since 1918*, ed. David F. Ford (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 395. For an authoritative guide to the characteristics of monastic theology see Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, 2d ed., reprint (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974). For the medieval origins of the split between theology and mysticism see F. Vandebroucke, “Le Divorce entre théologie et mystique: ses origines,” *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 82 (1950): 372–89.

¹⁷ Avery Dulles, *The Assurance of Things Hoped For: A Theology of Christian Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 39.

¹⁸ Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 31.

scholarly enterprise of understanding.¹⁹ This is how theology develops in the universities. St. Thomas's approach to theology is a unity of the two; a theology that is wisdom as divine gift, "but it is a wisdom which can be promoted, deepened, and extended by human study and argument."²⁰ According to Farley's account, the gradual disintegration of theological unity reaches its climax in the post-Enlightenment period.

The third argument is that the sapiential approach to theology collapses soon after St. Thomas, especially during the late scholastic period. This reason is the focus of Pinckaers's own history of the decline in sapiential moral theology. Jean-Pierre Torrell outlines three dimensions to St. Thomas's theology, or *sacra doctrina*. In outlining these dimensions Torrell also explains how St. Thomas's synthesis broke down. The first dimension of St. Thomas's theology is the speculative, or what is called *intellectus fidei*—to bring one's reason to what is held by faith. The second dimension is his effort to understand (both historically and allegorically) the sacred Scriptures, the better to preach them. The third dimension is what Torrell calls the mystical, meaning how, practically speaking, the Christian returns to God (what today we call moral theology).²¹ Torrell goes on to note that tellingly these three dimensions, which Thomas held in a splendid unity, were soon after his death separated.²² The speculative dimension descended into what is called the manualist tradition, whereby certitudes were sought through syllogisms. This manualist tradition, Torrell points out, became so sidelined after Vatican II that the speculative approach to understanding faith was neglected. The second dimension, one that is called today an historical-positivist approach, has evolved into a highly specialized field cut off from speculative theology. The outstanding examples of this are in the fields of exegesis and patristics. The mystical approach, as Torrell sees it, has tried to set itself up as an autonomous field of study and has descended into anti-intellectualism. This breakdown is a thwarting of the Thomistic synthesis which is Augustinian and Anselmian in origin.²³

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid., 36.

²¹ Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Volume 2: Spiritual Master*, trans. Robert Royal (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 2, 3.

²² Torrell, *Spiritual Master*, 3.

²³ Torrell, *Spiritual Master*, 3. A tradition summed up well by Avery Dulles: "In his (Anselm) various theological meditations he provides a classic instance of contemplative reason on pilgrimage between simple faith and the heavenly vision to which it aspires. Believing, for Anselm, is not a matter of intellect alone. The mind is inclined to believe by a heart that loves." Dulles, *The Assurance of Things Hoped For*, 28.

Many blame this breakdown on Duns Scotus (and his univocal concept of being)²⁴ and William of Ockham (nominalism). The onset of nominalism resulted in what Pinckaers calls an “atomic explosion” whereby the unity between faith, reason, freedom, grace, and nature were torn asunder.²⁵ Thus the ground was laid for the Reformation and the Enlightenment.²⁶ The duality between reason and revelation meant that spirituality and the quest for holiness came to be divorced from theology. Theological knowledge was no longer seen as a participatory knowledge.²⁷

Even if this disintegration began outside Thomism, it would later become somewhat synonymous with it, especially after the Reformation, as the theology of St. Thomas became the principal bulwark against Protestantism.²⁸ With the onset of the Enlightenment and the exaltation of reason,

²⁴ Thus, contrary to Aquinas’s (and the Christian theological tradition before him) doctrine of the analogy of being that held that while one can say that God exists the existence of which we speak can only be understood analogically when compared to created existence, Scotus says that the being (or existence) of God and creatures has no metaphysical difference. On this point, see Robert Barron, *The Priority of Christ: Toward a Post-Liberal Catholicism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2007), 13, 14; Olivier Boulnois, “Reading Duns Scotus: From History to Philosophy,” *Modern Theology* 21:4 (2005): 603–8.

²⁵ “With Ockham we witness the first atomic explosion of the modern era. The atom split was obviously not physical but psychic. It was the nadir of the human soul, with its faculties, which was broken apart by a new concept of freedom. This produced successive aftershocks, which destroyed the unity of theology and Western thought. With Ockham, freedom, by means of the claim to radical autonomy that defined it, was separated from all that was foreign to it: reason, sensibility, natural inclinations, and all external factors. Further separation followed: freedom was separated from nature, law, and grace; moral doctrine from mysticism; reason from faith; the individual from society.” Servais Pinckaers, O.P., *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, trans. Sr. Mary Thomas Noble, O.P. (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1995), 242.

²⁶ For the nominalist background to the Reformation see Alister McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 70–76.

²⁷ For a good account of theology as participation, with an accent on its historical decline, see Frans Jozef van Beeck, S.J., “Trinitarian Theology as Participation,” in *The Trinity*, ed. S. Davis, D. Kendall, and G. O’Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 295–325.

²⁸ For a brief overview of the principal figures and themes in Thomism see: Romanus Cessario, O.P., *A Short History of Thomism* (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003); Gerard McCool, S.J.’s series of books on recent Thomism, *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism: The Search for a Unitary Method* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989); *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989); *The Neo-Thomists* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994); and see Kerr, *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism*.

the thought of Thomas was seen as the most potent weapon with which to argue for the faith on the grounds of reason alone. This attempt is given the name neo-Thomism or neo-scholasticism.²⁹ Thus, as Fergus Kerr points out, “Paradoxically, theologians who might plausibly be charged with ‘post-Tridentine Catholic positivist authoritarianism’ in questions of doctrine were the very ones most anxious to secure autonomy for philosophy and the sciences, in what of course they conceived of ideally as a harmony between the work of reason and the gift of divine revelation.”³⁰

Situating Servais Pinckaers in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology

In the twentieth century there are two general critiques of Neo-Thomism and the perceived divorce between faith and reason, theology and life (spirituality). The first is termed transcendental Thomism; it was inspired by Rousselot and Marachel, and taken up by Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan.³¹ These Thomists were interested in taking up modern Kantian epistemology and marrying it to St. Thomas. The meeting of neo-scholastic Thomism and transcendental Thomism was more impasse than fruitful encounter, as Mark McIntosh outlines:

In the neo-scholastic case, the theological implications of spirituality are away off in a rarefied realm of highly unusual psychological states; and in the transcendental Thomist case, spiritual experience is primarily of interest as a piece of evidence for the existence of transcendental experience behind Kant’s categories—and whatever theological language such experiences might happen to be couched in would ultimately be secondary. In neither case could the integrity of theology and spirituality become perceptible, let alone persuasive.³²

²⁹ For a good account of Neo-scholasticism/Neo-Thomism, see Fergus Kerr, “A Different World: Neoscholasticism and its Discontents,” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 8, no. 2 (2006): 128–48.

³⁰ Fergus Kerr, O.P., “A Catholic Response to the Programme of Radical Orthodoxy,” in *Radical Orthodoxy? A Catholic Enquiry*, ed. Laurence Paul Hemming (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 56.

³¹ See Thomas Sheehan, “Pierre Rousselot and the Dynamism of the Human Spirit,” *Gregorianum* 66.2 (1985): 241–67. On his debt to both Rousselot and Marechal, see Rahner, *Hearers of the Word* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 9. See also *A Marechal Reader*, ed. Joseph Donceel (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970). For Karl Rahner’s transcendental approach see his *Hearers of the Word*, 53–68.

Although often put together, there are obvious differences between Rahner and Lonergan. On their basic approaches to theology and the reception of revelation, see Guy Mansini, “Experiential Expressivism and Two Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians,” *Nova et Vetera* 8, no. 1 (2010): 125–41.

³² McIntosh, “Theology and Spirituality,” 396.

The second critique came from the so-called *ressourcement theologians*, who sought to renew theology by going back to the sources. Fundamentally they advocated a return to the Scriptures, the Fathers and the liturgy as the principal sources for theology. Theologians such as Jean Daniélou and Henri de Lubac³³ believed that neo-Thomism had separated theology from life. Hans Boersma points out:

According to Daniélou and the other *nouvelle* theologians, neo-Thomism ended up endorsing modernity's acceptance of the autonomy of nature as well as the Enlightenment belief in human progress in this independent (or immanent) realm of nature. In the eyes of the *nouvelle* theologians, this was a deeply ironic situation, considering neo-Thomist distrust of the Enlightenment and the secularism that it had brought.³⁴

Servais Pinckaers, I argue, can be placed in a mediating position within Catholic theology; especially with respect to the split between neo-Thomism and those influenced by the *ressourcement* school. Pinckaers is not interested so much in transcendental Thomism, being rather critical of Kant's influence on modern theology.³⁵ To help place Pinckaers's theology today, a recent article by John Milbank is helpful, even if it does not mention Pinckaers by name. In the article Milbank, an Anglican "radical-orthodox" theologian, outlines what he sees as the new divide in theology.³⁶ This divide is between "romantic orthodoxy" and "classical orthodoxy."³⁷ He

³³ For an evaluation of Daniélou, see Aidan Nichols, "The Theology of Jean Daniélou: Epochs, Correspondences, and the Orders of the Real," *New Blackfriars* 91 (Jan 2010): 46–65. For a recent evaluation of Henri de Lubac's theology, see Aidan Nichols, "Henri de Lubac: Panorama and Proposal," *New Blackfriars* 93 (Jan 2012): 3–33.

³⁴ Hans Boersma, *Nouvelle Théologie and Sacramental Ontology: A Return to Mystery* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 5. For an overview of Catholic *ressourcement* theology see *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). For a look at a rapprochement between *ressourcement* and Thomism, see the symposium "Thomism and the *Nouvelle Théologie*," *Josephinum Journal of Theology* 18, no. 1 (2011), especially the introductory essay by William F. Murphy, "Thomism and the *Nouvelle Théologie*: A Dialogue Renewed?" 4–36.

³⁵ See, Servais Pinckaers, O.P., "My Sources," *Communio: International Catholic Review* 26 (1999): 913–15, and his comment, "I do not hide my impression that in morality I escaped from the prison of Kantian rationality thanks to St. Thomas." Interview with Thomas Instituut Utrecht, Jan. 16, 2000.

³⁶ John Milbank, "The New Divide: Romantic Versus Classical Orthodoxy," *Modern Theology* 26:1 (2010): 26–38.

³⁷ In the Romantic Orthodox camp Milbank places the Anglo-Catholic movement of Radical Orthodoxy, the *Communio* group (including Pope Benedict XVI),

contrasts this with the immediately preceding divide (more intra-protestant than intra-catholic) between theological orthodoxy (neo-orthodoxy) and theological liberalism. This new divide is united in its sapiential character, namely, that both sides see the importance of a unitive approach to theology. For example, Milbank sees “a new willingness to embrace ideas of analogy, participation, sacramentality, phenomenology and metaphysics.”³⁸ Moreover, “contemporary theology tends to look for a more ‘robust’ Christian intellectual account of everything under the sun and its searching tends to be both more catholic in scope and Catholic in its fundamental outlook.”³⁹

In a footnote in that same article, Milbank sees the “Dominican Fribourg-Toulouse school” as mediating between the romantic orthodox and classical orthodox tendencies. He explicitly mentions Jean-Pierre Torrell and Serge-Thomas Bonino in this school; however, we can safely include Servais Pinckaers as being representative.⁴⁰ Milbank writes that “they are more ‘romantic’ than ‘classical,’ and if they remain neo-Thomists then this is partly because they want to show that all the ‘romanticism’ one could want is in Aquinas himself. Hence their new stress on Thomas the commentator and Thomas the spiritual master.”⁴¹

This description by Milbank is supported by Serge-Thomas Bonino’s succinct account of this “Dominican Fribourg-Toulouse school” of Thomism, where Bonino highlights four principal traits: to further the fruitful work of historical-critical exegesis of St. Thomas’s works; to consider St. Thomas as a master of Christian wisdom and to treat him primarily as a theologian who respected the autonomy of philosophy and the need for spirituality (prayer) in theology; to absorb, “with discernment,” the Thomist tradition post-St. Thomas; and to bring these Thomist resources to contemporary questions in theology and philosophy.⁴² These traits line up with the approach Servais Pinckaers has to theology.

A Twentieth-Century Renewal in Thomist Sapiential Theology

Having accounted—albeit very briefly—for the decline in the Thomist sapiential theological tradition, I will turn now to what has been a renaiss-

and sophiological currents in Eastern Orthodoxy. In the Classical Orthodox camp, primarily located in the United States, he lists Romanus Cessario, Ralph McNerny, and Steven A. Long.

³⁸ Milbank, “The New Divide,” 28.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ This point was supported by John Milbank in personal correspondence.

⁴¹ Milbank, “The New Divide,” 36n1.

⁴² Serge-Thomas Bonino, O.P., “The Conception of Thomism after Henri de Lubac,” in *Surnaturel: A Controversy at the Heart of Twentieth-Century Thomistic*

sance in this tradition in the twentieth century.⁴³ This renewal is multifaceted and takes in a wide variety of theologians who broadly belong in the Thomist tradition. The particular focus here will be on two French Dominican Thomists, Marie-Dominique Chenu and Jean-Pierre Torrell. These two have been chosen for the way in which their Thomist understanding of theology connects with that of Servais Pinckaers.⁴⁴

Thought, ed. Serge-Thomas Bonino, O.P., trans. Robert Williams and Matthew Levering (Ave Maria, FL: Sapientia Press, 2009), vii, viii. In an interview Bonino further outlines this vision: "It seems to me that Saint Thomas offers today an adequate model concerning the way of doing theology. Five points seem to me of special importance:

1. The privileged instrument of the *intellectus fidei* is a philosophy of being.
2. Theology is the work of intelligence. It does not fear to have recourse to the concept.
3. The theologian elaborates his own doctrine in an ongoing confrontation with the preceding theological tradition. Contrary to the artificial opposition between the *quid homines senserunt* and the *veritas rerum* which a certain kind of Thomism wanted to establish, the theological practice of Saint Thomas attests that the *quid homines senserunt* is the privileged way to the *veritas rerum*.
4. Theology has a sapiential vocation. The *intellectus fidei* aims at a contemplative synthesis that is not content with the fragmentation of theological disciplines.
5. Doing theology presupposes a permanent contact with the living sources of faith (Scripture, Tradition, the life of the Church) and shows itself to be a source of spiritual life."

From Carlo Leget, "Don't Economise on References to Thomism—An Interview with Serge-Thomas Bonino, O.P." March 16, 2000. Found at www.thomasinstituut.org/nws.php?nws_id=3.

⁴³ One should note here that within the Catholic tradition in the nineteenth century there was a renaissance in sapiential theology, though this was strictly speaking outside the Thomist tradition. This renaissance is found in the Tübingen school (for example, Johann Adam Möhler) and with John Henry Cardinal Newman. Both tried to reintegrate theological knowledge avoiding the extremes of evangelism and rationalism. Thus there is a participatory and a scientific dimension to theology. On this point see Dulles, *The Assurance of Things Hoped For*, 83–87.

⁴⁴ However, it should be noted that the sapiential renewal of the twentieth century is broader than this. Good cases can be made that the so-called transcendental Thomists, such as Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan, tried to renew Thomism in a sapiential direction. Harvey D. Egan explicitly outlines the case for Karl Rahner, showing that Rahner attempted to integrate spiritual and systematic approaches to theology as well as seeing theology as a form of prayer. Harvey D. Egan, "Theology and Spirituality," in *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Rahner*, ed. Declan Marmion and Mary E. Hines (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 13–28. Also, the *Ressourcement* theologians, such as Henri de Lubac, Jean Daniélou et al., though principally concerned with pre-Thomist theology,

Marie-Dominique Chenu, O.P.

Marie-Dominique Chenu (1895–1990), one could argue, is the father of the renewal of Thomistic sapiential theology.⁴⁵ In his summation of Chenu's contribution to twentieth-century theology, Fergus Kerr traces the legacy of Chenu in the work of subsequent Thomists such as Jean-Pierre Torrell, Gilles Emery, Gregory Rocca, and, most especially, Servais Pinckaers (all without exception are proponents of a sapiential approach to theology).⁴⁶ Chenu's project, which began with his doctoral thesis, was to reintegrate St. Thomas into his historical context so as to better understand the sapiential nature of his entire work.⁴⁷ Here Chenu was battling what he saw as a Thomistic rationalism that had segregated the work of Thomas into a variety of parts, the most important of which was his philosophy, which was seen as the Church's principal armor against modern philosophy.⁴⁸ In the words of Fergus Kerr, "This was to inocu-

contributed to this renewal. (Sapientially inclined theologians such as Hans Urs von Balthasar and Joseph Ratzinger come out of this school.)

⁴⁵ For biographical details and evaluations of Chenu, see *Marie-Dominique Chenu, Un théologien en liberté: Jacques Duquesne interroge le Père Chenu* (Paris: Centurion, 1975); Christophe F. Potworowski, *Contemplation and Incarnation: The Theology of Marie-Dominique Chenu* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001); Fergus Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians: From Neoscholasticism to Nuptial Mysticism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 17–21; Kerr, "A Different World: Neoscholasticism and its Discontents," 141–48.

⁴⁶ Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, 33. We should note, however, that Chenu remains a controversial figure in Catholic theology, especially among Thomists. For a critique of Chenu's work with which I agree, see Thomas Joseph White, O.P., "The Precarity of Wisdom: Modern Dominican Theology, Perspectivalism, and the Task of Reconstruction," 92–94. White's essay is important because he looks at the recent history of Dominican theology and the real tension that existed therein between recent historical approaches to theology and a pure Thomism of the commentatorial tradition in the twentieth century. The two preeminent figures in this tension within Dominican theology were Marie-Dominique Chenu and Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange. White sums up this tension (which was not restricted to the Dominicans) as one between "the historical character of human existence and human knowledge and the supposedly absolute, unchanging truth claims of Christian revelation" (93). White, and here he would agree with Servais Pinckaers, finds both positive and negative aspects in both approaches; the solution, again agreeing with Pinckaers, is a return to a sapiential approach to theology that was the preferred way of St. Thomas himself.

⁴⁷ A task that he shared with Etienne Gilson; see Francesca Aran Murphy, "Gilson and Chenu: The Structure of the *Summa* and the Shape of Dominican Life," *New Blackfriars* 85 (May 2004): 290–303. Chenu's doctoral thesis was titled "A Psychological and Theological Analysis of Contemplation" (Angelicum, Rome, 1920).

⁴⁸ It is for this reason that Chenu was at the heart of one of the more important controversies in twentieth-century Catholic theology. This controversy centered

late them against infection by the idealist, subjectivist and positivist philosophies, which were held to have created the modernist crisis.”⁴⁹

A principal theme for Chenu in his studies of St. Thomas was the need to place him in his historical context as a Dominican friar of the thirteenth century. In Chenu’s understanding, St. Thomas the theologian is the son of St. Dominic the preacher.⁵⁰ This is demonstrated, for example, by Chenu’s devoting the first chapter of his work *Aquinas and His Role in Theology* to the “Friar Preacher.” Here Chenu notes two principal influences on the life and thought of St. Thomas: the importance of the Gospel that is to be preached, and the radical poverty the mendicants were called to. St. Thomas was in many ways caught up in a medieval evangelical revival, and his theology should not be divorced from that. In fact, Thomas’s prodigious intellect would be called on by his order to defend the “new apostles” against threats to their existence in Paris and thus to make explicit the apostolic and spiritual nature of the mendicants and the deep reasons for his own religious vocation.⁵¹

As part of situating Aquinas in his historical milieu, Chenu placed great emphasis on St. Thomas’s knowledge and love of Scripture. This is considered one of Chenu’s principal contributions in an era when the prevailing picture was that St. Thomas was primarily concerned with Aristotle.⁵² Chenu states that it is a “deadly misunderstanding” to overemphasize the Aristotelian dimension of Thomas’s work while forgetting the “life giving sap that comes from the Gospels and the Fathers.”⁵³ “St Thomas,” writes Chenu, “was first and foremost a master in the sacred page.”⁵⁴ Furthermore,

on a dispute between Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, a neo-Thomist, and Chenu (his student and a dissenter from neo-Thomism). Chenu’s manifesto of 1937, *Une école de théologie: le Saulchoir* (Paris: Cerf, 1985), later placed on the index of forbidden books, was accused of being relativistic in that it placed too much emphasis on the historical context of theology. For an overview of this debate, see Kerr, “A Different World: Neoscholasticism and its Discontents.” For a reevaluation of the life and work of Garrigou-Lagrange, see Aidan Nichols, O.P., *Reason and Piety: Garrigou-Lagrange in the Service of Catholic Thought* (Ave Maria, FL: Sapientia Press, 2008).

⁴⁹ Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, 1.

⁵⁰ Marie-Dominique Chenu, O.P., *Aquinas and His Role in Theology*, trans. Paul Philibert, O.P. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 10.

⁵¹ Chenu, *Aquinas and His Role in Theology*, 9.

⁵² This is the opinion of Lawrence Boadt, “St. Thomas Aquinas and the Biblical Wisdom Tradition,” *The Thomist* 45 (1985): 575.

⁵³ Chenu, *Aquinas and His Role in Theology*, 138.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

Theology (for Thomas) arises out of, develops, and fulfills itself in the atmosphere of this living Word received in faith. Master Thomas teaches continuously on the text of the Bible, which is a foundational text of the faculty of theology. His *Summa theologiae*, despite its technical methodology, can only be understood properly as a living emanation from the *pagina sacra* [the sacred page of the Bible]. This word of God is heard and can only be understood in the context of faith.⁵⁵

According to Chenu, theology is wisdom in the ancient sense of this word.⁵⁶ What he means by this is that wisdom pertains to the oneness of knowledge and truth whereas science “holds no jot of mystery.”⁵⁷ This is why, with St. Augustine, Chenu believes that theology is more a wisdom than a science. Following St. Thomas, Chenu outlines two ways in which the wisdom of faith develops, doctrinally and intuitively. The first is by way of study and instruction in the propositions of faith; the second through desire and emotional kinship with the object, such as the knowledge of a mother for her child. Theology proper belongs to the first; however, Chenu warns “woe to those who dissociate these two roads to the knowledge of God. They may arise from different principles and different disciplines, but they do not impair the essential unity of life and of grace.”⁵⁸ Theology as science, in the more modern sense of the word, entails the various functions and methodologies peculiar to the different disciplines of theology. Theology as wisdom has the task to unite the various functions of theological science. Thus, though each discipline will be autonomous in a certain way, they must all work in the

service of a single all-embracing vision which will always transcend the particular interests of the component parts. Thus the wisdom of theology gathers up and unifies many strands which are, humanly speaking, disparate—some of them eternal truths, some plunged in the temporal and contingent world, some the fruit of contemplation, some concerned with action—according to that division of functions which institutionally (and, alas, in practice too) distinguishes the ‘theologian’ from the ‘apostle’.⁵⁹

For Chenu, to be a Thomist means understanding the theological enterprise as a unity. “Theology is one, with a unity such as other branches of

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Marie-Dominique Chenu, O.P., *Is Theology a Science?* trans. A. H. N. Green-Armytage (London: Burns and Oates, 1959), 119.

⁵⁷ Chenu, *Is Theology a Science?* 119.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 120.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

human knowledge can never pretend to.”⁶⁰ Thus, while there are different sciences within the one wisdom of theology, each science should nourish the whole. In an essay on the renewal of moral theology, Chenu makes this point:

Right at the beginning I must remark that the category “moral theology,” as distinguished from “dogmatic theology,” cannot be employed without reservation. Not that it is false, but in its pedagogical formalism it separates the elements of a global perception outside of which truth remains fragmented. It is well-known that this distinction is ill-suited to the *ordo disciplinae* of Saint Thomas.⁶¹

Chenu specifically understands his description of sapiential theology as Thomistic. The objective and rational (scientific) and the intuitive and prayerful (spiritual) are distinct, though never separated. Both are ways, and both are necessary, to arrive at true wisdom, namely the knowledge of God. Therefore, Chenu in his writings places great stress on St. Thomas’s spiritual life and his quest for holiness. “In the person of Thomas, the doctor is a saint . . . this doctor of the Church is a doctor because he is a saint. This is the sanctity of intelligence. At the very heart of the spirituality of Thomas Aquinas rests this conviction: human understanding is a place for holiness, because the truth is holy.”⁶² In a chapter on St. Thomas titled “The Contemplative,” Chenu recounts how Thomas’s technical and speculative theology was a marrying of his contemplative/religious life as well as his intellectual genius. As a friar St. Thomas was a contemplative in action—one who is drawn to the pure contemplation of God while, at the same time, called to the evangelical zeal of the friar preacher. In making this point Chenu draws on a citation of St. Thomas from *Quaestio disputata de caritate*:

There are some who experience in the contemplation of God such delight that they are unwilling to let go of it, even for the service of God in the salvation of their brothers and sisters. There are others, however, who arrive at such a summit of love where even this divine contemplation, in which they experience the greatest delight, is re-expressed in serving God in their brothers and sisters. That was the perfection of the Apostle Paul. And that is the perfection that belongs to the preachers.⁶³

⁶⁰ Ibid., 116.

⁶¹ Marie-Dominique Chenu, O.P., “The Renewal of Moral Theology: The New Law,” *The Thomist* 34 (1970): 2.

⁶² Chenu, *Aquinas and His Role in Theology*, 31.

⁶³ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestio disputata de caritate*, a. 11, resp. 6, cited by Chenu, *Aquinas and His Role in Theology*, 45.

Chenu sees in this statement an expression of Thomas's own religious life as well as his vocation to the apostolate of the theologian. Thus wisdom for St. Thomas is both contemplative and active; it is also why there are found none of the modern distinctions between dogma, morality, and spirituality in his works.⁶⁴

In this short overview of the work of Marie-Dominique Chenu, it is evident that he belongs to a school of Thomism that can be described as sapiential. Chenu's commitment to placing St. Thomas in his historical milieu, as first and foremost a biblical theologian, as well as his unitive vision of theology, would have a lasting impact on twentieth-century theology, not least with Servais Pinckaers.

Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P.

Jean-Pierre Torrell has come to the attention of the English-speaking world with the translations of his authoritative two-volume work on the life and theology of St. Thomas.⁶⁵ These volumes have been a crucial contribution in the renewal of Thomistic theology. Gilles Emery, a student of Torrell's, states: "The important publications of Fr. Jean-Pierre Torrell have the great merit of helping us to rediscover the unity of the project of Christian wisdom which St Thomas Aquinas developed. . . . This integral conception of wisdom is indispensable to the vocation of the Christian theologian."⁶⁶ Emery adds that, in the second volume of his great work on Aquinas, Torrell explores the riches of Thomistic spirituality while showing the way to an authentic renewal of Thomism and "perhaps even to the renewal of theology itself."⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Chenu, *Aquinas and His Role in Theology*, 46.

⁶⁵ *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Volume 1: The Person and His Work*, revised ed., trans. Robert Royal (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005) and *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Volume 2: Spiritual Master*, trans. Robert Royal (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003).

⁶⁶ Gilles Emery, O.P., "Book review: *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Volume 2: Spiritual Master* by Jean-Pierre Torrell O.P.," *Nova et Vetera* 2, no. 1 (2004): 211.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* In a short intellectual autobiography, Torrell accounts for many of his influences and theological interests. He did his doctorate on the ecclesiology of Vatican I under the supervision of Jerome Hamer (who would have an influence on Servais Pinkaers). His ecclesiological studies were very much influenced by Henri de Lubac, Charles Journet, and Yves Congar. Torrell's interests moved after the Second Vatican Council from ecclesiology (he felt his work on Vatican I had been superseded by Vatican II) to revelation and the Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Verbum*. This led Torrell to the question of prophetic knowledge as found in the Bible and as interpreted by St. Thomas as well as other medievals. In 1973, in collaboration with Denise Bouthillier, Torrell worked on the theology of Peter the Venerable. That same year he was asked to join the Leonine Commission,

Torrell sees himself as following the ground-breaking work of Marie-Dominique Chenu. As he states at the beginning of his biography of St. Thomas: "We would not know how to introduce Thomas's work without mentioning Father Marie-Dominique Chenu's *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas*." A work "without equal," an "unprecedented effort . . . to reinsert the Master into the concrete milieu in which he lived—not only the historical and theological, but the "evangelical and theological" milieu."⁶⁸ Torrell adds that his own theological exploration of St. Thomas would have been unthinkable without Chenu.⁶⁹

Like others who form part of the sapiential renewal of Thomism, Torrell sees Thomas first and foremost as an inheritor of a tradition and a thinker of his age, rather than looking at St. Thomas through the lens of subsequent commentators. Therefore, Torrell highlights that St. Thomas's approach to theology is not a break from the tradition of Augustine and Anselm. For example, Augustine's prayer to understand the Trinity highlights that theology begins with faith: "Aiming my efforts according to that rule of faith, as much as I have been able . . . I have sought Thee; I desired to see in understanding what I held by faith."⁷⁰ Augustine's theological quest is expressed through prayer. "It is quite remarkable," adds Torrell, "that the inventor of the formula *fides quaerens intellectum*, Saint Anselm, also expresses his theological project in a prayer: "I desire to understand at least a little Your truth, Your truth that my heart believes and loves." And he adds something rather significant: "I do not seek to understand in order to believe, but I believe in order to understand (*credo ut intelligam*)."⁷¹ Thus faith and theology are inseparable and this is as true for St. Thomas as it is for Augustine and Anselm.⁷² The unseen (faith) together

where he would work for eight years. In 1981 he succeeded the prolific Thomist Jean-Hervé Nicolas as Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the University of Fribourg. There, though retired, he remains to this day. Commencing in 1981, Torrell became one of the most prolific French Thomists of the late twentieth century. Jean-Pierre Torrell, 'Mon Parcours Intellectuel,' Fribourg 15/02/07, www.unifr.ch/dogme/dogme150fr.htm (accessed 19/08/2010). See also the foreword by Walter Principe, C.S.B. to Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas: The Person and His Work*, ix–xii.

⁶⁸ Torrell, *Thomas Aquinas: Person and Work*, Preface, xix.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, xx.

⁷⁰ St. Augustine, *De Trinitate* XIV, 6, 3, as cited in Torrell, *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 4.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 4, 5.

⁷² Like Anselm and Augustine, "St Thomas's thought maintains that theology's origin is its relationship to faith, and that it would not even exist without constant dependence on faith. . . . Faith is that added capacity in us that requires human intelligence to rise to 'the height' of divine reality. It allows us to be

with the desire to know (reason); each spurring the other on in a common endeavor for truth. "Contemporary theologians," writes Torrell, "may differ on many points, but if they wish to remain theologians, they cannot disagree on the connection of theology and faith."⁷³

It is simply inconceivable, says Torrell, to understand St. Thomas's conception of theology divorced from his understanding of the need for faith. Torrell places particular importance on what St. Thomas says of his patron saint in his *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*: "Statim factus est Thomas bonus theologus ueram fidem confitendo."⁷⁴ The doubting Apostle Thomas immediately becomes a good theologian when he kneels at the feet of the Risen Lord. "Without faith, we would have only hollow formulas, and our most beautiful constructions would be nothing more than empty shells. With faith, we can truly begin to be theologians."⁷⁵ Therefore theology is a "pious science."⁷⁶ As such it "demands a living faith, which is to say a faith penetrated ('informed' as Thomas says) by charity in order to correspond fully to its definition."⁷⁷ Theology then follows the path of the believing Christian from faith to the Beatific Vision; thus, as a scholar, the theologian is in a different position than a scholar in some other field. He is not some disinterested observer distancing himself from that which he studies so as to have some objective gaze. The theologian "does not need to leave theology to find God. It is enough for him to push the demands of his science to the limit in order to be irresistibly drawn toward Him who is the final aim of the life of a believer."⁷⁸ Therefore prayer is an essential part of the theologian's toolkit.⁷⁹

Another aspect of Torrell's work that I wish to highlight is the spirituality of St. Thomas. It is significant that Torrell's summary of Thomas's

reunited with the divine because 'the act of believing does not reach completion in the formulas (of the Creed) but in (divine) reality itself' (*ST* IIa IIae q.1a. 2 ad 2)." Torrell, *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 5.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Lectura super Ioannem* 20, lect.6, n. 2562. Cited by Torrell, *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 6.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Jean-Pierre Torrell, *La Théologie Catholique*, Deuxième édition revue et augmentée d'un post-scriptum (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2008), 68.

⁷⁷ Torrell, *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 16, 17.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 9. Also, "Theological study demands the same faith as do Christian life and prayer. And though these are different activities, the same faith finds expression in them all." Ibid., 17.

⁷⁹ "This is why," states Torrell, "Thomas's Prologue to the *Sentences* says that for him who practices it theology takes on the modality of prayer (*modus oratiuus*). There is no doubt that, for him, prayer belongs to the practice of theology." *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 17.

theology (Volume 2) is entitled *Spiritual Master*. Aquinas's entire work, Torrell argues, can be seen as a "spirituality." Taking a lead from the work of Walter Principe, Torrell sees two dimensions to the word spirituality that can be related to the life and theology of St. Thomas.⁸⁰ The first dimension designates *spirituality* as the reality lived by a given person. As Torrell points out, there is little doubt that Thomas had a personal spirituality.⁸¹ The second dimension of spirituality designates a spiritual doctrine. Usually this spiritual doctrine is associated with a particular person's spiritual life—the doctrine and the life blend almost into one. There are many examples of this, such as Teresa of Avila, John of the Cross, Therese of Lisieux, Francis, and Benedict. Torrell makes a case that St. Thomas can be included in this list of "spiritual doctors." Not, he says, on the plane of the "practically practical" (that is, practical guidance in the spiritual life that can be imitated, such as that provided by those listed above). Rather, Thomas is a spiritual doctor on the plane of "speculative practical knowledge."⁸² This means, according to Torrell, that Thomas's theology, peerless in terms of its speculative nature, is directed towards living a life directed towards God. His spiritual doctrine "is an implicit and necessary dimension of his theology."⁸³ And further, he says, "For [Thomas] there was no need to elaborate a spirituality alongside his theology. His theology itself is a spiritual theology, and we should always be able to recognize a Thomist theologian by the spiritual tone that he gives to even the most technical investigations."⁸⁴

Torrell is aware that the stereotypical understanding of Thomas is a far cry from the one he is proposing, namely, that he is a "spiritual master." When one encounters St. Thomas's writings, especially the *Summa theologiae*, its very structure and tone, its impersonal style and method, seem to belie what Torrell says. However, the stereotypical understanding evolves

⁸⁰ Ibid., 18. The work of Walter Principe referred to is "Toward Defining Spirituality," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 12 (1983): 127–57.

⁸¹ Torrell, *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 18.

⁸² Ibid., 20.

⁸³ Ibid., 21.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 18. Furthermore, "[S]pirituality of the Thomist sort remains unnoticed only by those who do not read Thomas deeply (the same happens with the more explicit spiritual masters if we are satisfied with studying them only superficially). Those who study Thomas in depth know what is to be found in him, even if they usually feel no need to emphasize it. If Saint Thomas himself did not write that explicit work on spirituality that we seek, spirituality nonetheless finds a place in the *Summa Theologiae*. As Gilson once magnificently put it, '(t)hus his *Summa Theologiae*, with its abstract clarity, its impersonal transparency, crystallizes before our very eyes and for all eternity [Aquinas's] very interior life.'" Ibid., 21.

from a superficial reading of St. Thomas. Even his *via negativa* in coming to the divine, suggests Torrell, is a spiritual theology:

In itself, it is an unusually demanding asceticism. If a theologian tries to practice it in the spiritual state that we tried to describe in the opening pages of this book, he cannot help but see the stages of his progress as degrees of ascent on the way that leads to God. Like every believer, he must abandon idols and turn toward the living God (Acts 14:14). He must also renounce the constructions of his own mind, personal idols that have no less a hold. In his way, Thomas invites us to this when he distinguishes the contemplation of the philosophers from Christian contemplation. The former is always tempted to stop with the pleasure of knowledge in itself and, in the end, proceeds from self-love. The latter, the contemplation of the saints, completely inspired by love for the divine Truth, ends in the object itself . . . the practice of this theology shows itself to be an education in the spiritual life.⁸⁵

St. Thomas, according to Torrell (and following Chenu), is both a theologian and a mystic. This however does not involve a dichotomy whereby he divides his time between two pursuits. Rather, theological knowledge is mystical knowledge: "St. Thomas, for example, is a mystic because he is a theologian."⁸⁶ It is possible that a theologian can also be a mystic, says Torrell, because it is only by faith that the knowledge of the theologian has any real content; for it is through faith that the theologian is taken from the obscurity of this world toward the vision of God. This is why it is necessary for the theologian as a scholar to direct his skills and knowledge to their final end, that is, in God's own knowledge.⁸⁷ "The theologian," states Torrell, "does not have God at his disposal: he can only situate himself in relation to God, see in him his origin and his end, bring back to God everything in the universe as well as his own actions, and finally, pray to him, adore him, humble himself before him in contemplation."⁸⁸

It is essential that God be the subject of the theologian's inquiry and never be reduced to being an object. Thomas's position, says Torrell, is that theology is a science of conclusions (attainable only by faith as propositions), but this is not the end of theology. The end is "acquaintance with

⁸⁵ Ibid., 34.

⁸⁶ Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., "St. Thomas Aquinas: Theologian and Mystic," trans. Therese C. Scarpelli, *Nova et Vetera* 4, no. 1 (2006): 4.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 4.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 5. Torrell quotes Chenu: "Contemplative prayer or theological speculation are specifically different variants in their psychological manifestations; but in theological structure, they have the same object, the same beginning, the same end." *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 17.

theology's subject."⁸⁹ It is for this reason that a theologian is a contemplative. St. Thomas sees theology as primarily an exercise in contemplation (speculation) and only secondarily as a practical science.⁹⁰ "This answer," says Torrell,

puts Thomas into a class of his own in the long line of the theorists about theological science. Up until his appearance, theology was of course spoken of as a contemplative science, but essentially as it was ordered to the perfect practice of charity. . . . Thomas was the first to see it as, on the contrary, orientated toward contemplation. As we have just seen, since theology is completely directed toward God, that orientation carries all others along with it.⁹¹

Torrell sees in this observation another key point in St. Thomas's theological vision, namely, Thomas recognizes that there is no distinction between moral and dogmatic theology. "It is one and the same *sacra doctrina* that encompasses everything, even, as we have seen, later concepts such as 'spirituality' or spiritual theology."⁹²

For Torrell the most important thing we can learn from Aquinas is the unitive dimension of theology. This unity is found in the Trinitarian God.

In everything that concerns him, the theologian is constantly referred to the primary origin, which is Love flowing from its Trinitarian source. Thomas draws from this the concrete lesson that everything in theology, absolutely everything, must be considered in connection with God. It is from him that all things come, it is toward him that all creatures move.⁹³

While our knowledge of things has increased since medieval times, we have, according to Torrell, lost the ability to organize our knowledge. "The power of Aquinas is exactly to propose an organic vision of things departing from the highest cause and in relation with which one can appreciate the rest. This is precisely the difference between science(s) and wisdom."⁹⁴ Aquinas then is the master of synthesis and a man of "complete

⁸⁹ Ibid., 10, 11. Torrell goes on to point out that this understanding of theology's true aim changed in the fourteenth century.

⁹⁰ St. Thomas Aquinas, *ST* I, q. 1, a. 4.

⁹¹ Torrell, *Saint Thomas: Spiritual Master*, 12.

⁹² Ibid., 12, 13.

⁹³ Ibid., 11.

⁹⁴ Carlos Leget, "Liberating Aquinas from His Aristotelian Mask: An Interview with Jean-Pierre Torrell O.P." (14/4/1998), www.thomasinstituut.org/nws.php (accessed 19/08/2010).

knowledge”: philosopher and theologian; speculative and practical; exegete and patristic scholar. Reflecting on his own work, Torrell sees the “incontestable richness of vision” that an interdisciplinary—unifying—approach to theology gives.⁹⁵

Servais Pinckaers as a Moral Theologian in the Sapiential Tradition of St. Thomas

In this final section my purpose is simply to show that Servais Pinckaers is of the same mind as Marie-Dominique Chenu and Jean-Pierre Torrell both in his understanding of St. Thomas’s theological vision and in his sapiential approach to theology.⁹⁶ My focus will be on four areas: (1) How Pinckaers interprets (broadly speaking) St. Thomas’s writings; (2) Pinckaers’s notion of theology as a form of wisdom; (3) Pinckaers’s thoughts on the importance of prayer and holiness in theology; and (4) Why it is essential, according to Pinckaers, to understand the inherent unity of theology. Each of these areas demonstrates that Pinckaers’s theology is indeed a model of sapiential theology in accord with the criteria set out by the International Theological Commission.

Pinckaers’s Interpretation of St. Thomas

Servais Pinckaers is a Thomist, seeing in St. Thomas the principal, though not sole, influence for his own theology. Thus, when he seeks to define theology he takes his cue from Thomas: “Theology, in fact, is not merely the result of the work of reason elaborating science on the basis of the documents of revelation—which our condition as intellectuals inclines us to think. Beyond the discursive reason, theology finds its principal source, as St. Thomas himself says, in the light of the Word of God received in faith.”⁹⁷ Here we see Pinckaers, following the work of Chenu and Torrell, highlighting the essential nature of faith in doing theology. However, faith also requires charity, which enables the believer to know in a connatural way. Through the experience of God and the wisdom of the Holy Spirit, both the learned and the “little ones” are enlightened.

⁹⁵ Leget, “Liberating Aquinas.”

⁹⁶ Chenu was an important influence on Pinckaers and wrote the preface to his first book: *Le renouveau de la morale* (Tournai: Casterman, 1964). Contemporaries as theologians and Dominicans, Pinckaers and Torrell share the same fundamental approach to understanding St. Thomas.

⁹⁷ Servais Pinckaers, O.P., “Dominican Moral Theology in the 20th Century,” trans. Mary Thomas Noble, O.P., in *The Pinckaers Reader: Renewing Thomistic Moral Theology*, ed. John Berkman and Craig Steven Titus (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 84.

“This light of faith, the *lumen fidei*, is not sporadic. It accompanies and directs the lives of believers and of the Church all along the way, notably in the reflection of theologians.”⁹⁸ For Pinckaers, this Thomistic understanding of theology places the theologian in a place of docility, humble in faith before the source of faith. Again, this is a far cry from a rationalistic Thomism that had become the stereotype by the twentieth century.⁹⁹

The centrality of the Holy Spirit (and St. Thomas’s faithful docility to the Spirit) in reading the work of St. Thomas is paramount for Pinckaers. For example, Pinckaers states that in writing the *Summa*, “Thomas is aware that he is listening to the Lord teaching on the mountain, in the company of the Fathers and the holy Doctors of the Church, in the same fellowship with all those, philosophers and others, who, without having been able to hear this voice directly, had nonetheless known how to welcome, even if imperfectly, the light of truth poured into hearts by the Spirit, who had already hovered over the waters at the beginning of creation.”¹⁰⁰ Here we hear echoes of the first lecture of St. Thomas, “Similarly the minds of teachers, symbolized by the mountains, are watered by the things that are above in the wisdom of God, and by their ministry the light of divine wisdom flows down into the minds of students.”¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Pinckaers, like Chenu and Torrell, also notes the context of St. Thomas’s theology. See, for example, his discussion of Aquinas’s understanding of beatitude: “To adequately understand St. Thomas’s conviction that nothing in this world comes closer to perfect beatitude than the contemplative life, it is important to acknowledge Thomas’s cultural context and personal experience, which help us understand his teaching more deeply. According to Gregory the Great, the Gospel gives us the model for the ideal of contemplation in the person of Mary of Bethany, seated at the feet of Jesus and listening to him. Thomas’s ideal—that contemplation of the truth is the beginning of our future life—was one he lived out in the “springtime” of his Dominican religious order. In the previous century St. Dominic had founded the order for the contemplation and preaching of evangelical Truth. All the power—better, all the fire—of Thomas’s efforts for spiritual renewal in the thirteenth century is contained in these pages. In reasoning that is exquisitely ordered and rigorously elaborated, St. Thomas reveals the soul of his theology and the heart of his personal experience in communion with his brothers.” Servais Pinckaers, O.P., “Aquinas’s Pursuit of Beatitude: From the *Commentary on the Sentences* to the *Summa Theologiae*,” trans. Mary Thomas Noble, O.P. in *The Pinckaers Reader*, 99. Originally published as “La voie spirituelle du Bonheur,” in *Ordo sapientiae et amoris* (1993): 267–84.

¹⁰⁰ Servais Pinckaers, O.P., “Sources of the Ethics of St. Thomas Aquinas,” trans. Mary Thomas Noble, O.P., in *The Pinckaers Reader*, 23.

¹⁰¹ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Inaugural Lecture*, in Simon Tugwell, O.P., *Albert and Thomas: Selected Writings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 355.

We should, says Pinckaers, take our lead from St. Thomas that in order to understand divine revelation we need to read Scripture as it speaks to our hearts through the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, before reading the work of St. Thomas we should do as he did, namely open the Gospel and meditate on it, pray with it, and put it into practice. Thus, revelation becomes a “living knowledge.” Only then,

[n]ourished by the same spiritual source, we can enter into communion of mind and heart with St. Thomas and engage in fruitful dialogue with him, as well as with the authors whom he quotes, as he invites us to listen to them in our search for truth. Thus, we will better grasp the timeliness of his teaching, discerning its human riches and limitations. We will know, also, how to find the words needed today to transmit the intellectual treasure contained in his works.¹⁰²

Pinckaers, like Chenu and Torrell, reads St. Thomas in light of his sources. Thomas is a master, but should not be read simply as if there had been no theological sources before him. His work is flooded with his deep knowledge of Scripture as well as with all those who have gone before him who loved and searched for truth. Whether it be with the Fathers (East and West) or the Philosophers, Thomas enters into “profound communion . . . with all the authors whom he consults.”¹⁰³

Pinckaers's Notion of Theology as a Form of Wisdom

It is evident that, according to Pinckaers, theology is a form of wisdom. “Love for the ‘fulness of truth,’ as St. John puts it, ‘or the search for wisdom’ is essential for theology.”¹⁰⁴ Pinckaers takes up the theme of wisdom explic-

¹⁰² Pinckaers, “Sources of the Ethics of St. Thomas Aquinas,” 23.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Pinckaers, *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, 35. For a short overview of Pinckaers's thoughts on wisdom see Servais Pinckaers, O.P., *Plaidoyer pour la vertu* (Paris: Parole et Silence, 2007), 330–37. Pinckaers differentiates between philosophical wisdom and theological wisdom in the following: “We can cite the passage from Cicero's *De finibus bonorum et malorum* where he declares, “Wisdom does not resemble the art of the pilot and physician but rather a role in the theatre or a dance; for the height of art and its fulfillment lies in itself and is not at the beck and call of anything external to it.” And he adds that Wisdom is even more independent of external happenings than the arts. For Christian theology, according to St. Paul, the source of wisdom will be in God and will be communicated through the events of salvation history thanks to faith in Christ. Wisdom comes to the human person from without, but this does not hinder it from penetrating to the ultimate depths of the person. Wisdom, the supreme moral quality, thus acquires an objectivity and reality that are specific characteristics of Christian thought.” Servais Pinckaers, O.P., “A Historical Perspective on Intrinsically Evil

itly when he looks at the notion of truth in *The Sources of Christian Ethics*. He explains that since the Enlightenment and the onset of rationalism, theology has developed an impoverished notion of truth, a notion that separates truth from love. Taking his cue from Scripture, Pinckaers notes that a fuller understanding of truth does not just involve ideas but “grows out of a concrete, total experience engaging the entire person in encounter with the other.” This, he adds, is really a description of our relation to God.¹⁰⁵ This co-inheres with a classical definition of truth—“the mind’s grasp of a thing”—but, adds Pinckaers, with an added something, namely, that the thing grasped is not simply a material object but a personal reality—God or neighbor. “This personal reality reveals itself in all its nature and mystery as light, goodness, beauty, energy, life. Mind is not now abstract reason but intelligence united to will, love, and desire, informing and directing them. It is understanding joined to sensitivity and imagination, guiding and regulating them.”¹⁰⁶ Therefore, truth is not merely abstract but involves a person and, furthermore, the intellect having grasped truth is called into action. Thus we are called to live the truth in love. “Truth,” states Pinckaers, “is beneficial; through upright love it creates a profound harmony between our various faculties and between persons.”¹⁰⁷ This understanding of truth corresponds to St. Thomas’s definition of the human intellect, as

a power that “reads into” reality (IIaIIae, q 8, a1). It penetrates beyond the outward show of words, gestures, the literal text, to the very depth of a person, a thought, a life, and it understands. This understanding, flowing from active experience and profound contact, gives us a unique kind of knowledge that is universal, constructive, concrete, somewhat intuitive.¹⁰⁸

This knowledge is sure because it is “connatural”; it is acquired through doing the truth in love. “Its name is wisdom. It culminates in the gift of wisdom, which perfects charity, and the gift of understanding, which perfects faith.”¹⁰⁹ And theology, adds Pinckaers, for the Fathers, for Thomas and the great Scholastics, was a work of such wisdom—practical and contemplative.¹¹⁰

Acts,” trans. Mary Thomas Noble, O.P., in *The Pinckaers Reader*, 190–91. Originally published in Servais Pinckaers, O.P., *Ce qu’on ne peut jamais faire* (1986), 20–66.

¹⁰⁵ Pinckaers, *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, 34.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ “Here, then, is a new aspect of Christian asceticism: that intellectual and spiritual detachment produced by the desire for truth, which urges us firstly to transcend

For Pinckaers, it is essential to “love the truth”; love and truth belong together. He cites the intuition of the novelist Georges Bernanos, who wrote about the primordial will to either lie or tell the truth; the determined will to lie will flicker for an instant in the liar’s eye, revealing the reality of his person. “Love of truth or of lying is primordial, basic to a person, and will affect his actions decisively so that they will be rich or empty.”¹¹¹ Seeking the fullness of truth—wisdom—is essential in theology, whatever the theological discipline. For the moral theologian, such as Pinckaers, this seeking of wisdom will throw light on what a human act means. This wisdom is contemplative and must be restored to Christian ethics, which, states Pinckaers, “has become profoundly voluntaristic in recent centuries.”¹¹²

The Importance of Prayer and Holiness for Theology

A theme that runs throughout Pinckaers’s theology is the link between prayer (and the desire for holiness) and theological knowledge. In the Prologue to *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, Pinckaers argues: “Particularly in the field of Christian ethics, I am convinced that work is useless unless it flows from faith and prayer. This applies equally to intellectual work, study, and daily effort. Theology is ecclesial work, and no one, whether concerned with minor details or the entire building, can build without

sensible perceptions, then to transcend the ideas formed by our reason, then finally to transcend the intuitions of our mind, in order to allow the development within us of that contemplation, at once obscure and luminous, intelligent and unknowing, which is proper to faith in this life. When we reflect on these texts of the *Summa* we can read between the lines to discern the spiritual experience of the Angelic Doctor, an experience animated by the ardent love of truth which spurred Thomas on to seek God before all other realities, as his biographer William of Tocco tells us. We are not in his case dealing with a purely intellectual search, one which might become so abstract in its series of transcendent moves that it might risk vanishing like a rocket into the space of concepts, and even beyond that. From beginning to end, Thomas’s venture remains linked with the desire for beatitude and that love of goodness which moves the will. In his very succinct and sober style he describes for us the progress of our spiritual appetite, which unites the desire for truth with the love of the good, thus directing all the movements of the human mind and heart toward God. The pathway built by Thomas is indeed predominantly intellectual and sapiential, just like the teaching of the Fathers of the Church; but it is at the same time unitive through the love of God, which is strengthened by charity and the desire for beatitude, and lifted higher by the virtue of hope.” Servais Pinckaers, O.P., “Beatitude and the Beatitudes in Aquinas’s *Summa theologiae*,” in *The Pinckaers Reader*, 122–23.

¹¹¹ Pinckaers, *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, 35.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

the Holy Spirit.”¹¹³ Furthermore, in this same Prologue, to a work that he considered the synthesis of his theology, Pinckaers outlines his project: “I have opted for the roads that lead most directly to my main goal, and this goal has become progressively clearer to me. I have tried, in a word, to clear the way, all too often obstructed or even condemned, that leads to a rebonding of Christian ethics and spiritual spontaneity within the human heart, under the action of the Holy Spirit, through faith in Christ.”¹¹⁴ Notice here his determination to place prayer at the heart of the theological exercise, as well as the necessity, in moral theology, to take account of the role of the Holy Spirit.

The importance of prayer is also highlighted by Pinckaers when he discusses the centrality of Scripture, something the Fathers of Vatican II wanted renewed in moral theology.¹¹⁵ The reunification of moral theology and Scripture, Pinckaers considers, is the chief task for moral theology today. “We must seize upon the grace offered by the Council.”¹¹⁶ This means taking into account the many advances in the scientific study of Scripture, but it is not restricted to that. The moral theologian cannot just refer questions for deliberation to this science alone. Rather, Pinckaers proposes what he calls “experiential exegesis.” This means an understanding of the Word acquired by living the faith proposed by Scripture and reflecting upon it. We see this method used particularly in his reflection of the Sermon on the Mount.¹¹⁷ “The theologian,” states Pinckaers, “cannot be content with merely multiplying references to Scripture or to extensive patristic sources, but must penetrate and grasp theology’s deepest foundations and principles.”¹¹⁸

Unless prayer and theological reflection are integrated, the very essence of theology will be affected, as well as its insertion into the deposit of faith. “The principle underlying St. Augustine’s own research convinces us of this. His assertion ‘Unless you believe, you will not understand,’ can easily translate into: ‘Unless you pray, you will not understand.’”¹¹⁹ Moreover,

There must be a link between personal and liturgical prayer . . . and theology. Today we realize more and more the need for prayer in theological reflection. Under the influence of rationalism, we have too long

¹¹³ Ibid., xxi.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Vatican Council II, *Optatam Totius*, 15.

¹¹⁶ Pinckaers, *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, xxiii.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 161.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., xvii.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 163.

believed that theology was a work of pure reason and prayer a matter of emotion. We have forgotten that the theologian cannot acquire an experiential, accurate understanding of what he teaches without the light of grace and therefore of prayer, without his share in the gifts of wisdom, understanding, knowledge, and counsel.¹²⁰

Experiential knowledge also requires a virtuous life; thus for a theologian it is best that he or she is virtuous. His or her virtue “will be the wisdom that unites everything.”¹²¹ It is also worth noting that in his reflection on his “Sources” the first two he mentions, before any theologian or philosopher, are an attraction to the Eucharist and the discovery of the Bible as the Word of God. Eucharistic adoration, for Pinckaers, “is a source of contact (with the Lord) situated beyond ideas, words, sentiments and representations, which secretly inspires them and makes them fruitful.”¹²² Pinckaers links his own devotion to the Eucharist to that of St. Thomas; it belongs to the realm of faith and it imparts deep understanding: “*fides quaerens intellectum*.”¹²³ Understanding the Bible as the Word of God, superior to any human words, is paramount for Pinckaers. He writes, “I acquired from this an appreciation for the legitimacy and preeminence of the ‘spiritual’ meaning of the Scriptures that is tied to the experience that faith and practice provide, both through and beyond the historical and textual exegesis that was being taught to us. Interpreted in this way, following the practice of the Fathers of the Church but without neglecting the contributions made by modern scholarship, the Scriptures can become once again the principal and preeminent source of theology.”¹²⁴ Pinckaers’s devotion to the Eucharist and the Word of God affected him profoundly as a Thomistic moral theologian:

I was able to enter into the texts of St. Thomas from within, through the first source of its inspiration, beyond the textual and historical studies that approach his teaching from the outside. I was thus able to perceive the Christian and theological dimension of his teaching, particularly his moral teaching, while being confronted with the rational and philosophical reading of his work, which was predominant at the time: rediscovering, for example, the treatise on the New Law and the role of the gifts of the Holy Spirit; perceiving as well the spir-

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ “Le mieux pour un théologien est d’être lui-même vertueux. Sa vertu propre sera la sagesse qui les rassemble toutes.” Servais Pinckaers, O.P., *Plaidoyer pour la vertu*, 57.

¹²² Pinckaers, “My Sources,” 913.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

itual and even mystical dimension of his teaching, which one can connect to Eucharistic devotion.¹²⁵

The Unity of Theology According to Pinckaers

Another important part of Pinckaers's project is to reintegrate moral theology into theology as a whole. In other words, there is for Pinckaers an inherent unity in theology. The opening of *The Sources of Christian Ethics* consists in Pinckaers's attempt to define Christian ethics. No easy task, as he points out. The broad definition he favors is this: "Christian ethics is the branch of theology that studies human acts so as to direct them to a loving vision of God seen as our true, complete happiness and our final end. This vision is attained by means of grace, the virtues, and the gifts, in the light of revelation and reason."¹²⁶ The important point here in this unified vision of moral theology is the term "branch of theology." Rather than the usual terms such as discipline or specialization or even field, "branch of theology" suggests that at root all the different branches are linked, each a branch of one vine. Pinckaers is at pains to point out the unified nature of theology. He notes how in recent centuries Christian ethics has been cut adrift from dogma, exegesis, and spirituality. Although this is important and necessary for pedagogical purposes, the problem has been that theology is no longer a single science; rather it is "in actual fact a tangle of disconnected parts."¹²⁷ "One of the principal tasks of theology today," writes Pinckaers "is to restore its own unity."¹²⁸ The lines of communication between the different branches of theology need to be re-opened for the mutual benefit of all. After all, writes Pinckaers, "Did not St. Thomas claim that theology, with all its branches, possessed a more intrinsic unity than philosophy, since the latter admits the innate duality of metaphysics and ethics?"¹²⁹

N.V

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Pinckaers, *The Sources of Christian Ethics*, 8.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 9.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid. Before explaining the connection between the image of God and Christian ethics, Pinckaers states: "I approach the theme as a moralist, it is true, but one whose concern is to re-establish close bonds between Scripture, dogmatic theology, and the Christian experience, each of which expresses itself in its own way, converging in our theme." Servais Pinckaers, O.P., "Ethics and the Image of God," trans. Mary Thomas Noble, O.P., in *The Pinckaers Reader*, 131. Originally published as "Le thème de l'image de Dieu en l'homme et l'anthropologie," in *Humain à l'image de Dieu*, ed. Pierre Büchler (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989), 147–63.