Open hermeneutics:
André Scrima's
«éclatement de la parole "en moi"» (I)[1]

DANIELA DUMBRAVĂ ⓘD

Institute for the History of Religions, Romanian Academy
E-mail: daniela.dumbrava@gmail.com

Abstract. Towards the end of the 1960s, in the well-known Enrico Castelli (1900-1977) colloquia, while intensively discussing the topic of demythologization, scholars concluded that theological language is fundamental in exploring it. Thus, the topic of *the analysis of theological language: the Name of God*, became prevalent for them and they began to think that a distinction between the terms *religious* and *theological* would be desirable, avoiding scandalous formulas for the field of theology. According to Karl Jasper, God is just a chest of something *indicible*. André Scrima presents himself in the debate with an original proposal, namely to think of theological language, in the broadest sense of this concept, as enclosing religious discourse. In the beginning, speaking theologically should happen in the *Name of God*, Scrima asserts; at Jasper's antipodes, he places the *Name of God* as the origin and mystery that generates speaking theologically. This article aims first of all to bring the question of theological language back into the academic space that is more interested in the phenomenological issues promoted in Enrico Castelli's thought laboratory in Rome.

Keywords: theological language, religious discourse, religions, Name of God, phenomenology, Castelli Colloquia, André Scrima.

I. 1 Note on Enrico Castelli's thought laboratory. Towards the end of the 1960s, in the well-known Enrico Castelli colloquia, while intensively dis-

---

cussing the topic of demythologization, scholars concluded that theological language is fundamental in exploring it. Thus, the topic of *the analysis of theological language: the Name of God*, became prevalent for them and they began to think that a distinction between the terms *religious* and *theological* would be desirable, avoiding scandalous formulas for the field of theology. By reading and re-reading fundamental volumes such as "Hermeneutics and Tradition" (1963), "Le Mythe et la Foi", (1966), "The Analysis of Theological Language. The Name of God" (1969), and the volume of debates derived from the proceedings: "Débats sur le langage théologique" (1969), to mention only those closely related to language issue and the years when André Scrima attended these colloquia, I realised that the choice of topic opened up a consensual methodological orientation, but more than a consensus, it was a refined and varied spectrum of thought. Moreover, the most vivid and interesting part of this laboratory of Roman thought proved to be the debates. The tones were extremely erudite, no less cutting, severe, in a stage where key ideas or concepts were 'polished' on all sides, like diamonds, all prepared to accurately render their ideas for the specialised or non-specialised public. Bringing together philosophers, epistemologists, theologians, historians of religions, phenomenologists, each of them very distant in their disciplines in the Castelli Colloquia, yet brought together to deal with common themes of great relevance to the post-conciliar period (Vatican II), seemed to me a kind of counter-tendency to the continuous division of disciplines, as well as a remarkable effort to recode the language of each discipline in such a way as to coagulate the thought and issue on which they were reflecting. Of course, there is a dynamic of ideas within the Roman laboratory itself, I will summarise a brief part of this atmosphere here.

The European mentality of a humanist tradition open to the European history of ideas, combined with the ideas of scholars such as Ernesto Grassi or Eugenio Garin, set the tone for thematic volumes open to *Hermeticism, Rhetoric, Machiavellianism, Esotericism*, etc., all in the period from the 1950s to the 1960s. The term phenomenology appears for the first time in the 1951 volume *Archivio*. One of the major contributions directed towards traditional metaphysics, and not towards Husserlian phenomenology, was attributed to the Italian philosopher Gustavo Bontadini, *alma mater* Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore di Milano, who contributed to the formation of philosophers such as Angelo Scola, Emanuele Severini, Giovanni Reale, among the best known. The so-called return to Parmenides, especially to classical, Aristotelian and Thomistic metaphysics, made Bontadini one of the most important exponents of the theory of the identity of being and thought, an epistemic approach based on two constitutive elements: experience and the principle of non-contradiction. This was the ideological basis of the first monographic issue of *Il compito della fenomenologia*, published in 1957 in the *Archivio*

Filosofico, a space where the vicissitudes of European humanism at that time were to be exposed.

Phenomenological analysis, as long as it was research into the meanings of "common sense", i.e. research aimed at proving the truthfulness of the key to reading the openings of religious experience, was perfectly in line with Castelli's intentions. A few names to mention here, just to emphasise the multifaceted background, I mean both humanistic and scientific, of various exponents of these meetings: Erch Przywara (1889-1972), theological philosopher, highly original for his idea of the tension between divine and transcendent immanence (unity in tension) and remembered for his *Analogia Entis* (1932); Gerhard Funke (1914-2006), a student of Heidegger, later professor at the *École Normale Supérieure*, Paris; Roman Ingarden (1893-1970), a Polish-born mathematician and philosopher, one of Husserl's best students and doctoral students (during his time at Göttingen), influential especially for his volume *The Literary Work of Art*, but also for his contributions to epistemology, ontology, metaphysics, phenomenology. Beyond their simple enumeration, I think it is good to imagine the transversal line of the germinal stage of the Roman phenomenological laboratory, at least enough to understand what kind of perspectives and hermeneutic sensibilities are taking shape within the group where Scrima's contribution will be incorporated, or at least, to understand what kind of phenomenology is being discussed in the background of the colloquia where he was also present. If we were to consider Castelli's philosophy strictly, I invoke here the voice of Federica Pazzeli:

> [...] la sua è una filosofia della vita, il cui obiettivo è di superare la solitudine (il solipsismo) del soggetto proposto dalla filosofia (specialmente neoidealistica) per guadagnare, attraverso un 'senso comune', l'intesa intersoggettiva.[2]

Before the Italian philosopher Castelli died, the proceedings of the colloquium *L'herméneutique de la philosophie de la religion* had already defined the thematic directions, the hermeneutical priorities. The Castelli Colloquia were coordinated by the founder until 1977, and after his death he was succeeded by the philosopher Marco Maria Olivetti (1943-2006). Subsequently, the President of the Castelli Institute was Jean-Luc Marion, who continues to organize these colloquia at the Department of Philosophy of *La Sapienza*, University, Rome. The ambition of the founder of these colloquia was that through the authority of the contributions made by philosophers, theologians, sociologists, or historians of religions, a European pole of thought in the field of philosophy of religions would be generated and developed, privi-

---

[2] Federica Pazzelli, *Enrico Castelli e i Colloqui sulla demitizzazione* (1961-1975), Monte Porzio Catone, 11th-14th July 2016, 1.

leging this discipline, precisely because philosophy did not seem to respond to the major questions of those years.

A powerful stimulus for this group, as mentioned above, was the Second Vatican Council, chronologically speaking, in the same period of the heyday (1940s-70s) of the Roman School of Religious History, founded by Raffaele Pettazzoni in the first decades of the 20th century, both institutions of reflection on religious phenomena living under the same university area *La Sapienza*, Rome. These institutions were truly at the antipodes, but no less distinguished and influential globally in the history of the disciplines of religious studies. On the one hand, there were the Castelli Colloquia that focused on the philosophy of religion, a continental philosophy expanded to a kind of post-conciliar phenomenology, if we can call it that, and on the other hand, the Pettazzonian school of the history of religions, where phenomenology had a completely different strain. This is a separate chapter, which will have to be dealt with at some point, since many of the scholars present at the Castelli Colloquia were also present at European or international congresses of the History of Religions. It is a fact that among the participants in the Castelli Colloquium were many representatives of the various Christian denominations at the work of the Council, such as Father Andre Scrima who was an Orthodox monk, as well as the historian of religions and the brilliant classicist of Romanian-Hungarian origin Károly Kerényi, for example. Faith and religion, faithful or not, nothing was excluded, as long as their intellectual horizons included philosophical reflection and the thematic challenges of their Roman meetings.

Moreover, Castelli's preference for *colloquia* rather than the title of *congress* or *symposium* was precisely to give these meetings the character of an informal gathering of the reflections of those present, *mutatis mutandis* just like those of Eranos, where Mircea Eliade was present, as well as Károly Kerényi. Among them, perhaps the most famous, not necessarily the most effective, were scholars such as Gershom Scholem, Guido Calogero, Yves Congar, Jean Daniélou, Gaston Fessard, Paul Ricoeur, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Ugo Bianchi, and later Umberto Eco, Jean-Luc Marion, etc. In considering the publication of the proceedings of the Castelli Colloquia, it is also important to note the publication, as early as 1961, of the journal *Archivio di Filosofia* [*AF*] dedicated to the philosophy of religion, coordinated since 1977 by Marco Maria Olivetti.

Olivetti's epistemological imprint was that there was a way of doing philosophy, rather than generating a philosophy, as is evident from the *AF* issues from the period of the colloquia organised by Castelli. Scrima has an epistolary exchange[3] with Olivetti in the eighties, but all by virtue of the

---

[3] Letter from Rome, 3rd April 1980, **Prof. Marco Olivetti, Istituto di Studi Filosofici "Enrico Castelli" to A. Scrima,** at Mme de Menil, 7 rue Las Cases, Paris, 1 p. hand written

memory of the years he frequented with Castelli. This chapter is by no means the end of the story, about the colloquia, about Castelli, about those post-conciliar years that strengthened and motivated many scholars, conservative or less so, religious or less so, to frequent this environment, deserves a monograph in itself, partly already undertaken by Frederica Pazzelli.[4]

I. 2 Atmosphere at Villa Mirafiori, a hint: *hospitality and hermeneutic of bonne chère*. Inherent to the organization of the colloquium, in Villa Mirafiori, the hospitality perfectly complemented by the gardens of the Hotel Fenix, near the palm-lined streets of the area of the headquarters of the Faculty of Philosophy, *La Sapienza* University, where it is still located today, was highly appreciated by the participants, giving a unique note to an environmental area such as the Peripatetics, in full contemplation of nature and the Roman architectural beauty of Via Nomentana and the Trieste district. Thus, no impediment could have slipped in to "disturb the philosophical creativity" of this group,[5] Andreas Speer confesses. He also mentions l'*herméneutique de la bonne chère*, referring to a remark by Ludwig Feuerbach: *l'homme est ce qu'il mange*!, but against the background of the discussions of these colloquia in an "anti-dualist" framework, wishing to emphasize that the study days were structured in vast recreational areas, with good quality wine, with an exceptional hospitality at the Hotel Fenix. Around the round tables, participants from many parts of the world had the opportunity to get to know each other, to communicate, to maintain or to form lifelong friendships, to join in the continuity of what might be called a symposium, a salon culture, where the verbs *to savour* and to be wise literally enjoy possession of the same Latin root *sapere*, and the issues of the journal *AF* testify to this in their very essence.

I. 3 The Gordian knot of debate around the demythologization issue. I would like to point out that demystification is at the core of many of the topics discussed at the Castelli Colloquia. I cannot propose a full exposition of this argument in this article, I will limit myself to summarising it. Demythologizing, in Bultmann's terms, is primarily about communicating what is essential about the Christic salvific message, leaving behind biblical mythological language, the language that "wraps" the sacred content, in

---

and envelope, CS 202; Rome, 12th September 1980, **Marco Olivetti, Istituto di Studi Filosofici "Enrico Castelli" to A. Scrima**, 1 p. hand written, CS 203, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

[4] Federica Pazzelli, *La genesi dei Colloqui. Una prospettiva su Enrico Castelli*, (Pisa-Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2018), 435.

[5] Andreas Speer, "Sapida Scienzia. Observations sur la vie au Colloque Castelli", in *Archivio della Filosofia*, special issue: *Cinquant'anni di Colloqui Castelli* 79, no. 2, 2011, 59-62.

biblical texts. The mind, too much directed towards scientific objectivism, will not be otherwise magnetized, unless it considers the *kerygma*: the sharing of the biblical message with one's neighbour or the deep and essential message of the Bible through the minimalist Protestant grid. Anyone who has ever visited the Dome of Utrecht will understand this kind of 'minimalism' quite well visually.

No matter how we put it, this kind of problematization has become obsolete even within the historical-religious disciplines, the pressure of desacralization of theological languages in the 20th century and beyond is indeed a major one. The clear separation between faith and the interpretation of traditions or religious systems is already a matter of rallying to a minimal scientific ethics (Raffaele Pettazzoni). Demystification, in Castelli's terms, would be defined by the fact that by separating myth from message, from the specific linguistic envelope, everything is reduced to a barren morality, commonly accepted but irrelevant to deeply spiritual Christian existence.

Replacing the ontological content of knowledge with the formal articulation of discourse (after all, the foundation of existentialist theories starting with Heidegger!), is the basis of the critical thinking with which André Scrima launches into many of the debates of the "Enrico Castelli" colloquia, succeeding in pointing out the Gordian knot of the question: on the one hand, the positioning of the symbol as the constitutive referent of that which transcends language, the indicible; on the other hand, the word circumscribed to the configuration of the symbol leads to deciphering of meaning.[6] His argumentative and discursive approach is partly the subject of the following pages.

II. 1 The language of André Scrima according to André Scrima. A few remarks on his intellectual contribution to the Castelli Colloquia. Most of the time, in historiographical literature, the terms in which Scrima establishes his own epistemological approach are not identified as such, but are passed through an analytical filter specific to the mind of the person who intends to approach different aspects of Scrima's work, particularly his hermeneutical approach in the sixties. It is an excellent approach in interpreting Scrima language, there are no misunderstandings here.[7] But my approach is intended, for the moment, as an exercise in familiarity with the layered terminology and semantics of Fr Scrima's language. Very little and scattered, but mostly in extremely inaccessible volumes, have his writings been pub-

---

[6] **MEI** 1966, 83.

[7] For an annotated and comprehensive bibliography, see Daniela Dumbravă, Bogdan Tătaru-Cazaban (éds.), *André Scrima : expérience spirituelle et langage théologique. Actes du colloque de Rome, 29-30 octobre 2008*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 306 (Roma: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 2019), 241-249.

lished in the original French. His contributions to the Castelli Colloquia appear either as contributions as such in the form of philosophical essays published in the proceedings of the colloquia, or as incisive and even exhaustive interventions in the colloquia, in response to or problematizing the contributions of other thinkers, published in the debates, or as personal notes or preparatory to occasions when he was unable to participate, but corresponded with the organizers of the colloquia, in particular E. Castelli.[8] There is therefore a strong motivation to return to the language of father Scrima, attempting a precise systematisation of his interventions at the Castelli Colloquia.

II. 2 Word. Scrima considers language to be "the unique faculty of placing human experience into form [...] the unequivocal place of the manifestation of meaning."[9] Thus, he continues, it is not possible to trust the word that closes and structures the world in which it lives: it is only in itself, [i.e. the word], that one can escape the non-sense through which the temptation of irresponsibility insinuates itself, that of the impossibility of questioning and responding. Scrima's analysis is not concerned in examining the extent to which the prevalence of Western thought permeates, by one tendency or another, already knowing about the substitution of its ontological content with the formal articulations of discourse. The transformation of knowledge into the determining conditions of knowledge is a constant in the destiny of the Western spirit, from the earliest analyses of the Greek sophists to the lived experience – the *abendländische Wendung* – in our own time.[10]

Language, constituted by the word embedded in a system of communication, has as many limits as the world itself, Scrima says, referring again to Heidegger: "[...] being comes towards language. Language is the place where being is housed."[11] The world is in language, everything being the word of what exists. Scrima's considerations overlap exactly, at least to some extent, with Heideggerian thought. The paradigm shift from the German philosopher comes when Scrima states that language resides in man as the subject of divinity, as part of divine otherness, the word under the sign of freedom and, ultimately, of love.[12] From his perspective, it follows that, in fact, the function of the word is to generate communication, it is the instrument of understanding between people. From a strictly historical perspective, the *word* is situated in a universal framework, that is, until the

---

[8] A brief presentation of the sources in the archives is been included in the bibliographical section (primary sources) of this article.

[9] **MEI** 1996, 83.

[10] **MEI** 1966, 84.

[11] **ESL-TC**, 47; see also Martin Heidegger, *Repere pe drumul gândirii*, trans. Thomas Kleininger and Gabriel Liiceanu (Bucharest: Ed. Politică, 1978), 297.

[12] **ESL-TC**, 49.

Incarnation of the Logos in history, namely under the sign of a Greek logos combined with the Hellenic philosophical and cultural tradition. This is the most dominant in European culture, generating predictable operational thoughts structured on a few precise rules: the principle of identity (A=A), the principle of non-contradiction (A cannot be both A and non-A), the principle of the excluded third (apart from A and non-A, there is no possible third hypothesis).[13] Scrima calls them operations of the spirit which have the force of universality, but which suppress the other, absorb his otherness: "[...] the West reduces the other, reabsorbs his otherness: if the other wants to have a place in the world, he must speak - since the world is language - the logos of the West."[14] The revealed word, however, comes from an entirely different dimension, and since the origin of language is not in the possession of being (Heidegger), then it is left with only one circumstance, that of speaking itself:

> [...] Dire que je connais l'origine du monde signifie que je suis en même temps et en-deça de l'origine et avant l'origine. Donc si je suis avant l'origine, cela veut dire qu'il y a une autre origine et ainsi de suite. Pareillement pour le langage. Or, la Parole révélée se pose avec un statut absolument unique une prétention que certains de ses représentants (St. Paul, par exemple) n'hésitaient pas à assumer très nettement en tant que Folie. La Parole n'a pas elle-même une origine dépistable, situable à l'intérieur du monde, elle est "originale." Elle est l'Origine.[15]

This revealed word is also its Origin, moreover, it has an originating function: in turn, it opens up meaning. Scrima, even in practical terms, operates with the same categories and considerations about language, differentiating their exposition only according to the interlocutor: e.g. in the courses taught in Beirut in the seventies, or the Castelli colloquia, where they are explained much more elaborately and in a language appropriate to the phenomenological environment. Irrevocably, human experience is a generator of meaning, or of the manifestation of meaning: it has a horizon, an infinite opening of meanings, manifestations of meaning.[16]

II. 3 Symbol, energy and configuration. Scrima states that the symbol constitutes and manifests its structure within a double movement, and the value that gives meaning to the symbol reveals a triple function: of passage, of manifestation, of establishment. What does André Scrima mean when

---

[13] **ESL-TC**, 48.
[14] **ESL-TC**, 48.
[15] **ESL-TC**, 49-50.
[16] **ESL-TC**, 50.

he refers to the structure of the symbol? First of all, he does not propose a taxonomy of the different uses of the notion of symbol, or of its degree of legitimacy, but responds by referring to Gaston Bachelard: "Shouldn't a symbol mean something beyond its expression? Does it not imply an essential relationship between two meanings: a manifest meaning and a hidden one?"[17] If a symbolic datum (whatever in itself its expression may be) implies a constitutive reference to its own "world beyond", it is because its intentional vision is fulfilled in and through the passage of what appears (or is said), what remains invisible (or indicible), and vice versa. The concept speaks of the "zone of disruption" between the indicible, over which its expressive mode of being prevails, the symbol communicates by virtue of the reversible translation of the meaning of these two poles. As long as the symbol is alive, it remains open to the "world beyond" where it captures *l'énergie assimilatrice*, which could be translated, in the linguistic system, by pairs of associative notions or images according to the rule of analogy or contrast. In all the rigor of terms, the essential word he says is "a word of passage." A second movement within the structure is the word circumscribed by the configuration of the symbol: it is supposed to be deciphered and assimilated in such a way that the translation of the meaning could be achieved, Scrima claims.[18]

Scrima implies that even in the full equivocalness of the symbol, the possibility of containing simultaneously, a unity of structure, as well as multiple manifestations of what it signifies; at the opposite pole the logical, algorithmic symbol, eliminating any kind of equivocation (of interpretative, semantic variation), is inscribed in a formal linearity, where the sign univocally substitutes the symbol in the system. Based on Wittgenstein's statement: *Es gibt allerdings Unaussprechliches. Dies zeigt sich, es ist das Mystische*.[19] Somehow, the meaning of the world must lie outside of it and by this it is manifest whether it is a mystical one. On the other hand, if we were to reiterate Heidegger's words in his letter to Elisabeth Blochmann,[20] namely

---

[17] Scrima quoting Bachelard in **MEI**, 85.

[18] **MEI**, 85.

[19] "However, there is the ineffable. This shows itself, it is the mystical." (*Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*, 6.522).

[20] "[...] Conferința mea se limitează intenționat și unilateral la o anumită problemă, ale cărei coordonate mi-au fost livrate chiar de scopul conferinței, care era să arate ce poate și ce nu poate învăța un teolog de la fenomenologie. [...] S-a pus desigur întrebarea, pe parcursul discuției, dacă teologia este într-adevăr o știință. Semnificativ este faptul că, la Marburg, ea a venit tocmai din partea elevilor mei. Eu unul sunt, ce-i drept, convins că teologia *nu* este știință, însă în momentul de față nu sunt încă în stare *să arăt cu adevărat* acest lucru, pentru că, prin aceasta, importanta funcție a teologiei în istoria spiritualității să fie concepută *în mod pozitiv*. Simpla negare este o treabă ușoară, însă a spune ce este știința însăși și ce este teologia – dacă ea nu este nici filosofie, nici știință – toate acestea sunt probleme pe care nu le-aș dori târâte într-o discuție de moment. [...] Sunt convins de asemenea, că distincția

that the philosopher's endeavour converged towards a knowledge of theology through philosophical terms, without reducing it to philosophy, or distorting it, perhaps this is also to some extent in line with Scrima, namely with his efforts to unravel some of the meanings of myth, of symbols, including here those relating to Christian theology. On another occasion, however, Scrima laments the inability of Western metaphysics to integrate the transcendent, and this is because it must be "discovered" in a relationship of personal communion, where the values and all the "ingredients" of the transcendent are "embodied" in man, simply assimilated. Nothing is transcendent if man does not live it, if he does not experience it. A very interesting comparison found in his published notes refers to the doctrinal, visionary beauty of Indian spirituality (e.g. Hinduism and Mahāyāna Buddhism), associated with a "frightening decadence" of the masses, the emptiness of the soul. In fact, Scrima often incorporates elements of Hindu metaphysics into his reflections on Eastern metaphysics,[21] more specifically, notions that underlie an anthropological construction of contemplation, a search for the self. This metaphysics includes, paradoxically, the search for the transcendent plane, assimilated existentially, but coupled with a decentralisation of man, an anthropological decomposition suspended in the desire to be one with the transcendent, but which does not recompose itself so as to see its face restored, as in Christianity.

"Original time", "myth of creation", "causal function", "bipolarity and genesis of evil" all end up in the plane of a meaning that takes literary form and is grafted onto an anthropological framework. The fact that myth is a narrative that refers to a trans-worldly reality, to an Other as a symbol that assumes to be equivocal, ambiguous, transparent, as well as constituting religious systems. The reciprocity of the planes - mundane and transcendent - objectifies myth. Scrima sharply demarcates the planes: there is an ontological distance between them, the discourse of myth does not fully personalize either the Other or the human.[22]

Returning to Scrima, the phenomenologist of the miracle, and to his exposition *Le Mythe et l'épiphanie de l'indicible*, he brings to the fore a completely unusual concept, namely that of semantic energy overflowing over the world, more precisely where a myth, or an immanent identity, is founded. Until we move to the plane of Christianity, this semantic energy refers to the poetic imaginary, to the archetype, as understood in pre-

---

tradițională dintre științele naturii și cele ale spiritului este, în orice formă ar fi ea făcută, una superficială. Din punct de vedere metafizic nu există decât o singură știință.", Martin Heidegger & Elisabeth Blochmann, *Corespondență 1918-1969*, ed. Joachim W. Storck, traducere din germană de Ileana Snagoveanu-Spiegelberg (București: Humanitas, 2006), 38-42.

[21] André Scrima, "Noțiuni antropologice", in Vlad Alexandrescu (ed.), *Antropologia apofatică* (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2005), 204-206.

[22] **MEI**, 87.

Socratic thought; if we want something analogous, we can think of the original meaning of the word *physis* which derives from the verb $\varphi\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ (*phúō*, "to grow"), with the ending -$\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (-sis), the original etymology indicating the process of growth of plants, from seed to maturity, designating a precise process of development, a power of their becoming, often used by the naturalistic pre-Socratics. It is rarely found in Homeric texts, but with Thales and Anaximenes, this noun is assimilated to the soul, most likely due to the orphic inspiration of this resemantization of the term. Well, Scrima, when he refers to *semantic energy*, at least as it emerges from his text, mentioned above, thinks this kind of dynamics, intrinsic to the term, as well as its resemantization. The association of *logos* with *physis* in the Presocratics, could not leave indifferent an expert like André Scrima in the fundamental patristic texts, such as those of St. Maxim the Confessor or those of the Cappadocian fathers.

Scrima also often invokes Foucault's idea of the archaeology of knowledge, and Indo-European etymology is at his fingertips, like a natural tool. Of course, Scrima's exposition does not stop at either the *physis* or the *logos* of the pre-Socratics, but it is the perfect tool, by analogy, to introduce conceptually the force of the revealed *Logos*, its dynamics, even far beyond the objectification that man, anthropology, the human logos conjugates. A. S. delimits his discourse in terms of the meanings of myth as they are constructed from "intra-worldly determinism or what is the para-signification of a *Weltbild*" constructed by historians of religion such as Moses Gaster, G. Dumézil, R. Pettazzoni, M. Eliade, but this is not because he despises their exclusively rationalist construction or the historical-comparative approach; on the contrary, they serve him as useful tools for his own exposition. His aim is to show what the major support of the Christian *kerygma*, as it appears through the revealed Word.

Father André's thesis is that God is irreducible to human discourse and structures, more precisely, that God is a symbol in Himself and is not constituted to be part of a discourse about the world, or to constitute Himself as a "zone of disruption" between a sacred and a profane world. Calling on an assertion of St. Maxim the Confessor (*Ambigua*, P.G. 91, III6D) - God becoming a symbol of Himself – the *Incarnate Logos* – Scrima reiterates in phenomenological terms the assertion of the 7th -century theologian and says that the Logos makes its place in history, becomes incarnate, through inference, becomes a revealed symbol, objectifying primordial meanings: spirit, life, light, God...:

> [...] Le champ d'instauration ontologique de la parole est corrélatif à sa puissance symbolique; comme cette puissance est ici totale, l'assimilation sans confusion entre Dieu et l'homme le sera également. La foi exprime l'entrée dans l'ordre ontolo-

gique déployé par l'énergie assimilatrice de la manifestation de l'Absolu de cette manifestation.[23]

Reading the work of Fr. Scrima, especially the texts on the topic of language, I noticed a strong patristic argumentative support. These are first of all the texts of Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* (II), relating to language, as well as the texts of Maximus Confessor, already quoted in this article. André Scrima's exegesis, for example, as it emerges from his text dedicated to the *Scrisoarea Pelerinului Străin*,[24] emerges from a "before having been", a horizon of "before being said", a weaving of the text that is not so much an evocation of biographies as an advent, an anamnesis that turns into recognition. Above a *Nachlass* - however memorable it may be - it is therefore not memory that is fixed, but the present of a presence-symbol perfectly integrated into the plan of an eternal, soteriological time, a present perfectly compatible with liturgical times, more precisely the opening times of another world. The hermeneutics of Fr. Scrima's various texts, he says explicitly, often does not combine with the contemporary history of such an event, but becomes a transcription into writing of the data of a unique, singular experience, lived and seen at its end: an essential function in the construction of a meaning is to ensure the *avènement* of intelligibility, both of mental becoming and of things. Therefore, the second part of my article will be oriented towards the understanding of the texts of André Scrima where the father presents himself as a hermeneut, an understanding perfectly correlated with those already exposed in this article, with the difference that, this time, his language [i.e. Scrima] is given the arguments of a perfect knowledge and an original reading of the patristic sources.

References

Primary sources[25]

André Scrima Papers, New Europe College, Bucharest, systematised in 2001, updated in January 2010, May-September 2013, September 2015-2017, inven-

---

[23] **MEI** 1966, pp. 88.

[24] André Scrima, *Timpul Rugului Aprins. Maestrul spiritual în tradiţia răsăriteană*, Anca Manolescu ed., Andrei Pleşu (introduction) (Bucharest: Humanitas, 2000), 23-96.

[25] I have limited myself to presenting only the primary sources closely related to the topic of my article, however, the need for a detailed analysis of the primary sources of the writings of Fr. Scrima, seems to me very necessary indeed as there are some uncertainties concerning the datation of his writings, and I refer especially to his notes that were introduced in the volume *Antropologia apofatică*, the so-called anthropological notations. Also with regard to his presence and contributions to the Castelli Colloquia, there is still much to investigate and my research period at the Romanian Academy in Rome, in 2020, a period in which the restrictions for Covid-19 seriously impeded access to the Roman archives, was

tory by Anca Manolescu [abrev. **PAS-NEC**]. Dossier *Colloqui Enrico Castelli* [abrev. **CEC**], organised by André Scrima, with notes, unpublished annotated texts, published texts, documentation, miscellaneous. [abrev. **PAS-NEC /DCEC**]; [AIEIC] ***Archives of the Institute d'Etudes Islamo-Chrétiennes***, Beirut, Lebanon.

I. Published texts in **CEC**:

Scrima, André. "Le Mythe et l'épiphanie de l'indicible" [abrev. **MEI** 1966] in Enrico Castelli (ed.), *Mythe et Foi*. Actes du Colloque organisé par le Centre international d'études humanistes et par l'Institut d'études philosophiques de Rome, Rome, 6-12 Janvier 1966, Aubier. Éditions Montaigne, 1966, 83-103; [abrev. **MF** 1966].

———. "Le Nom-Lieu de Dieu " [abrev. **NLD** 1969], in *Débats sur le langage théologique* organisés par le Centre international d'études humanistes et par l'Institut d'études philosophiques de Rome, ed. Enrico Castelli, Aubier. Paris: Éditions Montaigne, 1969, 213-220, [abrev. **DLT** 1966].

———. "L'infaillibilité : inscription conceptuelle et destinée eschatologique" [abrev. **IICDE**], in *L'infaillibilité. Son aspect philosophique et théologique*. Actes du Colloque organisé par le Centre international d'études humanistes et par l'Institut d'études philosophiques de Rome. Rome, 5–12 Janvier 1970, ed. Enrico Castelli. Aubier. Paris: Éditions Montaigne, 1970, p. 571-584, [abrev. **IPT**]

II. Unpublished (or documents belonging to) texts, drafts, notes in **CEC**:

a. Interventions A. Scrima at the Colloquium "Demythisation et image", 10-18 January 1962.

6 pages in typescript (one with a handwritten note on the back), DN.CAS 2, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Notes A. Scrima for the Colloquium "Demythisation et image", 10-18 January 1962, 3 pages, 1 note, 1 manuscript envelope, DN.CAS 3, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

b. Interventions A. Scrima - Colloquium "Demythisation et image", 10-18 January 1962.

6 p. dactilo (with a handwritten note on the back), DN.CAS 2, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Notes A. Scrima - Colloquium "Demythisation et image", 10-18 January 1962, 3 pp., 1 card, 1 envelope, original handwritten notes, DN.CAS 3, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

c. Colloquium on 'Hermeneutics and Tradition' (10-16 January 1963). Colloquium program, DN.CAS 4, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

1 page (f/v) the brochure signed by Enrico Castelli (original and photocopy), Enrico Castelli, "Introduction au Colloque international Herméneutique et Tradition", 10-16 January 1963, 5 pp. edited, DN.CAS 5, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

d. Drafts A. Scrima for the Coll. *Herméneutique et Tradition*, 4 handwritten pages, DN.CAS 6, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

e. Brochure CEC, *Le mythe et la foi*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, Roma, 1966.

DN.CAS 7, 1 pag. (f/v) edited (2 samples, one of which with the business card of Enrico Castelli).

Castelli, Enrico. "Introduction au Colloque *Mythe et Foi"*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, 6-12 janvier, Roma, 1966, DN.CAS 8, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Bruaire, Claude. "Démythisation et conscience malheureuse" résumé (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 9, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Ott, Heinrich. "La structure de l'acte de foi" résumé (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma., DN.CAS 10, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Fessard, Gaston. "Le Dieu inconnu de Saint Paul" (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 11, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Grassi, Ernesto. "La signification archaique (foi et raison)" (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma., DN.CAS 12, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Bartsch, Hans Werner. "Le concept de foi dans l'epître aux Romains" (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma.DN.CAS 13, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

10 pp. for publish (proofs for the volume *Mythe et Foi*, Paris, Aubier-Montaine, 1966), with André Scrima's annotations.

Mancini, Italo. "Sufficiens inductivum ad credendum. Propositions pour une philosophie de la foi" (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studi Filosofici,

6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 14, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Ladrière, Jean. "Mythes cosmologiques et pensée de la constitution (Schéma introductif)" (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studii Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 15, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Waelhens, Alphonse de. "Le mythe de la démythification" (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studi Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 16, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Panikkar, Raymond. "La foi comme dimension constitutive de l'homme", résumé (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studi Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 17, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Vergote, Antoine. "Mythe, croyance aliénée et foi théologale" (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studi Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 18, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

Theunis, Franz. "La critique de la pensée et du discours objectivant et l'idée de théologie de R. Bultmann", traduction provisoire (Colloque *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studi Filosofici, 6-12 janvier 1966, Roma, DN.CAS 19, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

f. André Scrima. "Le mythe et l'épiphanie de l'indicible", 7 pp. hand writen pages, followd by discussions (edited), 9 pp. hand writen pages, published in Actes of the CEC, *Mythe et Foi*, Istituto di Studi Filosofici, Roma, 1966 (Paris, Aubier-Montaige, 1966, pp. 83-103). This volume ist o be found also in the Library beloging to the PAS-NEC, DN.CAS 20, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation. 6 pp + 2 pp. hand writen pages, DN.CAS 21, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

g. A. Scrima's response to H.-W Bartsch contribution at the Colloquim *Le mythe et la foi* (1966).

A. Scrima's response to H. Bouillard contribution at the Colloquim *Le mythe et la foi* (1966), DN.CAS 22, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

A. Scrima's response to G. Fessard at the Colloquium Le mythe et la foi (1966), DN.CAS 23, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

A. Scrima's response to P. Prini's contribution to the Colloquium Le mythe et la foi (1966), DN.CAS 24, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

A. Scrima's response to F. Theunis' contribution to the Colloquium *Le mythe et la foi* (1966), DN.CAS 25, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

A. Scrima's response to G. Girardi's contribution to the Colloquium *Le mythe et la foi* (1966), DN.CAS 26, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

A. Scrima notes for CEC, *Le mythe et la foi* (6-12 January 1966), DN.CAS 27, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

h. A. Scrima notes for CEC, *Le mythe de la peine* (January 1967, DN.CAS 28, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

i. A. Scrima notes for CEC, *Débats sur le langage théologique* (January 1969), DN.CAS 29, according to the PAS-NEC/DCEC quotation.

III. *L'expérience spirituelle et son language. La tradition chrétienne.* [abrev. **ESL-TC**], Course text based on a student's notes, Faculté de Sciences Religieuses. Université Saint-Joseph, Département d'Études Islamo-Chrétiennes, Beyrouth, Liban, Année 1977-1978, ms. **118** pp, copy received from the Archives of the *Institute of Islamic-Christian Studies*, Saint Joseph's University, Beirut, currently in the A. Scrima Papers, at the *Institute for the History of Religions*, Bucharest, with permission of ISIC for dissemination and publication. The digitisation of the entire corpus of Scrima's course texts (in audio and written format) is underway and will be available at andrescrima.ro.

Other references

Dumbravă, Daniela, Bogdan Tătaru-Cazaban (éds.). *André Scrima : expérience spirituelle et langage théologique. Actes du colloque de Rome, 29-30 octobre 2008*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 306, Roma: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 2019.

Gregorius Nyssenus. *Contra Eunomium* (II). Bilingual edition, translation, introductory remarks and notes by Gheorge Ovidiu Sfarlea; ed. by Adrian Muraru. Iasi: Polirom, 2020.

Heidegger, Martin & Elisabeth Blochmann. *Corespondență 1918-1969*. Joachim W. Storck ed. Translated from German by Ileana Snagoveanu-Spiegelberg. București: Humanitas, 2006.

———. *Repere pe drumul gândirii*. Translated by Thomas Kleininger and Gabriel Liiceanu. București: Ed. Politică, 1978.

Pazzelli, Federica. *Enrico Castelli e i Colloqui sulla demitizzazione* (1961-1975), Monte Porzio Catone, 11t[h]-14t[h] July 2016.

———. *La genesi dei Colloqui. Una prospettiva su Enrico Castelli*. Pisa- Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2018.

Speer, Andreas. "Sapida Scienzia. Observations sur la vie au Colloque Castelli." *Archivio della Filosofia*, special issue: *Cinquant'anni di Colloqui Castelli* 79, no. 2, 2011.

Scrima, André. *Timpul Rugului Aprins. Maestrul spiritual în tradiția răsăriteană*, Anca Manolescu ed., Andrei Pleşu (introduction). Bucharest: Humanitas, 2000.

———. "Noțiuni antropologice." In Vlad Alexandrescu (ed.), *Antropologia apofatică*. Bucharest: Humanitas, 2005.