I, CATHERINE

Selected Writings of
St Catherine of Siena

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY
Kenelm Foster OP
and Mary John Ronayne OP

COLLINS
St James's Place, London
1980

INTRODUCTION

'A prophetess towered in the tumult, a virginal tongue told.' G.M. Hopkins, *The Wreck of the Deutschland.*

The young woman who dictated the letters translated in this book was born, so far as we know, in 1347 at Siena in Tuscany, and died at Rome on 29 April 1380. Eighty one years later she was officially declared a saint by the humanist pope, Pius II, himself a Sienese. Sanctity, as the Church in such cases understands the term, is Christian virtue at a heroic degree and normally attested by extraordinary effects which, as held to be not accountable by the ordinary processes of nature, are called miracles. This is not the place for discussing miracles as such, nor indeed for much lingering over any external details of Catherine's brief intense life on earth; which in any case has attracted excellent biographers, especially as regards its later stages when Catherine was a conspicuous figure in the public life of her time. To study her letters is to be drawn deep into the history, both ecclesiastical and secular, of late fourteenth century Italy. This is not, however, their principal importance. Incomparably more important is the doctrinal and spiritual message of these letters, I mean their writer's passionate insight into the central dogma of Christianity, the union of godhead and manhood in Christ. For many this doctrine is pure fantasy and many others, while not denying it, give it only a desultory attention. For the Church of course it is everything, its entire *raison-d'être*. But to anyone, believer or not, who stops to reflect for two minutes, it must surely be clear that if that union *has* taken place, if our fellow-man Jesus *is* also God, then God is revealed as loving indeed and the New Testament affirmation 'God is love' [1] becomes a statement about our concrete human situation and one of the very utmost urgency. Now the whole

importance of Catherine of Siena as a writer – the aspect of her that most concerns us here – lies in the exceptional clarity, force, sweetness and profundity of her utterances on this great matter.

In what follows I shall first sketch St Catherine's life (I) and then give a brief summary of her spiritual teaching (II). A final section will give a few details about the text of her writings and their more important editions (III).

* * *

I

She was born, then, probably in 1347, the twenty third of twenty five children of a fairly prosperous Sienese dyer, Jacopo Benincasa, and his wife Lapa. Their house was on the steep hill below San Domenico. A twin sister having died in infancy, Lapa for once had time, before her last pregnancy, to suckle Catherine herself and so to become, we are told, particularly fond of her – a fact that did not prevent her finding this child, as she grew up to adolescence, bewilderingly unmanageable.

Siena was still a self-governing republic though already overshadowed by the greater power of Florence to the north, as by now were all the Tuscan communes. Because of this Florentine predominance in the region, Tuscany as a whole was one of the five chief centres of power in Italy, the others being Milan and Venice, the States of the Church (lying north-east, east and south of Tuscany) and the Kingdom of Naples. Catherine never had much to do, directly, with the two northern states Milan and Venice, nor with the southern kingdom, despite her contacts by letter with the notorious Queen of Naples, Joanna (see letter 58). It was only with the affairs of Florence and the Holy See that Catherine became deeply involved.

Between 1305 and 1378 all the popes were Frenchmen, governing the Church from Avignon in Provence from 1309 to '67 and again from 1370 to '77. This long absence of the popes from Rome naturally affected their

Italian dominions, the history of which, during this period, falls broadly into two phases, before and after 1354. Before this date the picture is one of a general collapse of central authority. In every region nominally subject to the Holy See the cities set up local despots or succumbed to external ones. Rome itself fell a prey to the struggle for power of the great local families, a state of affairs only interrupted by the strange career (1347–54) of the patriotic idealist Cola di Rienzo. However in 1354 the able and energetic Spanish cardinal Albornoz was entrusted by Innocent VI with the task of restoring order in the States of the Church. Albornoz succeeded so well that in 1367 Urban V – warmly applauded by Petrarch – was able to bring the Curia back to Rome; only to return to Avignon, and die there, in 1370. The definitive return to Rome was effected by the next Pope, Gregory XI, in 1377, under strong pressure from St Catherine, as we shall see.

To return now to that dyer's house overlooked by the great Dominican church at Siena. To the Florentine Dante the Sienese seemed a vain and dreamy race,[2] but the Benincasa at any rate were practical bourgeois folk and in the swarming hurly-burly of her home Catherine grew up in full contact with human realities. She grew up quickly too in Christian piety and before she was twelve had vowed her virginity to Jesus – no other husband for her! – a step that brought her at once into sharp conflict with her family until Jacopo, convinced at last that this daughter of his was no ordinary girl, ordered Lapa and the rest to let her be. Catherine was allowed a room of her own and there she remained, praying day and night, only leaving it to go to church or help with the housework. At sixteen she got herself admitted, against stiff opposition because of her youth, into a Dominican lay sisterhood, the *Mantellate*. This did not make her a nun but it gave her the black and white Dominican habit and the great Order's protection. She continued to live at home but now in a still stricter seclusion which may have lasted

three years and was only terminated when she received, as she believed, an order from Christ to come out of her solitude and begin to practise, in the world about her, his second commandment: 'Love your neighbour as yourself.'

It is worth pausing here to reflect briefly on Catherine's spiritual experience so far, and particularly on the 'preternatural' element in it. Of course we are largely in the dark as to what went on in her cell during these years of seclusion, but some gleams of light are not lacking, and we owe them to her closest friend, who was also her confessor, the Dominican Raymond of Capua (c. 1330–1399) who has left a fairly full account of Catherine's inner and outer life in youth and early womanhood. His *Legenda maior*[3] is in fact our chief authority (apart from her writings) on the life of Catherine, especially in its earlier stages. One can of course question Raymond's testimony, but he knew Catherine very well, and most of her family too, her mother in particular; and if some of the miracles and visions he reports seem barely credible, he is always careful to identify, whenever a *miracle* is in question, the source or sources of his information – the evidence of his own senses or of those of persons he had consulted when preparing his book. I underline 'miracles' to distinguish them from 'visions', following Raymond in this, who usually reserves the term miracle for extraordinary happenings which might, in principle, have been witnessed by more than one person at a time; as distinct from 'visions' which are experienced only by those who see them. So when, says Raymond, it is a question of Catherine's 'visions' (with which he associates 'revelations') 'we have only her own word' for it.[4] Lastly we have to take note of a third class of phenomena intermediary between miracle and vision (in the senses indicated) without being reducible to either. This is what Raymond calls Catherine's 'spirit of prophecy', under which he includes not only a power to see things 'at a distance', whether in time or

space, but also that of reading other people's secret thoughts and intentions. Of Catherine's possession of this power Raymond gives some striking instances.

* * *

Such, in outline, are the varieties of preternatural power attributed to Catherine by her earliest biographer; and they call for two observations. First, in a Christian perspective all such powers seem to come under the head of those 'charisms' enumerated by St Paul, in I Corinthians 12, as 'manifestation(s) of the Spirit for the common good'. Second, while such gifts may accompany holiness, they are not of its essence; which is constituted, simply and sufficiently, by what Paul in the next chapter of the same epistle calls the 'more excellent way', namely *agape* or charity, the love for God and one's neighbour (cf. Matthew 22:34 ff.). The other gifts 'do not make a saint, though they may help towards canonization. They are given for the sake of others, . . . as a means to an end . . . to draw attention to something else that really matters, the loving union of human beings with God'. Thus Thomas Gilby OP in his introduction to the English version of Raymond's book; but he knew very well, of course, that a craving for preternatural phenomena often tended in fact to blur the great distinction drawn by Paul, and that a good deal of this kind of confusion affected the cult of the saints in the late medieval Church. Catherine's own teaching is untouched by that confusion, but the same cannot be said of some of the devotion she inspired.

We have seen that Catherine came out of her seclusion – it was in or about 1367 – at the express command, as she believed, of Christ himself. This was only the last of a series of such communications, usually accompanied by a vision of him, that she received at this time. He would appear to her bodily senses, standing or moving about her room, sometimes alone, sometimes with Mary or one or other of the saints. The strongly visual element in her

religion was never more active than at this time. More important is the intensity of her concentration on the figure of Jesus. If she is a Christian mystic, it is the adjective that has to be stressed: at the centre of her vision is always God *incarnate*; a fact which links her, as a mystical writer, with St Bernard rather than with, say, her English contemporary the author of the *Cloud of Unknowing*, or with the Augustine of the *Confessions*. In the *Confessions* and in the *Cloud* Christ is the precondition of the experiences described, not their direct object; they are theocentric rather than christocentric, while the reverse is true of Bernard's sermons and still more of Catherine's writings which to a very large extent are meditations on Christ crucified; a characteristic that led Paul VI, when he declared Catherine a Doctor of the Church in 1970, to speak of her deep affinity with St Paul. Paul and John in fact were her favourite New Testament authors.

* * *

A noteworthy effect of her absorption with Jesus was the way (reminding one of St Teresa of Lisieux five centuries later) she did without normal 'spiritual direction'. True, she had her regular Dominican confessors, the Sienese Della Fonte at an early stage, and after 1374 Raymond of Capua, but only in a very qualified sense can they be said to have 'directed' her; indeed it was not long before Raymond, her senior by a good many years and a man of weight in his order, was calling her 'mother' and virtually submitting to *her* direction. Nor does he seem to have had any difficulty in accepting her account of the matter: 'You can take it as certain, Father, that I have never learned anything from men or women about the way of salvation, but only from the . . . sweet bridegroom of my soul, the Lord Jesus Christ, either in the form of an inspiration or from his speaking to me as I speak to you now, face to face.' [5] Two such communications are famous. The first came at an early stage and may well be the

source of her later, very characteristic, teaching on self-knowledge. 'Do you know, daughter', Jesus said to her, 'who you are and who I am? . . . *You are she who is not, I am he who is.*' [6] The other communication is also recorded by Raymond. Jesus appeared to Catherine when she had been through a violent and prolonged erotic temptation. 'Where were you, Lord, all this while?' she asked him. 'I was in your heart', he replied.[7] In passing we may note that she seems never to have been tempted in her faith (as Teresa of Lisieux was) though she may well, in the dark days of the Schism, have been tempted to despair; and she must often, with her fiery temperament, have found patience a considerable strain, which no doubt is why she has so much to say about it. Raymond devotes a whole chapter to her patience.

Catherine's resolve, on leaving her long solitude, to serve Christ in her neighbour involved no challenge to current ideas as to work suitable for a woman, provided at least that the service was limited to corporal works of mercy. So for a time her originality appeared only in her very extraordinary tenderness to the sick in the Sienese hospitals, and to the poor everywhere but especially to those who came to beg at her father's door, and naturally came in greater numbers as the news of her reckless generosity got around. Some of the stories told of her at this time are like miniature epics of charity; feats of high courage no less than benevolence. Still, her charity so far (if we ignore some not too conspicuous miracles) was only extraordinary in degree, not in kind; it represented the sort of thing that Christian women had always done and were to go on doing; so that one might be tempted to pass on to enterprises more distinctive and original, to her in that day unfeminine apostolate of the word, to her interventions in the affairs of princes and prelates. But that would be to over-stress the preacher and the public figure at the cost of the saint, at the cost too of missing some of the youthful charm of that holiness which had now appeared in the streets and squares of Siena.

The slender figure in the white tunic and black mantle, going around on errands of mercy, began to be talked about. Some professed to be shocked by the freedom of her ways (she always, we are told, looked you in the eyes when she spoke); and her austerities, which she could hardly keep concealed, were criticized by the wise and prudent. But many were drawn to her, and not only by her cheerful goodness but also increasingly by her intelligence. She did not seek to be loved but to love; but her Dominican training had not been wasted and she was already clear in her young mind that the way to love lay through knowledge. This truth she had already tested in the matter of loving God; she now had to discover – for her a harder task – the lovableness of human beings. So, as usual, she turned to Christ and begged for the grace to 'perceive the beauty of all the souls she came into contact with, so that she would be the more prompt to work for their salvation';[8] and we may perhaps discern an answer to this prayer in her magnificent insight into that dignity of 'the being endowed with reason' which was to be a major theme of her letters. As T. Deman wrote in a fine essay: 'According to current views, what needs explaining is how man ever does what is right; but as Catherine sees it, what needs explaining is how he can ever go wrong.'[9] Catherine never grew accustomed to evil; and this because she had so accustomed herself to relate everything to God, the creative and creating Good. Evil had to be recognized, but it was always the desecration of a goodness *already* bestowed, which *need never have happened*; for sin is nowhere but in the will, and since the will cannot be coerced, no sin ever is or was *necessary*. Catherine is among the most vigorous assertors in the Catholic tradition of what Dante had called the soul's *innata libertate*; indeed on this matter of free will she and Dante speak with remarkably similar voices. Characteristic of both is an abhorrence of any suggestion that *moral* evil is unavoidable. Catherine had, however, this advantage over the great poet, that from girlhood she had

spent herself on behalf of sinners and outcasts, had struggled with the demon of despair in the hearts of lepers and condemned criminals.

In 1368 her father died and in 1370 three brothers and her favourite sister-in-law migrated to Florence. Catherine felt these departures, for she was very much a woman, and an Italian one at that, as a chance remark she had once made about the children swarming in her mother's kitchen may serve to show: 'If decency allowed it, I would never stop kissing them.'[10] But meanwhile another 'family' had begun to form round her, the group of friends and disciples with whom her memory is connected; both men and women, priests and layfolk. The priests were mostly friars – Dominicans of course, but also Franciscans, and two Augustinians, one of them the English recluse with a Cambridge degree, William Flete. Some of the group were Catherine's seniors but the average age would not have been much over thirty. The Dominicans were on the young side (excepting Raymond of Capua, but he may not have known Catherine before 1373) and there were some young laymen, three of whom she was to use as her secretaries, dictating her letters to them. What held the motley company together was a common veneration for Catherine's manifest holiness. But mingling with this purely religious motive there must surely have been – if the distinction is admissible – an attachment to the woman in the saint. In a way this already appears in the fact that most of them called her 'mother' and she called them, whatever their age, her children (though in her letters to them she usually also said 'brother' or 'sister', as the case might be, or, when the man was a priest, 'father'). But the effect she had on men of her own age, or older, can hardly have been, in every case, originally simply 'maternal'. In her own way she must have been an attractive, if often formidable, woman. Consider this impression of her at this time, recorded by one of the Dominicans, Bartolomeo Dominici, many years later: 'She was young when I first knew

her, and her face was sweet and gay (*il suo volto appariva dolce e gaio*) and I too was young and yet I never felt in her company the kind of embarrassment I would have felt in that of any other girl; indeed the more time I passed with her, the less was I troubled by human passions (*più discorrevo con lei, e più le passioni umane mi si spengevano nel cuore*).' [11]

This Bartolomeo became a close friend of Catherine, accompanying her on her journeys to Pisa (1375), Avignon (1376) and Rome (1378) and living to bear witness to her sanctity – with other Dominicans of the original group – at the offical inquiry into it set up by the bishop of Venice in 1411. He was a friar of some intellectual distinction and in general it was a mark of Catherine's influence that she attracted men of more than average culture and ability – priests like Bartolomeo himself and Raymond of Capua, the theologian Tantucci, William Flete and the celebrated spiritual writer Giovanni delle Celle; and among the laymen, Niccolò Soderini of Florence, the poet Neri de' Pagliaresi, the painter Andrea Vanni, the jurist Lorenzo del Pino. Catherine always had a flair for reaching men 'at the top' in every walk of life. 'It is not everyone', remarks M. de la Bedoyère, 'who before he reaches the thirties finds himself in familiar intercourse with popes and sovereigns, cardinals and generals, or who presumes to influence . . . their policies.' [12] It is true that obscure artisans, enclosed nuns, ordinary housewives and common criminals were among her correspondents; but among her closer friends and disciples there was from the beginning a certain preponderance of educated people of the middle and upper class. It is all very strange, of course. She was a woman, and young, and not of noble birth, and in the ordinary sense quite uneducated. The wonder is not that she aroused suspicion and hostility (as she did, especially in the early stages, at Siena, between 1368 and 1374) but that she aroused so little. Nor need this be explained simply by her sanctity. Medieval society, though stiff with legal and social re-

straints, was spiritually, in a sense, less restricted than modern society. The Church itself, in the relations between its members, found room for franker and more direct approaches than was customary after the Reformation. Moreover Catherine, as a Dominican tertiary, operated under the wing of a religious order of unsurpassed intellectual prestige and doctrinal authority. She could no more have done what she did as a simple laywoman than she could have done it as an enclosed nun; and her Dominican connection was a special and very great advantage. It also perfectly suited her candid, communicative nature. Possessed of a first-rate mind and also, as a Tuscan, of a subtle, vigorous and beautiful language, she took a spontaneous delight in knowledge and in its communication, finding in every act of understanding a glimmer of the 'sweet First Truth'. If, echoing Aquinas perhaps unconsciously, she called the intellect 'the noblest part of the soul', it was because she was in love with Christ, for her the only 'Master' and a fountain of endless wisdom precisely because, being the Logos incarnate, he rendered the Father's glory knowable (John 1:14, 18). And it was just here, in this concept of God-to-man communication, that she found the Dominican ideal which she made her own. For by definition Dominicans are preachers and in founding the Order St Dominic had taken as its model the apostolic preaching of St Paul, as defined in II Corinthians 4:5–6: 'For we preach not ourselves but Jesus Christ our Lord . . . For the same God who said "let light shine out of the darkness" has shone into our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus.' No words could better express the ideal and the practice of St Catherine.

There is evidence that Catherine was in Florence in the early summer of 1374. It seems likely that this her first journey outside Sienese territory had something to do with the simultaneous presence in Florence, at the General Chapter of the Dominican Order which met there that year at Pentecost, of the Master General, a French-

man, and of Raymond of Capua, whom Catherine probably already knew. This is a plausible inference from a letter sent to Raymond two years later by Gregory XI, in which the pope confirms an authority already (*olim*) conferred on Raymond by the Master General over Catherine and some other unnamed Sienese tertiaries. It is clear that the pope regarded Catherine as the leading spirit in this group. As for its activities, he designates them as propaganda for a crusade 'and other matters of interest to the Holy Roman Church.' [13]

By 1374–75, then, Catherine was already getting involved in higher Church affairs, and she was soon to be drawn, in fact, into direct relations with the central government of the Church, first in the context of its Italian policies – the conflict between Florence and the Holy See, 1375–78 – and then in that of the threat to the papal institution itself, represented by the Great Schism, which began in September 1378. In both matters Catherine played a not inconspicuous part, putting herself unreservedly at the service of 'Christ-on-earth', as she called the pope, but always intensely longing for peace. In the general disintegration of the medieval world, of *her* world, she was involved in an historical process far too complex for her to understand save in purely moral and religious terms. And yet her political naivety can be exaggerated. Some of her interventions had a real, if limited, effect; her efforts for peace between the papacy and Florence were not all wasted, and Gregory XI's decision to leave Avignon in September 1376 was precipitated by Catherine's pleadings, even if it had already been his intention, long before he knew her, to bring the Curia back to Rome. But these are questions that cannot be pursued here. It will be more to my purpose, before concluding this biographical sketch, to describe very briefly Catherine's basic attitude to the Church and to the situation in which it found itself in the last years of her life.

We have seen that since adolescence she had committed herself to an active life in the world; but this external activity had to be nourished from an inward source, and the more so as a circle of disciples formed around her, eager for spiritual guidance, seeing in her not only an example of rare virtue but a source of enlightenment. So she became a teacher and preacher of 'the mystery of Christ', finding, characteristically, her way to this through the 'cell of self-knowledge'. And this alternation of inward and outward, contemplation and discourse, went on right to the end. But there was a gradual shift in her teaching, I think, towards an increasing concern with the Church. This was the effect mainly of the two successive events already mentioned, the papal-Florentine conflict (1375–July '78) and then the rebellion of the French cardinals against Urban VI in the summer of 1378, which led to the Great Schism. Catherine's passionate yet often wonderfully lucid reactions to these disasters may be studied in many of the letters in this volume. All that she says in them springs from her theology of the Blood. For her the indispensability of the Church consists precisely in this, that it is the medium through which the blood shed on the cross for the human race becomes not only the *sign* of God's re-creating love for sinners but also the vehicle of that love to this and that sinner individually. The Church 'holds the keys of the Blood',[14] the Blood reaches us 'through the ministers of holy Church'.[15] Indeed the Church exists, for Catherine, only *in function of* Christ's blood; but that was enough to prostrate her in reverence before its meanest minister. Her mysticism is extraordinarily 'ecclesial', a fact stressed by Paul VI in the declaration cited above.

But it was not in Catherine's feminine nature to contemplate an ideal without at once wanting to get it realized in the world about her. So her Christian vision issues into pleas for a general reform of the Church, usually addressed to the two popes she knew, Gregory XI and Urban VI; and in her letters to layfolk, especially those of high rank and authority, into urgent reminders of the

respect they owed to the Church's ministers. Her protests against irreverence to the clergy became sharper as she became aware of the rising tide of anticlerical feeling in Italy, which the Florentines openly encouraged – exploiting the anti-French element in it – in their conflict with Gregory XI. But Catherine also knew very well that in many cases these anticlerical sentiments were thoroughly justified; and was not afraid to say so to Gregory himself. He however died in March 1378, and with the election on 8 April of Urban VI and the great division of the Church that ensued – beginning at the top among the cardinals, and spreading downwards into the laity, according as secular rulers took one side or the other in the quarrel – every other concern in Catherine's mind took second place to her zeal for the unity of the Church and the authority of Urban. Her first call now was to the clergy and it was essentially a call to obedience. But her greatest severity was reserved for those 'incarnate devils' the great prelates who had started the Schism or had, she thought, done nothing to prevent it spreading (see letter 47 below).

Thus we see Catherine, in the last five years of her life, confronting two major threats to the unity of Christendom: the division between clergy and laity, which found one expression in the papal-Florentine conflict (as it had already found another of a different kind, though in its own way a very Florentine one, in Boccaccio's *Decameron*); and then the schism in the clerical body itself, that greater disaster which was to bring Catherine, utterly exhausted, to a premature death. Two conflicts and two efforts at reconciliation, the second apparently a total failure; but there was another conflict, inherited and sacrosanct, which found Catherine the reverse of reconciliatory, the war with the enemy *outside*. As we saw in the letter from Gregory XI to Raymond, cited above, Catherine's ardour for a renewed crusade against the Moslems had been among the things that first brought her to the attention of the higher authorities in the Church while still in her

nonage in Siena. Why the Avignon *curia* of the 1370s should have shown this interest in the idea of a crusade is a question that need not detain us here. Certainly it was a recurrent theme in Catherine's letters between 1373 and 1376, and more especially in those that she wrote from Pisa in 1375. Later, under the pressure of more urgent matters, she said less about the need for renewing the 'holy war' against the infidels, but she never seems to have doubted the rightness of such a war. As a woman of her time she thought it the plain duty of a Christian knight to be ready to draw his sword for the recovery of the holy places – which by right, she said, 'belong to us'. Nevertheless she could say of the Moslems, 'they are our brothers, redeemed by the blood of Christ just as we are' – a remarkable statement for that time.[16] And in a passage that seems to echo Romans 11:13–16 she looks forward to a rejuvenation of the Church, grown senile and sinful, by an inflow of converts from Islam.[17]

As the reader will recall, we left Catherine at Florence in the summer of 1374. Returning to Siena in the same year with Raymond of Capua, she found her city in the grip of the plague. Having laboured heroically among the sick and the dying, she moved south to Montepulciano, and then, early in 1375, with a number of friends and disciples, to Pisa. There she remained, on and off, for nearly a year. It was a year of much epistolary activity and of a considerable widening of her contacts and influence. As has been noted, many of her Pisan letters were aimed at spreading the idea of a crusade, but in the autumn, and on into 1376, she found herself increasingly engaged in the more urgent task of countering the anti-papal propaganda now emanating from Florence. In June 1375 the papal legate de Noellet had come to terms with Ghibelline Milan, thus leaving the notorious captain of mercenaries John Hawkwood free to invade Tuscany. Florence took alarm, scenting papal designs behind this threat; and began to organize an anti-papal league. Catherine, by now in touch with Gregory XI, was fighting

on two fronts. Horrified by the anticlerical spirit now prevailing in Florence, she at the same time sympathized with the widespread Italian hostility to the pope's representatives (usually Frenchmen) in Italy. So she both pleads with Gregory on behalf of his rebel subjects and begs him to undertake a radical reform of the Church, beginning at the top; and in the meantime to come and deal on the spot with the misgovernment in his Italian dominions. In March Bologna fell to the anti-papal league and Gregory put Florence under an interdict. But there were influential Florentines who desired peace, some of them friends of Catherine; and they succeeded in getting her offer accepted to act as mediator between the city and the pope. In this capacity she went to Avignon in June, with the usual company of friends and disciples, including the one with most authority, Raymond of Capua. He served as her interpreter with the pope, translating her voluble Tuscan into Latin.

So far as the papal-Florentine conflict was concerned, this embassy was not a success; the war dragged on till July 1378. But Catherine's persistence did overcome the pope's hesitations about leaving Avignon; and he had done this, and arrived back in Rome by the end of January 1377. Meanwhile Catherine was back in Italy, and, after Christmas at Siena, moved south to the Val d'Orcia in the Sienese *contado*. Here, and in the wild country further west, she passed most of 1377, evangelizing the wretchedly poor countryfolk, helped always by friars from Siena. Her letters of this period, among which are some of her finest, are mostly on the themes she was to develop and expand in her great mystical treatise, traditionally called *Il Dialogo*, which she probably began to dictate to her secretaries in the winter of 1377–78, after returning from Val d'Orcia to Siena, and probably completed before she finally moved to Rome in November 1378. In the meantime she had been forced back into politics by an order from Gregory XI early in 1378. She was to return to Florence where it was hoped that her

influence would tip the scales in favour of the Guelf party now working, against stiff opposition, for a final peace with the Holy See. Catherine obeyed and remained in Florence for about four months, narrowly escaping death at the hands of an anti-Guelf mob which took virtual control of the city on 22 June. Meanwhile Gregory had died and it was his successor Urban VI who finally made peace with the Florentines on 28 July.

This is not the place to go into the confused matter of the election to the See of Peter, on 8 April 1378, of the Archbishop of Bari, who became Urban VI. Catherine never doubted the validity of Urban's election though she may well have been tempted, in her heart, to regret it. Urban was upright and zealous, but irascible, rude, tactless and overbearing. Catherine had quickly read his character but was nevertheless overwhelmed with grief and horror when the majority of the cardinals went back on their oath to Urban, and on 20 September elected as their pope Robert of Geneva (Clement VII). Between these two elections Catherine, her work in Florence now finished, returned to Siena, her heart filled with misgivings by the rumours that reached her from Rome. Her first care was to warn Urban against his own temperament, her second to secure him good advisers. After the election of Clement VII, Urban let Catherine know, through Raymond, that he wanted her at Rome, but she refused to come without a direct command. When this came she went to Rome, arriving on 28 November. During the following terrible year, though her counsels of moderation were not all wasted on Urban himself, her general influence on the course of events was slight. The Schism spread across Europe following the lines of national frontier and rivalry; France, Scotland, Naples, and later Aragon were 'Clementine'; Italy, apart from the southern kingdom, England, Hungary and most of the Empire were for Urban. Catherine's own Dominican Order split along the same lines, the Master General, a Frenchman, becoming a schismatic. It was not long

before the division became a military issue. In all this turmoil Catherine's voice is heard repeatedly pleading, arguing, denouncing; but her arguments for the validity of Urban's election involved her in disputes about factual details that lay outside her direct experience and could not be decided *a priori*. Her *forte* as teacher and preacher had always been her deep insight into the essential principles of Christian life; and her power as a Church reformer depended, now as always, on her ability to get these principles into the minds of men in authority in the Church, or to spread them as a leaven in the hearts of ordinary Christians. But in the conflict now raging, and with the Church divided from top to bottom, the first of these methods was, for the time being, virtually ruled out. Not entirely, however, the second one. Catherine still had her group of fervent disciples. There was Raymond who received, at Genoa, as a kind of spiritual testament, the last two letters translated in the present selection; and whom she expected – correctly as it turned out – to be elected General of the non-schismatic Dominicans at the General Chapter that was due to begin at Bologna in May 1380. And there was the rest of her 'family', many of whom were with her when she died, after much suffering, on 29 April. On 16 March she had been induced to call them all together and to give them a kind of summary, the gist of which has been preserved, of all that she had tried to teach them by word and example. Her book, the *Dialogo*, she had already bequeathed to Raymond.

* * *

II

On 4 October 1970 Paul VI declared St Catherine a *Doctor Ecclesiae*, thus giving her a place among the Church's major theologians. The title itself has been given to relatively few of the saints, and so far to only two women, the other being Teresa of Avila. Of course these two great women are usually thought of as mystics rather

than as theologians, but in Catholic usage the terms denote simply different ways of apprehending the same object, the God of the Christian faith, self-revealed in Jesus Christ. Theology, on this view, is mainly a skill in analyzing and expounding this Christian concept of God, whereas mysticism is an experienced contact with the reality to which it refers. Thus theology is chiefly intellectual, mysticism affective and experimental. But the *object* of both is the same, namely the living God whom Jesus has told us to love above all things (including our subtlest concepts) and who, having loved us first, can be trusted to love the mind that sincerely seeks him and to guide it into what St Paul called 'the depths of God' (I Corinthians 2:10). This is the guidance described by Catholic theology in terms of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, who is the spirit of love; above all the gift of wisdom, without which the cleverest theology remains arid and stunted.[18] In this sense all theology worthy of the name is in tendency 'mystical'. As for mystics in the more usual sense of the term, whether their contact with God will give rise to clearly articulated doctrine will depend, humanly speaking, on their natural gifts and circumstances.

Splendidly explicit as she always was about her love for God, Catherine must have had an inward experience of him that was hers alone. But the *image* from which her meditations commonly began was the familiar one presented by any crucifix. At whatever point we enter her mind we encounter Christ crucified, and in particular the thought of his blood. The blood shed on the cross became for her the supreme sign and pledge of divine love and the chief motive for ours. It summed up for her, both as a reality and a sign, all her understanding of Christianity.

Everything, for her, relates then to the cross; but to understand why this is so we have to distinguish, in Catherine's teaching, two other major topics: the need for self-knowledge and the doctrine of the soul as a created 'image' of the divine Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. I shall take the second of these three themes

first; then the third; and conclude with that of the Incarnate Word on the cross.

1 *Self-knowledge*

The way to God, for Catherine, begins in the 'cell of self-knowledge'; this she never tires of repeating. But the point is sometimes imperfectly understood. Her insistence on the need for self-knowledge is not only, or even primarily, a way of saying that we must recognize ourselves to be sinners, and so acquire humility. Of course it is that; but Catherine always looks *through* the sin to the goodness which it thwarts and distorts – that is, to the soul's radical 'likeness' to the Creator whose image it bears. It was, in fact, a *double* illumination that Catherine had gained, in youth, through self-knowledge, and that she spent her life trying to communicate to others. In herself she had discovered both man and God; and each, again, under a double aspect. This is perhaps obscure, but the point should become clearer if we consider the human creature that she found in herself. She found it *morally* frail – full of self-love, greed, impatience, etc. – and she found a frailty in its very *being*. Presumably the former insight preceded the latter in time, being the more empirically evident one. And from it she derived, in the last resort, her fierce and very physical asceticism, her insistence on self-hatred as a concomitant of the love of Christ,[19] her ceaseless attack on that 'perverse self-love', often identified with sensuality, 'which is the root-cause of all our evils'.[20] But the other insight was a looking *past* sin to creatureliness as such, and so to the Creator this implied. A sense of the frailty of one's being may be no more than a sense of physical weakness, but it can also, in intelligences of the finer sort, contain an intuition of being as such; it can be incipiently metaphysical. And that it was so in Catherine I am led to believe by those words, already cited, in which she expressed this insight, and which she believed she had heard from Christ himself: 'Daughter, . . . you are she who is not, I am he who is.'[21]

Philosophy however, for obvious reasons, was not Catherine's vocation, and the doctrine of the creation of all things out of nothing quickly combined in her Christian intelligence with that which identified the Creator with the holy Trinity. Moreover the same faith which gave her this conception of God told her of a special likeness and affinity to God imprinted on the essence of man, as recorded in Genesis 1:26: 'Let us make man in our own image and likeness.' It followed that genuine self-knowledge must be some kind of discerning, in and through oneself, of the Father, the Son and the Spirit. This consequence Catherine eagerly drew, and she did so with what may be called a particularly Christian stress, inasmuch as the triune godhead whom she saw reflected in her soul was seen very specifically in relation to man, and to man not only as created in innocence but also as re-created after his lapse into sin. In other words, the discernment of the Trinity, through its 'image', which she claimed to have, included that of the whole divine plan and process with regard to man, as Christian faith represents this, the plan and process which she was accustomed to call simply 'the Truth', as in the following very typical passage: 'I do not see how we can relish . . . this truth if we do not know ourselves, for through genuine self-knowledge we discover that we are not, and we find our being in God, seeing that he has created us to his image and likeness . . . and we find moreover our re-creation inasmuch as God has re-created us . . . in the blood of his Son, the blood that shows us the truth of God the Father; whose truth is this, that he created us for the glory of his name and in order that we might have a share in his eternal beauty, being sanctified in him.'[22]

This text exemplifies the ease with which Catherine can pass from self-knowledge to the contemplation of God – albeit of God very much in relation to man. Hardly less noteworthy are some of her insights, drawn from the same source, into the human condition. Three of these may be singled out.

a Looking into herself Catherine was very aware of her propensity to love and to seek love; and in the light of the Christian idea of creation, and of her human experience, she thence drew out one of her sweetest and most pregnant generalizations: 'Because the soul is made in the image . . . of God, it is made of love and for love . . . and cannot live without love.' [23] And again: 'The human heart is drawn by nothing so much as by love, for man is made of love . . . both as to his soul and his body; for it was through love that God created man in his own image, and it is through love that a father and mother give of their own substance to the child whom they conceive and beget.' [24] But it is, of course, on the primal unmediated divine love creating the rational soul that Catherine most dwells; the love which has left its imprint indelibly in the soul; so that, as it was an infinite divine desire that brought man into existence, so man in turn, in his deepest self, is moved by an 'infinite desire' which makes it impossible for him 'to find peace in this life', since that desire aims at nothing less than 'union with the divine essence',[25] the 'sweet First Truth'.[26] 'The Deity', in short, 'is the soul's true object (*vero obietto dell'anima*)'.[27] Note that in these texts Catherine speaks of the soul's *nature*, not of any effect of 'grace' in the sense of a quality *super-added* to nature.

b An immediate consequence of the divine image in the soul is its *non*-subjection to anything but God. 'You alone', declares Catherine to God, 'are greater than we';[28] and what she has in mind above all is the freedom of the human will, the power of 'the creature endowed with reason' to decide 'freely and for itself' [29] – a power such that 'no devil or any other creature whatsoever can constrain the soul to a mortal sin against its will'. This last phrase – an echo perhaps of Romans 8:35 – recurs frequently, with slight variations, in the letters, and always in connection, implicitly at least, with the idea of creation. Characteristically, Catherine imagines God saying to the newly created Adam: 'Be it done as you will . . . I create you free, subject to nothing except me'; such being, she adds, the nobility (*eccellenza*) of man that 'all things are created to serve him, and he to have no master but God'.[30]

c It will be clear by now that Catherine took a special delight in the doctrine of creation. It is a trait that she shares with Dante; and as in his case so in hers, it goes with a strong sense of the radical goodness of human nature and indeed of all things considered in themselves. Evil manifests itself only as a disorder in desire. This disorder is sin, which Catherine identifies, in the last resort, as we have seen, with self-love, itself often characterized as sensuality. The task of self-knowledge is to unmask this self-love – to see it, and see it as perverse. Now all loving is perverse that is not, directly or indirectly, a love for God (which is always in fact a loving-in-return, since he has loved us first and all that is lovable in oneself, or in others, or in nature, is only so because of him) .[31] The right order in loving – put negatively – is, do not love yourself for yourself, nor even God for yourself, but love yourself and everything else for God, and God for himself; in short, whatever you love, love it or him or her *in God*.[32] To flout this order is to try to enclose in the finite our natural desire for the Infinite [see above under *a*]; it is to act a lie against oneself and God. Such a perversion must be due to a darkening of the mind, a failure to *see* ourselves in our true relation to God. But what can account for this if not a prior misdirection of *desire* through absorption by, and in, the self and the sensible world? But does not this in turn entail some error of judgement? Further analysis would be needed to untie this knot, but we should not expect it from Catherine; enough for her to have seen – though she could not perfectly explain it – the interplay of error and self-love, of darkened mind and twisted desire, that is at the root of sin.[33]

2 *The creation of man as 'image' of the Trinity*

Catherine habitually thought of God as the three divine

Persons; but without giving particular attention to that *immanent* activity within the godhead posited by classical theology in its effort to give some account of the issuing of the Son from the Father, and of the Holy Spirit from both.[34] Catherine takes all that for granted, focussing her attention rather on the two great *external* actions of God which concern mankind: creation and redemption. As to creation, she mostly ignores (very unlike Dante here) the material world. Her focus is on the rational soul; but usually with at least implicit reference to the Genesis account of the creation of man in an original innocence. In her account of this creation two characteristic features may be noted here.

(i) She puts enormous emphasis on the *love*-motive in creation. She is never tired of repeating that we were loved before we began to exist. Gazing into himself, God fell in love with the beauty of his creature-to-be.[35] In the strongest possible sense of the term our creation is an act of sheer love. Man is God's darling. So much does she stress this point that she can speak of God as 'mad' or 'drunk' with love of his creature-to-be, and even – at the risk of scandalizing theologians – of his being 'compelled' by love to create man, though knowing full well that man would sin.[36]

(ii) The ultimate purpose of man's creation is that he may share in God's eternal joy. But this will only be the climax of a communication *already* established (but at risk of being lost by sin) in the original 'forming' of the soul to the image of the creating Trinity.[37] Catherine's treatment of this theme is a variant on the Augustinian tradition. A text from the *Dialogo* illustrates her procedure. She is commenting on Genesis 1:26: *Let us make man to our own image* – 'And this you did, most high eternal Trinity, so that man might participate in all of you (*in tutto te*). So you gave him memory, to remember your benefits; and by this he participates in your power, eternal Father. And you gave him intellect, to see and know your goodness, and so participate in the wisdom of the . . . Son. And you

gave him will that he might love what with his understanding he saw and knew of your truth, and thus participate in the clemency of the Holy Spirit'.[38] This last term 'clemency', *clemenza*, raises questions which cannot be gone into here. It is often used by Catherine, instead of the more usual 'love', for the divine attribute 'appropriated', as theologians say, to the Holy Spirit. The appropriations of power to the Father and of wisdom to the Son are more traditional. Their reflections in the soul are the Augustinian triad of memory, understanding and will, united as a single image of the Creator.

3 *Christ on the cross*

The same love that moved God to create man in order that a creature might share in the uncreated divine life, moved him to recreate man when, by misusing his inborn freedom, he had in effect refused that destiny. It was one and the same love, only now even more ecstatically displayed; for not content with giving being to a creature bearing his image, God now, in the person of the Son, so identified himself with this creature as to share its very nature, human nature. This is the Incarnation – a love union of God with humanity aimed at *reconciliation*. And this reconciliation, considered from God's side, has three aspects corresponding to the three main evils involved in human sinfulness: disobedience, ignorance (especially of God's love) and the love of self in preference to God. Of these three evils the first is, in Christian tradition and for Catherine, the precondition of the others; for the state of spiritual blindness and disordered loving which is the general condition of sinful mankind, had its origin in an act of disobedience, the sin of Adam.

The remedying of these evils by the incarnate Word is seen by Catherine almost exclusively in terms of the Crucifixion.

Jesus' death on the cross was his supreme act of obedience to the Father (cf. Philippians 2:8, Romans 5:9). As such it reversed Adam's disobedience, cancelling, 'mak-

ing satisfaction' for, the offence to infinite Goodness which that entailed (Romans 3:25; 5:19). But nothing that Jesus did or suffered would have been of any avail apart from the divine (not merely human) love – love for the Father and for his fellow men – which drove him to the cross. It is this infinite divine love, in the last resort, that atones for the infinite *non*-love that is at the heart of sin. Jesus' obedience was the expression of his redemptive love. It was love, and not the nails, that held him fixed to the cross.[39]

And this love, above all, is what the cross is a *sign* of, what it *shows* to man's self-darkened understanding. Here again Catherine is a pupil of St Paul (Romans 5:8; 8:31–2; Galatians 2:20), but she develops the idea that God *reveals* himself on the cross with a persistence that is all her own. She never tires of repeating that the blood of Jesus is the medium through which we can now know 'the truth of God the Father', that is, God's desire, from the first, to give us his own glory and joy, in eternal life. For her the Blood is the clue to the whole meaning of God in relation to man (cf. Ephesians 1:9; Colossians 1:26); and conversely, to the meaning of man. To 'lift the eye of the intellect' to the Crucified is the first task of every Christian; and this not only for the ascetical reason that Christ has shown that we have to suffer, and how we should suffer, if we would be his disciples (I Peter 2:21). Catherine accepts this reason, of course; but she sees in the Blood much more than an example. She sees, or strives continually to see, the *end* beyond all suffering and discipleship; the end that will be the restoration in ourselves of the original unspoiled image of the Trinity, that 'pure tree of humanity' planted by God 'in the beginning'.[40] In this sense the Blood is the clue to a kind of ultimate self-knowledge.[41]

This knowledge of God in and through Jesus is more than merely natural or rational; it involves faith, the starting point of Christian life. But what, for Catherine, was the connection between this faith-knowledge and the

remedying of that disorder in desire which, as we have seen, was the third of the three great evils affecting mankind as fallen and sinful? In other words, how does Catherine view Christian life in relation to the *will*, to its rectification and sanctification? With my answer to this question I conclude this outline account of Catherine's teaching; and I would answer it as follows:

(i) Faith is a 'light' given to the soul at baptism so that it may come to know 'its true object, the . . . Deity'.[42]

(ii) The first step to that final vision is an understanding, in the light of faith, of God's love for man as revealed in Christ, especially in his Passion;[43] this understanding being distinct from the beatific vision of heaven inasmuch as its proper immediate object is God 'shown under the veil of humanity'.[44]

(iii) This understanding implies an act of love in the will turning the mind towards Christ. In this sense charity precedes faith and nourishes it.[45]

(iv) To know Christ is to desire to be rid of vice and to grow in virtue; which in turn brings vigorously into play, and the more the better, the 'natural light' of reason; the task of which, enlightened by faith, is to correct sensuality and bring the soul into a 'sweet and glorious order'.[46]

(v) As love follows knowledge (of the good), so the more Christ is known, the more he must be found lovable. This consequence is much stressed by Catherine – to the point, sometimes, of seeming to say that it is *only* ignorance of Christ that can account for sin.[47]

(vi) The love springing from faith has two main effects in the soul, one negative, the other positive. The negative effect is an annulling or 'stripping off' of self-love. The positive effect is a 'clothing' of the will in the will of God, so that it begins to seek God above all things, and nothing else except in and for him.[48] This is the 'bright garment' of charity,[49] the supreme virtue, a 'foretaste', *arra*, of eternal life.[50] But it is not enough to call charity a love for God; it is *love in return for love*, a love of love, a surrender, in fact, to the full force of him who IS Love (I John 4:8,

16) and who is now bringing his created image to its ultimate point of resemblance to himself; communicating to it his own 'immortal riches',[51] and even his 'infinity',[52] and even, Catherine will say, making it 'god',[53] another 'myself'.[54] And she can say all this without a hint of pantheism because she is not speaking precisely of the soul's *being* (which remains creaturely) but of its *powers*, and especially of its power to love. To the soul's powers God (their Creator in the first place) now gives himself with the great twofold, divinizing gift; the gift, first, of the incarnate Word enlightening the intellect; and then of the Holy Spirit, God's love-gift *par excellence*,[55] whose gift to us is nothing else than a share in the divine love itself after which that Spirit is named.[56] At this point Catherine's eloquence falters, her thought becomes less clear. As a teacher she has much more to say about – indeed she is usually much more concerned with – the way to ultimate union with God than with the union itself. But three things may be noted, to conclude, in what she does say about it. First, the word 'peace', *pace*, expressing the fulness of charity.[57] Second, that between God's love for us and ours, however perfect, for him there is and always must be this difference that his love for us is absolutely *gratis*, *di grazia*, whereas ours for him is a love we *owe*, it is *di debito*. Only in our neighbour-love can we imitate *this* aspect of God's charity.[58] Third, Catherine sees the Holy Spirit as the agent, as it were, of our final union with God. The soul takes only charity with her into eternal life;[59] charity the proper effect of the Third Person (Romans 5:5). And when in the vision described in the famous letter on the execution of Niccolò di Toldo she sees this young man's soul enter the heart of Jesus, she adds that 'the hands of the Holy Spirit sealed him in'.[60]

Catherine's teaching is intensely personal but its content of course is the common stock of Catholic belief as she had imbibed this from childhood, at home and in church, from sacred images and ritual and countless

sermons and instructions. She must have learned much also in conversation with the theologians of various traditions who became her friends. We know too, from Raymond (Life, pp. 96–7), that quite early she had learned to read the Psalms of the Divine Office in Latin, and this would have been her introduction to the Vulgate Bible. She was certainly familiar with the New Testament. No doubt she could also read Italian; she seems to have known the popular devotional theology of the Dominican Domenico Cavalca (1270–1342) who was also a translator of selections from the Church Fathers. Her writings, at all events, show some knowledge, however acquired, of works by St Augustine, Cassian, St Bernard and, to a lesser extent, St Thomas. But all this matter of Catherine's sources will presumably be discussed afresh by specialists in the coming centenary year, 1980. So there, for the present, we may leave it.[61]

* * *

III

St Catherine's writings are the book that has come to be known as the 'Dialogue' (*Il Dialogo della Divina Provvidenza*) and most, if not all, of the 382 letters traditionally ascribed to her. There are also transcriptions of 26 prayers, not written by her or dictated, but taken down, as she uttered them, by her disciples (critical edition by G. Cavallini, Rome, 1978). One or two of the surviving letters were written in the first place by Catherine herself,[62] and perhaps even parts of the 'Dialogue', but no autograph has survived and it is certain that the great bulk both of this work and of the letters was dictated to secretaries. The dictation of the 'Dialogue' can be dated to between December 1377 and the following autumn; and a complete fair copy was made, very probably before the end of 1382. This copy is preserved at Rome (ms. Casanatense 292) and serves as the basis of the best edition of the work, that by G. Cavallini, Rome, 1968. The

transmission of the text of the letters is a more complicated matter, but for our purpose it will suffice to note the following points.

1 Catherine began to dictate letters around 1370 and continued to within two months of her death in April 1380.

2 Eight specimens of the original dictation have survived.

3 It is certain that small collections of letters were made by her disciples during the decade following her death, at the latest.

4 By about 1430 the larger collections had been made on which all our printed editions are based. They can be grouped into three 'families' each deriving from one or other of three of Catherine's secretaries, Neri Pagliaresi, Stefano Maconi and Fra Tommaso Caffarini.

5 The main motive behind these collections was the preservation and diffusion of Catherine's spiritual teaching. The collectors ignore chronological sequence and show little interest in the details of Catherine's day-to-day life. This explains most, if not all, of the 'cuts' discernible towards the end of many of the letters.

6 There seems to be no good reason to doubt the authenticity of the great majority at least of the letters ascribed to Catherine. This is the view of the three chief scholars in the field, Fawtier (in his second volume, 1930), Motzo and Dupré Theseider. The chief editions are those by Gigli, Tommaseo-Misciatelli and Dupré Theseider (for details see the Bibliography below, and the Translators' Preface).

KENELM FOSTER OP

1 I John 4: 8, 16.
2 *Inferno* XXIX, 121–2.
3 English translation by G. Lamb, *The Life of St Catherine of Siena*; with an introduction by Thomas Gilby OP: London, Harvill Press, 1960.
4 Raymond of Capua, *Life*, op. cit., p. 78.
5 ibid., p. 72.
6 ibid., p. 79.
7 ibid., p. 94.
8 ibid., p. 137.
9 *Vie Spirituelle*, Supplément, Oct. 1934, p. 11.
10 *Supplementum* (T. Caffarini's additions to Raymond's *Life*) transl. by A. Tantucci, I,II,12: Lucca, 1754.
11 *Processo Castellano, Il* (*Fontes Vitae S. Cat. Sen. Hist.*, ed. Laurent & Valli, IX), Siena, 1942, p. 295.
12 See *Catherine*, by M. de la Bedoyère (London, 1947), p. 35.
13 See article by T.M. Centi, OP. in *S. Caterina tra i Dottori della Chiesa*, ed. T.S. Centi, OP., Florence, 1970, pp. 39–56.
14 Cf. Dupré, letter XVII, p. 65.
15 ibid., letter LXXXII, p. 334.
16 Cf. Dupré, letter LII, p. 206.
17 ibid., letter LXXIV, p. 304.
18 Cf. St Thomas, *Summa theol.* 1a 2ae 68; 2a 2ae 45.
19 e.g. letter 5 below.
20 Dupré LXI.
21 Raymond, *Life*, p. 79.
22 Tommaseo 102.
23 See letter 14 below.
24 See letter 20 below.
25 See Dupré XVIII.
26 See Dupré XLV.
27 *Orazioni* V, line 6.
28 *Orazioni* VIII, line 175.
29 See Dupré XVII.
30 See letter 6 below.
31 See Dupré XXXX.
32 See letters 27, 39, 44 and others below.
33 See letters 34 & 37 below.
34 Cf. St Thomas, *Summa Theol.* 1a 27–31.
35 See letter 2 below & passim.
36 *Orazioni* IV, lines 95–117.
37 *Orazioni* I, 1–16.
38 See *Dialogue*, pp. 283–4 below.
39 Cf. letters 3, 5, 16, 26 and others below.
40 *Orazioni*, X, lines 1–11; cf. *Dialogue* ch. X.
41 See the great passage in *Dialogue*, ch. CLXVII, beginning '*O*

Trinità eterna, fuoco e abisso di carità . . .'

42 *Orazioni* V, 1–6; XVIII, 25–35, etc.
43 ibid., IV, 10–26; VIII, 56–62, and letter 42 & others below.
44 *Orazioni* XXI, 21–25; XV, 15–35; etc.
45 *Orazioni* VII, lines 62–79; VIII, 67–73; cf. letter 6 below, and *Dialogue*, ch. LI.
46 *Orazioni* VII, 92–102; cf. letter 59 below.
47 e.g. in letters 5, 17 & 34 below; cf. Dupré XL and LXI.
48 Cf. letters 27 & 28 below; *Orazioni* XXI *passim*.
49 See letter 42 below.
50 See letter 48 below.
51 *Orazioni* XXI, 90–95.
52 ibid. lines 104–9.
53 ibid., lines 117–20.
54 *Dialogue*, pp. 280–1 below.
55 Cf. St Thomas, *Summa theol.* Ia. 38.
56 *Dialogue*, ch. CLXVII; *Orazioni* XXII, lines 113–5; St Thomas, *Summa theol.* Ia 37.
57 *Dialogue* ch. LIV and letter 18 below.
58 *Dialogue*, ch. LXIV; *Orazioni* XXI, lines 80–89, and letters 38 & 44 below.
59 Cf. Tommaseo 345.
60 Letter 9 below.
61 For a provisional summary of the matter I may be allowed to refer to my article 'St Catherine's Teaching', in *Life of the Spirit*, XVI, no. 187 (1962), pp. 311–13.
62 See letter 272, Tommaseo-Misciatelli edition, IV, p. 215.