

Thomas Aquinas, Thomas More and the Vindication of Humor as a Virtue: *Eutrapelia* and *Iucunditas*

Carlo De Marchi

Pontificia Università della Santa Croce, Rome

In the *Dialogue of Comfort* (II, 1: 82/17-21), Antony and Vincent discuss “Whether a man may not in tribulation use some worldly recreation for his comfort,” and make an explicit reference to the *auctoritas* of St. Thomas Aquinas. The paper investigates the Thomistic foundation of the virtue of recreation, which is presented as a key aspect of More’s spirituality and theological outlook. Some theological sources for this study can be found in José Morales, Cornelio Fabro, Hugo Rahner and Louis Bouyer.

Keywords: Aquinas, *eutrapelia*, *iucunditas*, humor, merry tales, joy

Dans le Dialogue du réconfort (II, 1: 82/17-21), Antony et Vincent se demandent « si un homme soumis aux tribulations ne pourrait pas utiliser quelque récréation propre à ce monde pour se consoler », et il fait une référence explicite à l’auctoritas de saint Thomas d’Aquin. Cet article explore la base thomiste de la vertu de récréation, qui est présentée comme aspect clé dans la spiritualité et la vision théologique de More. On trouvera certaines sources théologiques pour cette étude chez José Morales, Cornelio Fabro, Hugo Rahner et Louis Bouyer.

Mots-clés: Thomas d’Aquin, *eutrapelia*, *iucunditas*, *humour*, *Histoires drôles, joie*

En el *Diálogo del Consuelo* (II, 1: 82/17-21), Antonio y Vicente conversan sobre “Si, en medio de la tribulación, un hombre no podría servirse de algún recreo mundano para su consuelo”, haciendo referencia explícita a la *auctoritas* de S. Tomás de Aquino. Este ensayo expone la naturaleza tomista de la virtud del descanso, presentada como aspecto clave de la espiritualidad y enfoque teológico de More. Algunas de las fuentes

teológicas para este estudio se encuentran en José Morales, Cornelio Fabro, Hugo Rahner y Louis Bouyer.

Palabras clave: Aquino, *eutrapelia*, *iucunditas*, humor, cuentos divertidos, gozo.

* * *

In the first chapter of Book II of the *Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation*, the young Vincent asks himself whether, amid the many troubles in life, it is licit to look for comfort in happy or relaxing things. Arguing in favor of the fitting nature of recreation, he cites Thomas Aquinas saying, “Saint Thomas saith that proper pleasant talking, which is called εὐτραπελία, is a good virtue, serving to refresh the mind and make it quick and lusty to labor and study again... whereas continual fatigation would make it dull and deadly.”¹

The aim of this paper is to show that these words are neither reproduced at random nor are they generic. In the first place, it is

¹ More, T., *Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation*, II, 1 (82/17–21); the citations here are taken from the CTMS 2014 (M. Gottschalk, ed.) on the basis of the critical edition, *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More* (Yale UP), volume 12 [CW 12]; the citations in the footnotes will now simply appear as *Dialogue of Comfort*. One of the more thorough studies on *eutrapelia* in Thomas More is that of Prescott, A. L., “The Ambivalent Heart: Thomas More's Merry Tales,” in *Criticism* 45-4 (Fall 2003): 417–433. Nevertheless, the perspective of the study made by Anne L. Prescott is certainly literary in nature. It is perhaps on account of this that it does not pursue the Thomistic source of the discourse on *eutrapelia*. See also the points made by Castelli, A., *Dialogue of Comfort* (Editrice Studium: Roma, 1970), 113–114, which respond to the criticism advanced by Pineas, R. in, “Thomas More’s Use of Humour as a Weapon of Religious Controversy,” in *Studies in Philology* (April 1961): 97–114. For further bibliographic information on the “merry tales”, see note 10.

worth asking ourselves why More resorts to the *auctoritas* of St. Thomas Aquinas when the cultural milieu was nearly unanimously opposed to the methods, language and syllogistic dryness of Scholasticism.

There are essentially three works that intentionally place Thomas Aquinas and Thomas More in relation to one another for the sake of studying the influence of one on the other, in addition to an early study by André Prévost² that has interesting insight into this theme. The broadest and most systematic of these works is that of the theologian José Morales,³ followed by that of Walter M. Gordon,⁴ and an article—albeit hardly considered properly “technical”—by Romanus Cessario.⁵ There is, then, an additional source where there are but few hints, yet given the importance of the author it is appropriate that we acknowledge the intuition of Cornelio Fabro as well, in his contribution to the Italian edition of the *Dialogue of Comfort* published by Alberto Castelli in 1970. Here Fabro writes,

² Prévost, A., *Thomas More et la crise de la pensée européenne* (Mame: Tours, 1969); special attention should be given to chapters II-III of the second part, entitled “Humanism and Theology: More and Erasmus” and “The Reformation of the Studies of Theology”.

³ Morales, J., “La formación espiritual e intelectual de Tomás Moro y sus contactos con la doctrina y las obras de Santo Tomás de Aquino,” in *Scripta Theologica* VI-2 (1974): 439–489. See also Morales, J., “Un libro reciente sobre Tomás Moro,” in *Scripta Theologica* VII-1 (1975): 259–282.

⁴ Gordon, W. M., “Hope’s Movement toward Love in More and Aquinas,” in *Moreana* vol. 40, 153–154 (March 2003): 159–172.

⁵ Cessario, R., “Moral Theology on Earth: Learning from Two Thomases,” in *Studies in Christian Ethics* 19.3 (2006): 305–322. This essay deals with some major issues of moral theology, following John Paul II’s *Motu proprio* proclaiming Saint Thomas More Patron of Statesmen and Politicians, n. 4, where More is seen as a model of integrity “able to indicate the path of truth at a time in history when difficult challenges and crucial responsibilities are increasing (...). What enlightened the saint’s conscience was the sense that man cannot be sundered from God, nor politics from morality”. Cessario makes also a short reference to the Thomistic question on *eutrapelia* (p. 311).

In the final defense of the humanist Lord Chancellor, unsettled and yet all at once quiet, the man and the Christian, the humanist and the theologian walk side by side in a mutual exchange that calls to mind the harmony between faith and reason in St. Thomas Aquinas, something More himself praises (...) calling it the very flower of theology.⁶

From a theological perspective, Morales distinguishes an analogous facet that assimilates Thomas More to Thomas Aquinas: a more sapiential reflection on the totality of Catholic dogma, which

is present in More's contemplative attitude and studies, something translated into his realism, his general sense of theology, his affection for perennial philosophy, his simple and religious reading of the Bible, and in his faithfulness to the Magisterium of the Church. For More, as for Thomas Aquinas, there was no such thing as wisdom that was exclusively philosophical.⁷

On the other hand, in the larger body of More's works Aquinas is cited very little, and mentioned exclusively even less. Nevertheless, one can say that More appreciates Aquinas even though he shares the perplexity of his contemporaries with respect to

⁶ Fabro, C., "Il Dialogo del conforto nelle tribolazioni di Tommaso Moro," in Fabro, *Miscellanea*, 14 (1944–1983): insert 120 (first published in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 9 April 1971, p. 3). In the Italian translation of the *Dialogue of Comfort* (Alberto Castelli, ed.) which was in the library of Cornelio Fabro—now part of the collection in the library of the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross in Rome (*Santa Croce*)—one can see many pencil marks that serve as proof of a deep and careful study of the text. The definition of Aquinas as "the very floure of theology" can be read in *The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer*, in *CW* 8, 713. For a more systematic presentation of the relationship between Aquinas and More, see De Marchi, C., *L'affabilità nei rapporti sociali. Studio comparativo sulla socievolezza e il buonumore in Tommaso d'Aquino, Thomas More e Francesco di Sales* (Edusc: Roma 2010), in particular p. 195–261 (the chapter "Affabilità e buonumore in Thomas More," "Friendliness and Humor in Thomas More").

⁷ Morales, "La formación espiritual e intelectual de Tomás Moro...", *op. cit.*, 481–482.

the methods and language of Scholasticism. More places Aquinas' works on a different level than that of Scholasticism *in genere*.⁸

Returning to the text of the *Dialogue* that discusses *eutrapelia*, we observe that this reference is to a *quaestio* of the *Summa* in a section on morality, where it is asked *utrum possit esse aliqua virtus circa actiones ludi*.⁹ In his response to his nephew, Antony tells a story taken from classical Patristics:

Cassian, that very good, virtuous man, rehearseth in a certain collation of his that a certain holy father, in making of a sermon, spoke of heaven, and of heavenly things, so celestially that much of his audience with the sweet sound thereof began to forget all the world and fall asleep; which when the father beheld, he dissembled their sleeping and suddenly said unto them, *I shall tell you a merry tale*—at which word they lifted up their heads and hearkened unto that.¹⁰

The citation is not exact. In the *quaestio* pertaining to *eutrapelia*, Aquinas effectively shares an anecdote that is very similar

⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 453–456. In More's *Complete Works* there are only four individual and explicit citations of Aquinas, and others in which Aquinas is quoted together with other Doctors and Fathers of the Church. Morales' study is quite detailed and systematically approaches various dogmatic issues, coming to the conclusion that—although there are some differences in sacramental and ecclesiological theology—there is a substantial dogmatic consistency between More and Aquinas, so much so that one can say that “with Thomas More the Thomistic renewal of the sixteenth century is projected in Tudor England” (p. 482).

⁹ *S. Th.*, II-II, q. 168, a. 2, co.

¹⁰ *Dialogue of Comfort*, II, 1 (84, 6/11). For more on the “merry tales” of Thomas More, see the interesting discussion on hope and good humor in Manley, F., “The Argument of the Book,” in the introduction to the *Dialogue of Comfort*, p. XCVIII. See also, Gordon, W. M., “In Defense of More's Merry Tales,” in *Moreana* 38 (June 1973): 5–12; as well as Gottschalk, M. “Why Is More So Merry in *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies*?” in *Thomas More Studies* 3(2009): 24–31. A recent and insightful essay presents a good *status quaestionis* of the debate on More's humor: Curtright, T., *Thomas More on Humor*, in *Logos* 17-1 (Winter 2014): 13-35.

to that of Antony, only that his source is Cicero, and the citation taken from Cassian is not found in the *Collationes*, rather the *De Coenobiorum Institutis*.¹¹ Secondly, and more interestingly, the sense of the original anecdote stands in contradiction to More's argument, for Cassian's meaning is to state that the devil rejoices when frivolous stories are told. It is all the more interesting to note that here, too, in the question in the *Summa* on *eutrapelia* the *auctoritas* produced is Cassian, with an episode from the life of St. John the Evangelist retold in the *Collationes*.¹²

Seeing as More probably did not have access to the *Summa Theologiae* when he wrote the *Dialogue of Comfort*, the affinity between his and Aquinas' argumentation seems to be exactly a sign of the significant familiarity with *quaestio* 168 of the II-II, which More the humanist recounts as if by heart, albeit confusing a bit the anecdote in its details. An additional contribution to the confusion might be one of the arguments presented by Aquinas directly after the description of *eutrapelia*, when he says that "fun should fit with business and persons; wherefore Tully says (*De Invent. Rhet.* I, 17) that when the audience is weary, it will be useful for the speaker to try something novel or amusing, provided that joking be not incompatible with the gravity of the subject."¹³ Antony's argumentation is analogous to this:

He that cannot long endure to hold up his head and hear talking of heaven except he be now and then between (as though heaven were heaviness) refreshed with a foolish merry

¹¹ Cassian, *De Coenobiorum Institutis*, V, 31 (PL 49, 247–248).

¹² Cf. Cassian, *Collationes*, 24, 21 (PL 49, 1312).

¹³ *S. Th.*, II-II, q. 168, a. 2, ad 1: "Iocosa debent congruere negotiis et personis. Unde et Tullius dicit, in I Rhet., quod quando auditores sunt defatigati, *non est inutile ab aliqua re nova aut ridicula oratorem incipere, si tamen rei dignitas non admittit iocandi facultatem.*"

tale—there is no other remedy but you must let him have it.
Better would I wish it, but I cannot help it.¹⁴

Antony's argument in defense of the licit nature of jokes springs from the claim that there clearly exists a natural inclination to amusement.

Folk are prone enough to such fancies of their own mind. You may see this by ourselves, which coming now together to talk of as earnest, sad matter as men can devise (...) were fallen yet, even at the first, into wanton, idle tales. And of truth, Cousin—as you know very well—myself am of nature even half a giglot and more!¹⁵

It is likely that this expression “half a giglot and more” is another of the numerous puns on his own last name, through which More offers a concise self-portrait.¹⁶ It is something of a “signature” found precisely at the heart of the *Dialogue*, right in the middle of the discussion of the role of humor and silliness in Christian life. More's argument through Antony reads as follows:

But for that you require my mind in the matter, whether men in tribulation may not lawfully seek recreation, and comfort themselves with some honest mirth: First agreed that our chief comfort must be of God—and that with him we must begin, and with him continue, and with him end also—a man to take now and then some honest worldly mirth, I dare not be so sore as utterly to forbid it (...) since good men and well learned have in some cases allowed it, especially for the diversity of diverse men's minds.¹⁷

¹⁴ *Dialogue of Comfort*, II, 1 (84/19–23).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, (82/26–83/5).

¹⁶ The play on words is presumed by Louis L. Martz and Frank Manley (cf. *Dialogue of Comfort*, note 83/4–5); the *Glossary* of the critical edition defines Old English term *gigglot* “one excessively given to merriment.”

¹⁷ *Dialogue of Comfort*, II, 1 (83/5–15).

In reality, apart from the previous reference to Aquinas, the group of rather nondescript “good men and well learned” who would find favor with this text is reduced to one alone, “that very good, virtuous man.” This is Cassian, already cited, as has been seen, in an imprecise and even partly distorted manner. Aristotle remarked that *eutrapelia* was to be counted among the social virtues, defining it as the just mean between excesses—he who is *bomolochos* (a buffoon) and he who is *agroikos* (a boor)—and says that they who are *eutrapeloi* are ones who know to joke in proper measure, so as then to be more prepared to face the more serious matters of life.¹⁸ Nevertheless, in a moral reflection subsequent to Aristotle, as Hugo Rahner observes, the term *eutrapelia* undergoes an immediate semantic evolution that then influenced the conception of this virtue throughout history. Since the Classical Age, this term has taken on a pejorative connotation, one which tends to in fact superimpose over the term its own vice *per defect* (boorishness, vulgarity, *scurrilitas*).¹⁹ The New Testament and Church Fathers know only the negative meaning of the Greek term *eutrapelia*: nearly the entirety of the eastern and monastic literature leans toward the condemnation of pranks, pass-times and often even the act of grinning.²⁰

¹⁸ Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV, 14, 1129.

¹⁹ Cf. Rahner, H., *Eutrapélie*, in Viller, M. (ed.) *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (Paris 1961), coll. 1726–1729. A recent study on the same topic is that of Roszak, P., “Anatomy of Ludic Pleasure in Thomas Aquinas” in *Pensamiento y Cultura* vol. 16-2 (December 2013): 50-71; see especially the paragraph “Theology of Good Humour in Thomas Aquinas. Ludicity and Truth” (pp. 65-69).

²⁰ Cf. For example, *Eph* 5:3–4: St. Paul uses *eutrapelia* to indicate one of the realities *quae non decent*, against which the Christian must guard himself. The *Nova Vulgata* renders the term synonymous with *scurrilitas*: “*Fornicatio autem et omnis immunditia aut avaritia nec nominetur in vobis, sicut decet sanctos, et turpitudine et stultiloquium aut scurrilitas, quae non decent.*” St. Jerome—to give an example of that which H. Rahner claims is an idea held in common with the Western Fathers and certainly those of the East—describes the defect in the following manner: “*scurrilitas appetit quaedam vel urbana verba vel rustica vel turpia vel faceta, quam nos jocularitatem alio verbo possumus appellare, ut risum*

When Aquinas along the lines of Aristotle returns to the idea that recreation can be the object of virtue—a part of the cardinal virtue of temperance—he is in fact contradicting the Patristic and monastic tradition and instead alludes directly to Aristotle. Aquinas' vindication of *eutrapelia* as a virtue seems to be embraced by More, and this makes the explicit citation of the Angelic Doctor all but obligatory, as Aquinas is literally the only *auctoritas* of the Christian tradition that can be cited to this effect.

A further point of contact between Aquinas and More can be seen when reflecting on the word Aquinas chooses to define the reinstated virtue of humor, *iucunditas*. The word comes from Cicero,²¹ and Aquinas in turn often uses it in a context that refers to the joy derived from interpersonal communion here on earth, starting from the maxim that holds “no good thing can be joyfully possessed without partnership,”²² for he who “rejoices most is in the company of others.”²³

According to Aquinas, sharing of what is good with others will also be an important part of eternal joy:

In heavenly glory there are above all two things that shower the good with joy. First, the fruition of divinity and the communion of the saints. There can be no joy when in possession of a good that is not shared, as says Boethius. And

moveat audientibus” (*Comm. a Eph. 5, 4: PL 26, 520a*). One may well note that in *S. Th.* II-II, q. 168, a. 2 ad 1, Aquinas lessens the severity of the doctrine of St. Ambrose, saying that “Ambrose does not altogether exclude fun from human speech, but from the sacred doctrine.” It thus seems to be an emblematic example of his vindication of good humor as a virtue, contrary to Patristic tradition.

²¹ *S. Th.*, II-II, q. 168, a. 4, ad 3. Cf. for example, Cicero, *Laelius de Amicitia*, I, 55: “vita inculta et deserta ab amicis non possit esse iucunda”.

²² *S. Th.* I, q. 32, a. 1, ob. 2: “nullius boni sine consortio potest esse iucunda possessio.” Although Aquinas attributes this to Boethius, the citation comes from Seneca, *Ad Lucilium*, 6, 13; Aquinas often returns to it, cf. *S. Th.*, I, q. 32, a. 1, ob. 1; I-II, q. 4, a. 8, ob. 2; *De veritate*, q. 10, a. 13, ad 6; etc.

²³ *Super Heb.*, cap. XI, lect. 8: “magis enim gaudet homo cum pluribus gaudentibus.”

as Psalm 132 reads, ‘it is good and it is right that that brothers live together.’²⁴

Through the use of *iucundus* Aquinas also expresses the final end of the Christian life, which requires sharing the sufferings of Christ: “hard and rough is the road, heavy the going, but delightful the end.”²⁵ The Thomistic *iucunditas* seems to have something in common both with humor and *eutrapelia* as well as with joy eternal.

Walter M. Gordon in a presentation of the virtue of hope in Aquinas and More points out

two unforgettable traits about More’s conduct at the end. His prayer for his judges begs that they all will meet in heaven to rejoice in a oneness that they had not experienced on earth (...). Secondly, his entire manner evokes a spirit of play or merriment that seems unique in the history of martyrs. The fruit of hope, according to Aquinas, is joy.

In reality, the “spirit of play and merriment” is something more than the *eutrapelia* of which Vincent and Antony speak in the *Dialogue*. It is indeed, Gordon concludes, “the very essence of man’s spirituality,”²⁶ a cheerful calm that pervades even in times of tribulation and is characteristic of him who is animated by a secure hope. For More (as for Aquinas), joy is a manifestation of theological hope, and needs to be visible to the others while on earth.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, cap. XII, lect. 4: “In caelesti autem gloria duo sunt, quae potissime bonos laetificabunt, scilicet fruitio deitatis, et communis sanctorum societas. Nullius enim boni possessio iucunda est sine socio, ut dicit Boetius; et Ps. CXXXII, v. 1: ecce quam bonum, et quam iucundum habitare fratres in unum.”

²⁵ *S. Th.*, III, q. 45 a. 1: “via est difficilis et aspera, et iter laboriosum, finis vero iucundus.”

²⁶ Gordon, W. *Hope’s Movement Toward Love in More and Aquinas...*, *op. cit.*, 170. See also Aquinas in *Super II Cor.*, cap. I, lect. 3: “Tribulatio potest considerari dupliciter. Vel secundum se, et sic est taediosa; vel in comparatione ad finem, et sic est iucunda, in quantum propter Deum et spem vitae aeternae sustinetur.” It would be interesting to know if More noticed this Thomistic passage about tribulation, *iucunditas*, hope and eternal life.

This human and supernatural joy will later be transfigured and fully realized in eternal life, in communion with God and in the company of the blessed. There is no need to prove here how social and relational virtues were apparent in More's daily life.²⁷ An interesting description of their supernatural transfiguration can be found in the first book of the *Dialogue*, crafting an argument beginning with a line from Qoelet (3.4: "there is a time to weep and a time to laugh"):

as you see (...) he setteth the weeping time *before*; for that is the time of this wretched world, and the laughing time shall come after, in heaven (...). There is also a time of sowing, and a time of reaping, too. Now must we in this world sow, that we may in the other world reap; and in this short sowing time of this weeping world must we water our seed with the showers of our tears, and then shall we have in heaven a merry laughing harvest forever.²⁸

It is an eternal sound of laughter that More, in the dark hour of his tribulation, hopes to find in Heaven. More, as has been noted, does not cease to pray for his fellows even in the extreme moments of his life, so that "we may yet hereafter in heaven merrily all meet together, to our everlasting salvation."²⁹

These brief passages seem sufficient to suggest a further harmony between Aquinas and More, precisely in the Thomistic *iucunditas* and More's humor. They both attribute these two realities as proper to the final end of mankind, a full and complete joy in the

²⁷ See Curtright, T., *Thomas More on Humor*, *op. cit.*; this essay takes into account the opinion of the "revisionist scholars", who pretend that More's humor was lacking in sincerity. At the end of the essay, More's attitude is put in relation with St Paul's "theology of foolishness" (cf. 1 Cor 1, 23). It could be another aspect worth studying in Aquinas, looking for further links with Thomas More.

²⁸ *Dialogue of Comfort*, I, 13 (42/2-8).

²⁹ Roper, W. *Life of Sir Thomas More*, Gerard B. Wegemer – Stephen W. Smith (eds.) (CTMS: Dallas, 2003), 54-55.

communion with God and one's fellow.³⁰ In the *Devout Prayer* written in the Tower, Thomas More asks for

an humble, lowly, quiet, peaceable, patient, charitable, kind, tender, and pitiful mind, with all my works, and all my words, and all my thoughts, to have a taste of thy holy, blessed Spirit.³¹

These words suggest that every visible sign of holiness, including friendliness, humor and all other manifestations of charity in human relationships, are to be considered fruits of the Holy Spirit. Using a more specific theological language, humor can be seen as one of the “perfections that the Holy Spirit forms in us as the first fruits of eternal glory.”³² They are gifts necessary for a Christian in daily life, and will be perfectly fulfilled only in life eternal. More's humor, and even the laughter that was so often heard in his house, were just the beginning of the perpetual human and divine cheerfulness that is prepared for every son of God.

The great theologian Louis Bouyer wrote a fitting and deep biographical profile of Thomas More, whom he named

a model, not of some particular humanism more or less Christianized, but of a Christianity that sought to be and truly is totally and completely human (...). From this perspective, this is all made one in More, who by profession was a jurist, a man of the state, the father of a family, a friend, a thinker, a mystic, and lastly a martyr, apart from the common man with his perspicacity, his sensibility, his generous attitude, beyond

³⁰ For a more detailed account of Aquinas in the *Dialogue of Comfort* see, De Marchi, *L'affabilità nei rapporti sociali...*, *op. cit.*, 222–231.

³¹ More, *A Devout Prayer*, in *CW* 13, 229-230.

³² *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, n. 1832. The consideration of Morean humor as a fruit of the Holy Spirit would need a deeper analysis: for a first glance on the topic, both in Aquinas and More, see De Marchi, *L'affabilità nei rapporti sociali...*, *op. cit.*, 162–165, 246–255.

his *humor* that puts everything in its proper place, gently but firmly dispelling all falsity.”³³

In another study, Bouyer goes so far as to say that

few men in the whole of English history are true peers of Thomas More, as a typical representative of that refined attitude, incomprehensible to the Latin or to the German, which is usually called *humor*. His taste for passing off huge nonsense with nonchalance, insinuating at the same time in the most paradoxical way many truths of common sense, constitutes the whole spirit (in the limitedness of the term) of Thomas More.³⁴

In the context of a theological reflection on Thomas More, it can thus be said that the *spirit* so well expressed by the writer in the Tower Works and incarnated in the demeanor of the martyr, has firm roots in the Christian humanism of Thomas Aquinas. It is only the Christian in fact who is “capable of being *homo ludens*, for he is the one who recognizes exactly where he stands: between the world and Christ, between flesh and spirit, between hope and despair.”³⁵

Carlo De Marchi

carlo.demarchi@gmail.com

³³ Bouyer, L. *Tommaso Moro, umanista e martire* (Jaca Book: Milan, 1985). Original title: *Sir Thomas More, humaniste et martyr* (Editions CDL: Chambray-lès-Tours, 1984), 100–101.

³⁴ Bouyer, L. *Erasmus tra Umanesimo e Riforma*, Morcelliana, Brescia, 1962 (tit. or. *Autour d'Érasme. Études sur le christianisme des humanistes catholiques*, Cerf, Paris, 1955), 94.

³⁵ Rahner, *Eutrapélie*, *op. cit.*, col. 1728. Further considerations along these lines can be found in De Marchi C., “Breve storia del sorriso,” in *Studi cattolici* 683 (October 2013): 685–687.