



Institute for Christian Studies
Institutional Repository

Sweetman, Robert. "Nisi Causa Utili et Necessaria: Catherine of Siena's Dominican Confessors and the Principles of a Licit Pastoral 'Irregularity'." IN *Rule Makers and Breakers: Proceedings of a St. Michael's College Symposium (1-2 October 2004)*, pp. 199-210. Eds. Joseph Goering, Francesco Guardiani, Giulio Silano. New York: LEGAS, 2006.

Permission granted by the author to digitize this article for the ICS institutional repository.

Dated: April 9, 2014.

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE SERIES

— 8 —

COVER:

Seventeenth century print
from *Poesie diverse*, Francesco de Lemene, Milano 1691.

Rule Makers and Rule Breakers

Proceedings of
A St. Michael's College Symposium
(1-2 October 2004)

Edited by
Joseph Goering, Francesco Guardiani, Giulio Silano



New York

Ottawa

Toronto

St. Michael's College Symposium (7th : 2004 : University of Toronto)
Rule makers and rule breakers : proceedings of a St. Michael's College
symposium (1-2 October 2004) / edited by Joseph Goering, Francesco
Guardiani, Giulio Silano.

(St. Michael's College series ; 8)
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 1-894508-86-6

1. Canon law--History--Congresses. 2. Law, Medieval--Congresses.
3. Christian literature, Latin (Medieval and modern)--History and criticism--Congresses. 4. Rules (Philosophy)--Congresses. I. Goering, Joseph, 1947-
II. Guardiani, Francesco, 1949- III. Silano, Giulio, 1955- IV. Title. V. Series.

BT77.S77 2006 230 C2006-903600-4

For further information and for orders:

<http://www.legaspublishing.com>

LEGAS
P. O. Box 040328 3 Wood Aster Bay 2908 Dufferin Street
Brooklyn, New York Ottawa, Ontario Toronto, Ontario
USA 11204 K2R 1B3 M6B 3S8

Printed and bound in Canada

ROBERT SWEETMAN

NISI CAUSA UTILI ET NECESSARIA:
CATHERINE OF SIENA'S DOMINICAN
CONFESSIONS AND THE PRINCIPLES OF A LICIT
PASTORAL 'IRREGULARITY'

ABSTRACT. The Dominican Order gradually evolved rules governing contact between a Dominican pastor and a woman penitent. In the context of these rules, the care given to Catherine of Siena as reported by Raymund of Capua and as confirmed in the letters of Catherine herself can only be termed irregular. The paper attempts to identify the principles underlying and legitimating pastoral irregularity.

In this essay, I argue for a certain construal of the pastoral frame of reference within which Catherine of Siena and her Dominican *confessores* or spiritual directors conceived of their lives together. I admit to taking a risk here, for I normally spend my time mucking about in the thirteenth-century history of the Dominican order, ploughing, as it were, with furrowed brow through its mystical, hagiographical, pastoral and theological fields. I admit, in addition, that my focus has been upon those rain-soaked provinces north and west of the Alps rather than upon the dappled landscapes of sunny Italy. You might think of me, then, as a grey Le Carré spy who has consented to come out of the cold for a moment, mud-spattered dossier in hand. Predictably I find myself squinting at the luminous vistas Catherine of Siena bids me behold with light addled eyes.

I begin with the most general and difficult of the questions I want to ask of Catherine and her *confessores*. What is one speaking of when invoking the term 'Dominican *cura mulierum* or care of women'? Admittedly, I cannot hope to deal with the pastoral office indicated within this rubric in all its complexity. Rather, I am content to examine a specific

Rule Makers and Rule Breakers - A St. Michael's College Symposium
Joseph Goering, Francesco Guardiani, Giulio Silano eds. Ottawa: Legas, 2006

institutional dynamic at work in Catherine's relationship with her Dominican *confessores*.

The dynamic I have in mind can be thought of as perennially animating the structures of Dominican *cura mulierum*. I offer as evidence a personal vignette. In 1985 I sent long-time Oxford Dominican Osmund Lewry a first draft of a chapter of my thesis.¹ In it, I had attempted to get at the Latin Church's reconstruction of pastoral care in the half-century preceding the foundation and spread of the Dominican Order. I had attempted to describe the role Dominican friars assumed in that care in the first half-century of their existence. As part of the latter effort, I had described the complex and fraught relationship between a number of Dominican houses in Flanders and the groups of beguines who looked to them for pastoral care. The beguines consistently worked through their patrons, both male and female, to ensure Dominican friars' presence as preachers, confessors and spiritual counselors; the friars worked to restrict their obligations. Fr. Lewry found the draft very rough indeed. But my account of this pastoral tension moved him to recognition. He mused that he was reminded of tensions he had experienced at play in Oxford between Blackfriars and a number of houses of nuns that looked to the friars of Blackfriars for spiritual direction. He sighed. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*.

The structures of Dominican *cura mulierum* themselves can be fruitfully thought about in terms of the three-fold distinction articulated in the middle decades of the thirteenth century by one of the earliest examples of what I in homage of Chaucer will call a Dominican "nuns' priest," Thomas of Cantimpré.² In the *Bonum universale de apibus* or "Book of Bees," Thomas divided his own *cura* into three constitutive acts: *praedicare* or liturgical preaching, *confessiones audire* or hearing confes-

¹ The thesis itself emerged some years later as "Dominican Preaching in the Southern Low Countries 1240-1260: *Materiae Praedicabiles* in the *Liber de natura rerum* and *Bonum universale de apibus* of Thomas of Cantimpré" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1988). The final form of the section mentioned here can be found on pages 18-69, endnotes 77-84.

² For accounts of the life and times of Thomas of Cantimpré, see A. DeBoutte C.r.r.S., "Thomas van Cantimpré zijn opleiding te Kamerijk," *Ons geestelijk erf* 56 (1982): 283-299; idem, "Thomas van Cantimpré als auditor van Albertus Magnus," *Ons geestelijk erf* 58 (1984): 192-209; A. Debroux, "Thomas de Cantimpré (v. 1200-1270): l'homme et son oeuvre écrite. Essai de biographie" (mémoire de licence, Université catholique de Louvain, 1979); the thesis noted above; and Thomas W. Grzebian, "Penance, Purgatory, Mysticism and Miracles: The Life, Hagiography, and Spirituality of Thomas of Cantimpré (1200-1270)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1990).

sion, and *concilium spirituale proferre* or giving spiritual counsel.³ The first two of these acts refers to the major sacramental rhythms of religious life, Penance and Eucharist. The third of these acts is less liturgically precise. Spiritual counsel could take place in a number of settings, some fully sacramental (or liturgical) as in the examination of souls within the sacrament of penance, some quasi-sacramental (quasi-liturgical) such as the collations within a religious community's daily cycle of prayer, and others non-sacramental (a-liturgical) as in the pastoral home visitation of tertiaries or the pastoral investigation of women known for extraordinary spiritual experiences.⁴

Thomas of Cantimpré's three-fold distinction gives us a conceptual apparatus by which to think about Dominican *cura mulierum* as that care is manifest in Catherine's *vita* and in the letters she wrote to her *confessores*. In other words, his distinction gives us containers in which to place the pastoral acts referred to or implied in these sources. Nevertheless, it does not help us understand the dynamic animating such structured care, and it is this dynamic I wish us to examine.

There is, however, help to hand. A survey of thirteenth and fourteenth-century efforts at legislative oversight of Dominican care sets that dynamic in relief, in and through its highlighting of the same structural tension at play among thirteenth-century Dominican friars and beguines in Flanders and among Dominican friars and certain communities of nuns in late twentieth-century Oxford. That is, a fairly large number of *admonitiones* promulgated at both the order's general chapters and at the chapters of the Roman province, in which Catherine of Sienna lived, exhibit the effort thirteenth and fourteenth-century friars took both to restrict and simultaneously enable spiritually appropriate "conversation" between Dominican *confessores* and their female charges.⁵

³ See *Bonum universale de apibus, sive Miraculorum et exemplorum memorabilium sui temporis libri duo*, ed. G. Colvenère (Douai: Bellaci, 1627) 2.42.2.413 (= book 2, chapter 42, part 2, page #). In this exemplum the proffering of counsel is also named from the point of view of subject of pastoral care as *loqui spiritualibus viris*.

⁴ The taxonomy of devotional pattern I am using (and playing on) is elaborated in Leonard E. Boyle OP, "Popular Piety in the Middle Ages: What is Popular?" *Florilegium: Carleton University Annual Papers on Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages* 4 (1982): 184-193.

⁵ The constitutions and admonitions of the province of Rome are published in *Acta capitulorum provincialium provinciae romanae (1243-1344)*, Monumenta ordinis fratrum praedicatorum 25, ed. Thomas Kaeppli OP and Antonie Dondaine OP (Rome: Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1941)—henceforth referred to as *Acta*, year of chapter.page # from edition.

For example the 101 years between 1243 and 1344 saw 35 provincial chapters of the Roman province address themselves to issues surrounding Dominican *cura mulierum*.⁶ More impressively still, fully thirty of those chapters met between 1243 and 1287. This pattern suggests to me that the Roman province's orientation to Dominican *cura mulierum* was hammered out in the first 50 or 60 years of the province's existence. After that, provincial chapters contented themselves with fine tuning or recalling the orienting contours of the care as it had evolved in that first half-century.⁷

The Roman provincial pattern mirrors the pattern at play in the order at large. A wide variety of pastoral arrangements were worked out on the ground between various communities of women religious and Dominican friars in the first 30 years of the order's existence. Worries about the institutional and pastoral implications of this crazy-quilt *cura* came to a head in the 1240s during the tenure as Dominican Master General of John of Wildeshausen.⁸ The administratively talented Humbert of Romans worked to standardize Dominican *cura mulierum* in the late 1250s and early 1260s and his reforms were implemented slowly over the next few decades, an implementation that reaches one apex in the establishment in 1285 of an order of Dominican tertiaries or lay people living in the world under the religious direction and pastoral care of Dominican friars.⁹ It is of course among the Mantellate, a widow

⁶ Pertinent admonitions for the period 1243-1344 were formulated for the Roman province in 1243, 1244, 1246, 1248, 1249, 1252, 1253, 1254, 1256, 1257, 1260, 1261, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1267, 1270, 1271, 1273, 1275, 1277, 1278, 1279, 1281, 1282, 1283, 1284, 1285, 1286, 1287, 1315, 1322, 1325, 1340, 1343.

⁷ The pattern of intense legislative activity followed by fine-tuning parallels the development legislation in contemporaneous collections of diocesan statutes (*libri synodales*). See in this regard, C.R. Cheney, *English Synodalia of the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1941); O. Pontal, *Les statuts synodales*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1975); Joseph Avril, "L'évolution du Synodal de l'Ouest: Les statuts synodaux du diocèse du Mans et les constitutions synodales de Michel Villoseau, évêque d'Angers (1220-1251)," (Mémoire dact., EPHE, Paris, 1973) later published as "Naissance et évolution des législations synodales dans les diocèses du Nord et de l'Ouest de la France (1200-1250)," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 72 (1986): 152-249. I have also described the development of diocesan legislative activity in Robert Sweetman, "The Synodal Book of Cambrai c. 1238-1287: Its Nature, Structure and Pastoral Legislation" (Licentiate thesis, The Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1983).

⁸ See the discussion of these issues in William A. Hinnebusch OP, *The History of the Dominican Order: Origins and Growth to 1500*, 2 Volumes (Staten Island N.Y.: Alba House, 1965) 1.375-400.

⁹For the founding of the third order see *Ibid.* 1.400-404.

community of "Dominican tertiaries" at Siena that Catherine would receive the Dominican habit at the age of 18.¹⁰

What strikes one first about these *admonitiones* of the Roman province is their care to restrain and delimit pastoral encounters between Dominican friars and women religious whether they be Dominican nuns or beguines. Such constraint was structured in three interlocking but irreducible ways. In the first place, Dominican friars were admonished to restrict their administration of the sacraments for their female charges, especially the hearing of confession among beguines and later communities of tertiaries like the *Mantellate* of Siena.¹¹ In 1243, for example, Dominicans of the Roman province were admonished not to hear the confessions of beguines more than one time in a week.¹²

In the second place, many admonitions were designed to restrict the *cura mulierum* to a very few confessors operating under strict licensure.¹³ Thus, in 1244, for example, those priories of the province that had a heavy responsibility for *cura mulierum* were to establish two mature friars as "nuns' priests" to hear the confessions of women who by custom came to the friars to confess. All friars of the community except these two, in addition the prior and the subprior, were to be restricted from hearing the confession of these women.¹⁴ Those *admonitiones* that dealt with the licensure of Dominican nuns' priests and which were disseminated throughout the Roman province in the years before the mid-1250s assumed licensure to be a matter of the local prior's discretion.¹⁵ From that point on a number of checks upon priorial discretion were put in place. For example, confirmation by a body of "discrete friars" acting as a kind of senate within the priory was required and recalled from the

¹⁰ Suzanne Noffke OP provides a handy chronology of Catherine's life among the introductory materials of her *The Letters of Catherine of Siena*, 2 Volumes (Tempe AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000) 1.iii-lvi. She has also written a full-length monograph on the life of Catherine, *Catherine of Siena: Vision Through a Distant Eye* (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, c. 1996).

¹¹ Restrictions are articulated and repeated in *Acta*.1243.1; 1244.2-3; 1246.5; 1248.8; 1249.9; 1259.13; 1260.24-25; 1275.45; 1278.49-50; 1322.223.

¹² *Acta*.1243.1.

¹³ Licensure is underscored and rearticulated in *Acta*.1244.2-3; 1246.5; 1252.13; 1257.21; 1264.30; 1275.45; 1278.49-50; 1279.52; 1281.55; 1283.63-64; 1284.66; 1285.70-71; 1315.194; 1343.342.

¹⁴ *Acta*.1244.2-3.

¹⁵ For example, *Acta*.1244.2-3 and 1252.13.

1270s on.¹⁶ In the 14th century a further stipulation was added; licensure was also to be overseen by the provincial prior and diffinitors.¹⁷

In the third place, contact between Dominican nuns' priests and their pastoral charges was also regulated and subject to on the spot surveillance.¹⁸ Time and again, Dominican "nuns priests" were admonished against frequent and public "familiarities" with beguines. The contexts of such "familiarities" were gradually specified and either proscribed or endowed with specific chaperons.¹⁹ An admonition of 1252 restricted home visitation of beguines to nuns' priests in possession of a special license for that purpose.²⁰ Long and regular discussions with women were warned against and the various locales in which such discussions were not to take place itemized and repeated.²¹ Punishment for infringement gradually became a matter of provincial oversight.²² Even in the case of the care of Dominican nuns the pastoral actions of Dominican friars were to be carefully choreographed.²³ In 1285 the priors of the Roman province were reminded that they were not to send friars to the nuns' monasteries "except to preach and hear confessions. And likewise, the friars who have gone to preach are not to involve themselves in speech with the nuns, neither before nor after preaching (*Acta*.1285.70-71)."²⁴ All contact with women charges is to be carefully chaperoned by the friar's *socius* or at the very least the presence of a second woman.²⁵

As already stated there was much recapitulation and further specification of these admonitions in the years between 1243-1344. The later admonitions make a point of placing their restrictions within a context,

¹⁶ See, in this regard, *Acta*.1257.21; 1260.24-25; 1261.25.

¹⁷ See, in this regard, *Acta*.1275.45; 1281.55; 1283.63-64.

¹⁸ See, for a good example, *Acta*.1315.194.

¹⁹ See the progressive specification and response to "familiarities" in *Acta*.1246.5; 1249.8; 1253.15; 1267.31; 1283.63-64; 1285.70-71; 1286.72-73.

²⁰ *Acta*.1252.13.

²¹ I illustrate with a number of examples. The place of meeting must be public (*Acta*.1267.27). Meetings are not to take place in the houses of the women themselves (1264.30). Friars are not to eat or stay over in the monasteries of women (1283.63-64). *Socii* are to be present during all contact with women (1286.72-73).

²² See, for a good example, *Acta*.1283.63-64.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Item ordinamus et volumus quod priores, suppriori et eorum vicarii non mittant fratres ad monasteria nisi ad predicandum et confessiones audiendum, ita tamen quod fratres qui ad predicandum iverint, nec ante predicationem nec post ponant se cum monialibus in locutionibus diffusis . . .

²⁵ *Acta*.1286.72-73.

namely, protecting the honour of the order and of its religious propositum.²⁶ A sense of spiritual danger to the order, to the friars and their female charges suffuses all this admonitory activity. It is tempting to stop here cluck knowingly and embrace a half-truth. We know what's going on here we might say. Surely we witness but one more taudry example of male fear and repression of the feminine Other.²⁷ That may be, at least as far as it goes, but there is more to the story and that more is what I am interested in.

I spoke earlier about the tension or ambivalence of Dominican admonitions surrounding the friars' *cura mulierum*. There was a sustained effort to restrict but simultaneously also to enable Dominican "conversation" with female spiritual charges. Every restriction was cast in categorical terms followed by that pregnant conjunction *nisi*, "unless." Friars were not to visit the homes of beguines admonishes one Roman provincial chapter unless "by reason of consolation in a time of sorrow" or "of penance in a time of [grave] illness (*Acta*.1253.15)."²⁸ The general principles behind all these "*nisi*-clauses" are two: necessity and utility. In the event of necessity or utility none of the restrictions apply. In that event, conversations can take place both long and public, homes can be visited with impunity, the sacraments can be administered on demand, *causa utili sive necessaria*.

Indeed the formulation of Dominican *admonitiones* is easily recognizable. We observe the age-old conventions of legal discourse rooted in Roman jurisprudence. Every law is constituted by two elements: 1) its *regula* or rule that governs the ordinary circumstances of life, i.e., that pattern of behaviour that holds as appropriate *in pluribus*; and 2) its *dispensationes* or exceptions that adapt law to rare circumstances, i.e., those patterns of behaviour that hold as appropriate *in paucioribus*.²⁹ The *regulae*

²⁶ See, for example, *Acta*.1286.72-73; 1287.76; 1322.223; 1325.235.

²⁷ For a powerfully written description of the sense of male fear operative within biblical religion, see Catherine Keller, *From a Broken Web: Separation, Sexism and Self* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986).

²⁸ Ammonemus et districte iniungimus ut nullus fratrum nostrorum longas et frequentes confabulationes cum aliqua muliere teneat, et hoc volumus a prelati et subditis senioribus et iunioribus districte servari. Item quod in domibus illarum non frequenter visitentur, nisi causa consolationis tempore tristitie, vel causa penitentie tempore infirmitatis.

²⁹ This connection between law and rule is posited as a basic maxim in *Digest* 50.17.1. *Exceptiones* are indicated with respect to rules. The formula goes something like this: "a" is the case in affair "b" and should lead to implications "c" [the rule], unless "x". The clause beginning with 'unless' marks out the licit exception(s) to the rule. It is then not

of Dominican *admonitiones* encode the restrictive emphases or orientation of Dominican *cura mulierum*. Awareness of the dangers inherent within this care is what holds *in pluribus*. But wherever one beholds the twin presence of utility and necessity, one encounters the call to a far less conditional fraternal charity. In such circumstances one enacts a care capacious enough to encompass what is assumed to hold only *in paucioribus*.

The relationship between Catherine of Siena and her Dominican *confessores* presented by Raymund of Capua in his *Legenda maior* is cut of the latter and exceptional cloth. I do not deny the presence of tension and clever negotiation in the scenes in which she interacts with one or another of her *confessores*.³⁰ No, Catherine is a strong-willed woman capable of resisting the expectation of her "superiors" in matters of the religious heart. What I am pointing out in fact is that her spiritual directors visit her constantly.³¹ They hear her confession and provide her the occasion in which to receive communion at her request.³² They engage in long and public confabulations with her time and time again.³³ They do so grudgingly, to be sure. Raymund is honest enough to record the subtle interchanges in which he tries to re-interpret Catherine's experience and its meaning for her only to have her reassert her own interpretation in the end.³⁴ It is clear that they do not always know what she is

insignificant that the *nisi* clauses examined above conform to the *exceptio* in Roman Law. See, in this regard, H.J. Jolowicz and Barry Nicholas, *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law*, 3rd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972) 206-208.

³⁰ The standard *vita* of Catherine of Siena is that of Raymund of Capua OP entitled *Legenda maior de Sancta Catharina Senensi, virgine de Poenitentia Sancti Dominici in Acta Sanctorum, Aprilis, Tomus 3* (Paris: Palmé, 1866) 862-967. A recent English translation that uses a slightly different numbering system for chapters and paragraphs is that of Conleath Kearns OP, trans., *The Life of Catherine of Siena of Raymund of Capua* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1980). Citations will be to both editions, the Latin edition being the first citation followed a semi-colon and the English edition. Citations will take the form of *Vita* book #.chapter #.paragraph #.page # of edition. For a fine example of the negotiation of meaning between Catherine and her *confessors*, see *Vita* 1.2.43.873; 1.4.43.41-43. For an example of tension, see *Vita* 1.3.58.876-877; 1.6.58.55.

³¹ Raymund, for example, is in her company so much that he includes himself among the "we who lived with her"—see *Vita* 1.3.62.877; 1.6.62.57-58.

³² A fine example of sacrament on demand is recounted in *Vita* 2.6.189.909; 2.6.189.181-182. Her reception of a papal privilege to take communion daily is reported in *Vita* 2.16.314.940; 1.12.314.291.

³³ Indeed, Raymund admits that at times their confabulations went on longer than he had the stamina to give. He fell asleep at times in the course of listening to Catherine. See *Vita* 1.3.62.877; 1.6.62.57-58.

³⁴ A good example is to be found at *Vita* 2.5.167.904; 2.5.167.160-161.

on about.³⁵ It is equally clear that they give half an ear to the skeptical analyses of Catherine's detractors, while fearing to broach the topic too directly with their ecclesiastical daughter.³⁶ But they do all this and do so to all appearances against the *regulae* as formulated within Dominican *admonitiones*. In ignoring the rules however they are not corrupting their care, but rather acknowledging the twin conditions that make sense of and legitimate their behavior, utility and necessity.

There is the question of whose utility and necessity is being served. The complexity of the question reflects the complexity of the Dominican *confessores'* spiritual condition with respect to Catherine. They are at one and the same time her fathers and sons; she is in turn simultaneously their daughter and mother. Both she and they are aware of the crossing of authority and position that suffuses all their acts together.³⁷ Moreover, this awareness is not just the effect of Raymund's hagiographical imagination, for it is confirmed by the language and tone that Catherine assumes in letters she wrote to her *confessores*.³⁸ The language of formal humility, of her *status humilitatis* and simultaneously an endearing familiarity act as paranthesis to stiff admonitions.³⁹ Often she makes the crossing explicit writing to her father and son, naming herself as his daughter and mother.⁴⁰ As I said the direction of utility is often

³⁵ A fine example is recounted in *Vita* 1.5.90-91.884-885; 1.9.90-91.82-83.

³⁶ See the stories told at *Vita* 1.5.80.882; 1.9.80.74-75. and 1.5.86-89.883-884; 1.9.86-89.78-82.

³⁷ Raymond addresses Catherine as "Mother" at *Vita* 2.7.198.911; 2.6.198.188-189 and again at 2.8.214.914; 2.6.214.202-203.

³⁸ I have used as my dossier the collection of letters translated and published by Suzanne Noffke OP in *The Letters of Saint Catherine of Siena, Volume 1*, 2nd edition, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 202 (Tempe AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2000). One finds 11 letters to Dominican familiars in this collection: T41/G105/DT7 (pp. 6-10); T105/G113/DT8 (pp. 17-19); T200/G112/DT9 (pp. 20-22); T127/G117/DT20 (pp. 38-41); T70/G114/DT21 (pp. 42-45); T273/G97/DT31 (pp. 82-90); T146/G115/DT27 (pp. 95-97); T139/G106/DT46 (pp. 194-196); T283/G104/DT47 (pp. 197-199); T129/G116/DT29 (pp. 233-238); T74/G119 (pp. 312-315).

³⁹ See, for example, the letter addressed to Bartolomeo Dominici OP published as T129/G116/DT29 (pp. 233-238) and the letter to Niccolò da Montalcino OP published as T74/G119 (pp. 312-315).

⁴⁰ Catherine writes to two of her Dominican familiars in this way, both as Mother and Daughter, to her Father and Son. See the letter to Raymund of Capua OP published as T273/G97/DT31 (pp. 82-90) and the letter to Bartolomeo Dominici OP published as T146/G115/DT27 (pp. 95-97).

the reverse of what might be expected. It is the utility of the *confessor* that is at issue in the friar's visitations and confabulations.⁴¹

There is also the matter of Catherine's need for the Eucharist, her hunger as she so fetchingly confesses, and for absolution for sins that only she is able to see and judge in full severity.⁴² Indeed, I would propose in sum that, regarding the exceptionality of the *cura* administered by Catherine's *confessores*, the requisite need is her need for frequent participation in the sacraments and the requisite utility as already said is her *confessores* need for the good word she is able to bring to them from the revelatory font of her spiritual experiences.

And yet, despite the exceptional generosity of the *cura* Catherine received, it was not enough to efface the structural tension at play within Dominican pastorate among the friars' female charges. Here too Raymond preserves the traces of her disappointment and frustration.⁴³ It is precisely at these moments of desert difficulty that the presence of Christ comes into play.⁴⁴ One can of course interpret the role that Christ's consolations play in the life of Catherine as a subversion of the ecclesiastical structuring of pastoral authority.⁴⁵ But I want to suggest an alternative story. Medieval Dominican friars, like the most thoughtful and demanding of their spiritual charges, knew in their bones that the pastoral care they administered was not enough in and of itself to subserve the ends of religious life. Their best and most generous efforts, even *causa utili sive necessaria* were not sufficient to realize the full communion with God that travels under the name of bliss. For they were,

⁴¹ For a complementary reading see John Coakley, "Friars as Confidants of Holy Women in Medieval Dominican Hagiography" in *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*, ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Tímea Szell (Ithaca N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991) 222-246.

⁴² For Raymond's struggle to understand Catherine's confessions see *Vita* 1.1.44.873-874; 1.3.44.42-43. For narratives describing Catherine's longing for the eucharist see *Vita* 2.17.311-329.939-944; 2.12.311-329.288-304.

⁴³ We see the difficulty giving rise to her *necessitas* in *Vita* 2.17.317.941; 2.12.317.293-294.

⁴⁴ We see Christ's response to her difficulty in *Vita* 2.17.318-322.941-942; 2.12.318-322.294-298.

⁴⁵ For this sort of interpretation see, Mary Walsh Meany, "Angela of Foligno: A Eucharistic Model of Lay Sanctity," in *Lay Sanctity, Medieval and Modern: A Search for Models*, ed. Ann W. Astell (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000) 61-75; Karen Scott, "Catherine of Siena and Lay Sanctity in the Fourteenth Century," in *Ibid.* 77-90. One must acknowledge the founding role of Caroline Walker Bynum's analysis in *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), especially her remarks on page 236.

after all, in the end, but men, however graced with power and authority, and mere mortals have their limits: time, place, energy, commitment, compassion, love—all these, they knew, existed in insufficient quantities and qualities. In the end, even the pastor saint fell short. But, halleluia, Christ made up the difference. In a woman as spiritually gifted as Catherine the ways that Christ made up the difference could not but be spectacular and awe-inspiring. Hers was the work of a highly disciplined religious professional; please do not try this at home. Raymund acknowledged as much in his hagiographical portrayal. Papal dispensations as regards Catherine's participation in the Eucharist and by implication Penance would fail.⁴⁶ Her spiritual needs would remain unrequited, if Christ withheld his presence.

The mode in which this happened was conceived as being as intense and as hyperbolic as was Catherine herself. But we do not see here a difference in kind separating Catherine's circumstances from those of the most humble Dominican nun or tertiary, or friar for that matter. In short, the failure of ecclesiastical care to enact its own ultimate end is the common condition of the Church *in via*. All believers from the bishop of Rome down knew and perhaps still know this in their bones. Certainly, neither Catherine nor Raymund ever doubted it. They both knew of the structural insufficiency of Dominican *cura mulierum*, both in its rules and in its exceptions *causa utili et necessaria*. But they saw with the eyes of the spirit that Christ made up the difference.

Nor should this surprise anyone on one important level. For the end of pastoral care is eschatological; it is the bliss of final fulfilment. And a sense of structural lack manifest even in the moment of actual fruition was explicit in another, properly theological context—theorization of the resurrection of the body.⁴⁷ We take the doctrine of another thirteenth-century Dominican Thomas, Thomas Aquinas, as our example.⁴⁸ Despite his anthropological and philosophical doctrine of

⁴⁶ See, in this regard, *Vita* 2.17.314.940; 2.12.314.291; but also 2.17.941-942; 2.12.317-322.293-298.

⁴⁷ See, in this regard, the third major part of Caroline Walker Bynum's *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995) 229-343; but also her "Material Continuity, Personal Survival and the Resurrection of the Body: A Scholastic Discussion in Its Medieval and Modern Contexts," in *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone Books, 1992) 239-298.

⁴⁸ See Bynum's discussion of Aquinas in the works cited in the preceding note. For Aquinas himself one does well to look at *Summa contra Gentiles* 4.79-88, but especially 79-81.

personal identity, locating that identity in and as the human soul, Aquinas argues for the coherence of a received doctrine of the resurrected body that understands personal identity as a physical and material continuity between the resurrected body and the body one was before death. That is, he posited the identity of resurrected body with the body we as psychosomatic unity were *in via* on the basis of a *caro radicalis*, a root flesh or group of material corpuscles that only that human soul had ever informed throughout the duration of the original creation. Of course, he admitted that this *caro radicalis* did not, nor could it be thought to, provide all the material corpuscles necessitated by the resurrected body.⁴⁹ There would be a shortfall, to be sure, but nevertheless, and you will have guessed it, Christ will make up the difference. Such is the structural tension of human life, graceless, graced, saintly, even glorified human life. Such was the Dominican *cura* that Catherine endured, enhanced and enjoyed in the course of her life as a Sienese tertiary.

Institute of Christian Studies
Toronto

⁴⁹ *Summa contra Gentiles* 4.81.15.