
STUDIA FABRIANA

CORNELIO FABRO

Essential Thinker

Philosopher of Being and of Freedom

FATHER
CORNELIO FABRO
Cultural Project

CF

Edited by the Cornelio Fabro Cultural Project
of the Institute of the Incarnate Word

Cover Design

© 2017 by IVE Press, Chillum, MD
Institute of the Incarnate Word, Inc.
All rights reserved

© 2017 by Cornelio Fabro Cultural Project
All rights reserved



E-mail: fabroproject@corneliofabro.org

www.corneliofabro.org

www.ivepress.org

ISBN-10: 1-939018-78-1

ISBN-13: 978-1-939018-78-6

eISBN: 978-1-947568-04-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017947991

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Preface

Contributors

Abbreviations

Introduction to Cornelio Fabro

Nathaniel Dreyer

Journey through the Destiny of Being

Gianluca Trombini

Father Cornelio Fabro: Stigmatine – Devotee of His Founder

Joseph C. Henchey

Cornelio Fabro on Participation and Aquinas's *Quarta Via*

John F. Wippel

Fabro's Double Participation and
Aquinas's Double Exemplarism

Gregory T. Doolan

Cornelio Fabro on Supernatural Participations

Jason A. Mitchell

The Impact of Søren Kierkegaard
on the Thought of Cornelio Fabro

Joshua Furnal

*God in Exile: An Introduction to
Cornelio Fabro's Appraisal of Modern Thought*

Patricia Pintado

Journey through the Destiny of Being¹

GIANLUCA TROMBINI, IVE, PhL

Cornelio Fabro Cultural Project
Director

Cornelio Fabro was born in 1911 and died in 1995. He lived nearly 84 years. In 1931, at the very young age of 20, he began an intense period of study, research, and academic activity that lasted nearly 50 years.

Whoever reads Fabro is immediately given the impression that his texts are difficult to understand. However, the attentive reader will soon observe that this difficulty is not the result of sterile rhetorical sophistication but rather the consequence of his unceasing commitment to bring about a *resolutio* toward the foundation. As a good philosopher, Fabro directs all of his speculation to the search for the foundation; a search for the foundation of reality, for the foundation of knowledge, for the foundation of freedom. Philosophy is essentially this “quest” for the foundation of every reality that surrounds us, of our being and of our acts.

Fabro’s intellectual production is truly great, not only in its quantity but also and above all in its intensity. Few in the history of thought have had such a vast and intense production: this includes more than 38 volumes, the majority being highly dense theoretically; more than 900 articles in scientific journals and newspapers; hundreds of reviews for various scientific journals; many encyclopedic entries (for the *Enciclopedia Cattolica* alone he wrote 113 entries); more than fifty university courses given at various universities in Italy and abroad, and so on.

I would like to explain Fabro’s intellectual itinerary and I will ask Fabro himself to help me. What you are about to read is not a presentation of what I consider to be the most important points of Fabro’s thought, but rather those which Fabro himself held to be the main moments of his intellectual journey and of his thought.²

At the beginning of 1980, when Fabro was nearly 70 and the date of his retirement was fast approaching, Professor Antonio Pieretti, director of the Institute of Philosophy at the University of Perugia, asked him to write the stages of his life of research. Fabro began to write but, dissatisfied, he rewrote the text three times. In each version he described the three main directions of his thought, but he handed over only the third version which would then be

published, together with other contributions, in a volume entitled *Essere e Libertà. Studi in onore di Cornelio Fabro [Being and Freedom: Studies in Honor of Cornelio Fabro]*, released in 1984.³

In 2011, the three versions were published in their entirety in a volume entitled *Appunti di un itinerario*. I shall now try to synthesize these three versions, taking elements from all three in an attempt to show what Fabro himself considered his itinerary as a researcher.

Fabro wrote that this journey, which lasted nearly half a century, had three fundamental moments. It is important to bear in mind the following:

- All three of these moments were directed to the “search for the foundation.”
- All three began almost simultaneously.
- These three moments had as their “essential end” (as he says) to direct themselves and to direct others to where truth is and to how freedom is born.
- These three moments are all part of the same journey.⁴

What, then, are these three moments of his research?

- 1) A Return to the Metaphysics of Participation
- 2) The Essential Belonging of Atheism to Modern Immanence and the Dissolution of Man
- 3) The Vindication of Kierkegaard’s Anti-Hegelian Position: Freedom as the Independence of the *Single Individual’s* Responsibility for the *Choice* of the Absolute

1. A RETURN TO THE METAPHYSICS OF PARTICIPATION

When Fabro was still an adolescent, he began to read the classical authors; later, the modern authors began little by little to be his main passion. The fruits of this first phase of study were his thesis for his doctorate in philosophy on “The Objectivity of the Principle of Causality and the Criticism of David Hume” in 1931 and his research that won the competition held by the Academy of St. Thomas in 1934.⁵

“This first approach to the critico-metaphysical problem,” Fabro said, “led me to discover ... the growing centrality that the metaphysical notion of participation has in the speculative work of Thomas Aquinas, which had remained buried in the Thomistic school.”⁶

This encounter with the notion of participation was decisive for the rest of

his research. As the notion of participation is the key of his hermeneutical speculation at all levels, this encounter was fortunate, but not by chance. Fabro recounts:

At the beginning of 1934 I was finishing my text for the academic competition, but I did not feel at ease even though I was following the majority of Thomists and Neo-Scholastics... . One night, perhaps shaken by latent restlessness, I awoke with a start and was struck by a thought which seemed to me very simple and radical: the ultimate critical formula of the principle of causality could be nothing other than that with which St. Thomas expresses the first and radical “dependence” of the creature on the Creator. I rose, opened the First Part of the *Summa Theologiae* to Question 44, article 1, “Utrum sit necessarium omne ens esse creatum a Deo” and immediately found the radical formula which I was looking for: “necesse est dicere omne quod quocumque modo est, a Deo esse. Si enim aliquid invenitur in aliquo per participationem, necesse est quod causetur in ipso ab eo cui essentialiter convenit.”⁷

The study of participation has completely occupied the rest of my life, almost at the foundation of every moment of reflection. It seems I can distinguish three main parts in this reflection:

- a) *The Metaphysical Notion of Participation according to St. Thomas Aquinas*
- b) *Participation and Causality, that is, the Thematic Expansion of the Metaphysics of Participation*
- c) *The Intensive Hermeneutics of Thomistic Philosophy: The Notion of Participation*⁸

a) *The Metaphysical Notion of Participation according to St. Thomas Aquinas*

In the book *La nozione metafisica di partecipazione*,⁹ apart from demonstrating how participation is the hermeneutical key that allows for the understanding of St. Thomas’s thought in all of his writings, Fabro notes how in both philosophy and theology, St. Thomas desires to make a “reduction to the foundation.” The *decisive* standard of this *reductio* is always the notion of *esse* as the act of every act. As the eminent medievalist Van Steenberghe affirms: “In this work ... Fabro shows how St. Thomas overcomes the Aristotelian notion of act by making a superior synthesis of Aristotelianism and Platonism by means of an original transposition of the doctrine of participation.”¹⁰

With this doctoral thesis, defended in 1937, and its subsequent publication in 1939, Fabro brings an essentially new answer to the question of the search

for the *essence* of Thomism.

b) *Participation and Causality, that is, the Thematic Expansion of the Metaphysics of Participation*

In 1960, Fabro published *Partecipazione e causalità*.¹¹ His thought had matured during the 20 years since the publication of *La nozione metafisica di partecipazione*. In the first work, Fabro assessed the situation of Western thought with respect to the past concerning the speculative polemics within classical thought and the various Scholastic schools. In *Partecipazione e causalità*, he takes a step forward with a plan for confronting modern thought, projecting a bright light on the fundamental points of St. Thomas's metaphysics. The peculiar character of this new investigation is Fabro's resolute projection from classical to modern thought; the perspectives of Parmenides, Heraclitus, Aristotle, Plato, Proclus, Pseudo-Dionysius, etc., are accompanied and confronted with those of Averroes, Avicenna, *De Causis*, etc., up to the modern age with Kant, Hegel, Heidegger, and so forth.

Partecipazione e causalità originated from a metaphysics seminar which Fabro gave in 1954 at the University of Leuven for the Cardinal Mercier Chair. This study begins where *The Metaphysical Notion of Participation* had left off, that is, from the novelty of the Thomistic "esse" as the breaking point with the essentialist formalism of the Scholastic school. The work examines the devastating consequences of the loss of "esse ut actus" in the Thomistic school. Fabro shows clearly how Heidegger's accusation of the *Vergessenheit des Sein*, although valid for the Thomistic school, is not at all true of St. Thomas. Shedding light on "esse ut actus essendi" in St. Thomas is therefore one of Fabro's greatest discoveries. Participation, which was analyzed in the first book in a "static" way, is now transported to the dynamic field.

The application of participation to anthropology is of particular interest and in a special way to the cogitative power, the internal sense that participates directly in the intellect's nature and whose cooperation is indispensable to the entire process of knowing and wanting. The cogitative is the key for an elaboration of Thomistic anthropology in its existential and metaphysical structure, giving unity to the operating spiritual subject. His insights into the metaphysical foundations of freedom, after the hermeneutic novelties brought by Fabro to St. Thomas's thought, are very interesting and as of yet little studied.

c) *The Intensive Hermeneutics of Thomistic Philosophy: The Notion of Participation*¹²

St. Thomas's notion of participation can be considered an absolutely new and original speculative event in the history of thought.

In the foreword of *Partecipazione e causalità*, Fabro observes that, in order to clarify the theoretical environment proper to the Thomistic metaphysics of participation, it is necessary to

not so much insist on the exposition of that idea [that is, of the notion of participation] as much as to relate to its foundation, that is, to indicate the original Thomistic orientation of metaphysics as the pure theoreticity of *esse* as act. Thus speculation cannot stop at the relation of essence to being, but must found the constitutive belonging of *esse* to man and of man to *esse*, clarifying at the same time why man seeks himself in *esse* and why *esse* is illuminated in man.¹³

The book *Partecipazione e causalità* sought to fine-tune the principle moments of this aspiration which Fabro expressed in the foreword. On the other hand, the central point of this article on the intensive hermeneutics of the Thomistic *esse* is to indicate the *locus metaphysicus* where this aspiration is fulfilled. For Joseph Maréchal and the transcendental Thomists who follow him, the *locus metaphysicus* is fulfilled in the *being* of judgment. Fabro, on the other hand, after an attentive and profound study of all St. Thomas's works, insists that only the Thomistic *ens* satisfies modern thought's speculative requirement for the immediate beginning. St. Thomas's metaphysics begins with *ens* and not with *esse*. This is only possible to understand if one succeeds in becoming aware of the originality of the life of the spirit in its first and fundamental manifestation, which is the intrinsic belonging of *esse* to the spirit and of the spirit to *esse*. These two aspects or moments are convergent and indissoluble in the constitution of truth and of freedom. Here is the root and the *locus metaphysicus* of the dialectic of participation: in the first contact of the spirit with *ens*, "that which first falls on one's apprehension is *ens*."¹⁴ *Ens* is the principle of intelligibility, the first "*intensionante*," the key of knowledge and the opening by which to ascend to the First Cause by means of the purifying process of analogy.

If we theoretically deepen the metaphysical intensity of the real plexus *ens-essentia-esse* and of the *esse-agere*, we could dissipate so many shadows which have darkened Western thought. Western thought, despite its defeat for having claimed to absorb and generate reality in itself and from itself, cannot renounce its historical duty of enlightening the original sense of truth and of establishing the possibility of an authentic freedom.¹⁵

2. THE ESSENTIAL BELONGING OF ATHEISM TO MODERN IMMANENCE AND THE DISSOLUTION OF MAN

In the second part of Fabro's research journey, he showed the essential belonging of atheism to the immanence of modern philosophy.¹⁶

With the principle of immanence, thought took a new path. Various authors, both followers and opponents of the principle of immanence, have agreed on the nature of this new path. It is a sort of *Copernican revolution in thought*, a complete reversal of direction from the object to the subject. At times Fabro will speak of an *intentional inversion*, at others of the *overturning of the axis of truth* or of the *overturning of the metaphysical axis*.¹⁷

The principle of immanence *affirms the immanence of being in thought and therefore denies the transcendence related to knowing*. All knowing is, in some way, resolved in the act of consciousness.

The principle of immanence *places the truth of act as the basis of the truth of content*, that is, it sets consciousness as the foundation of *esse*, in this way deriving the truth of content from the truth of act.

We could say that from the very beginning the principle of immanence breaks both the syntheticity of the real and the syntheticity of knowledge. Our knowledge is synthetic: it is formed by a synthesis of subject and object, of act and content. Eliminating the syntheticity of knowledge is like eliminating the syntheticity of the real.

We know that immanence does not originate with modern philosophy but can already be found in both classical and Christian thought. However, there is a great difference between the immanence of classical thought and that of modern thought: authentic immanence, that of classical thought, refers to the intentional presence of *esse* to consciousness. It is a perfective immanence in which the soul is perfected; the subject in itself grows. The immanence of modern thought, on the other hand, is constitutive and foundational with regard to *esse*.¹⁸

In simpler terms: in realism, *being* founds thought; in modern thought, consciousness founds *being*.

Identifying being and thought affirms that the object of thought does not refer to a reality outside of thought. Consciousness therefore finds itself in every object and in every act. Nothing exists outside of consciousness; anything that seems to fall outside of consciousness really falls within consciousness itself.

Conclusion: If being is limited to consciousness, being is finite. Hence, for modern thought consciousness constitutively, that is, in its very nature, refers to the finite.

From this gnoseological immanence one passes necessarily to an ontological immanence. Fabro explains this very clearly in [chapter 8](#) of his book *Introduzione all'ateismo moderno*. From here, it is easy to see how the

next step is the denial of the transcendence of *esse* and therefore the denial of God as Transcendent Being. This can be seen in Spinoza, Hegel, Heidegger, and many others.

Therefore, another fundamental point of Fabro's thought is his condemnation of the principle of immanence as intrinsically atheistic. The problem is where the philosophy begins. Thus, the first question that a realist ought to ask an immanentist should not be one regarding topics or systems, but rather preliminary and regarding principles: What is *being* for consciousness?

The first thing to do, therefore, is to establish the relationship between being and consciousness. For us, the most evident reality is that *ens* is: this is the first awakening of consciousness, outside of which there is nothing but the darkness of the spirit. The first and fundamental cause of modern atheism is of a constitutive nature and must be sought in the first step of thought. If the *cogito* is the starting point, *esse* becomes dependent on thought. Human thought is finite; thus, that which man can attain by beginning from his thought is only something enclosed within the horizon of his own finitude.

Thus the criticism of modern thought—for whoever would like to undertake it—does not concern primarily the problem of God but the problem of the *being* of *ens*, or rather the problem of the beginning and of the foundation (*Grund*). Only by beginning with *ens* and focusing on the act of *being* can one arrive at the Absolute Being which is God. Whoever starts from consciousness, on the other hand, will end up being absorbed by the intrinsic finitude of his horizon or else be lost in the nothingness of being.¹⁹

There is much more to say about this that can be found in the volume *Introduzione all'ateismo moderno*, translated into English under the title *God in Exile*.²⁰

3. VINDICATION OF KIERKEGAARD'S ANTI-HEGELIAN POSITION: FREEDOM AS THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE SINGLE INDIVIDUAL'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CHOICE OF THE ABSOLUTE

The third focal moment of Fabro's thought is his vindication of Kierkegaard's anti-Hegelian position: freedom as the independence of the *single individual's* responsibility for the *choice* of the Absolute.

From his very first reading of Kierkegaard, Fabro was struck by the persuasive force of his criticism of the Hegelian dialectic. According to Fabro, Kierkegaard's criticism of Hegel constitutes the common thread of his literary activity. After having read *The Concept of Anxiety*, Fabro continued to

read German translations of Kierkegaard. Discouraged by these unintelligible translations, and encouraged by one of his professor-friends, he began to study Danish and to read Kierkegaard's writings in the original language.

Fabro intensified his reading of Kierkegaard during the Second World War, and he later admitted that reading Kierkegaard greatly helped him to endure the hardships of the war.²¹

Kierkegaard, says Fabro, is one of the few souls who knows how to address himself directly to the reader's conscience.

I can and must say that my encounter with Kierkegaard was decisive, no less than that with St. Thomas... . And just as Thomas's metaphysics forever freed me from the formalisms and emptiness of Scholastic controversies, Kierkegaard's Christian existentialism freed me from the inferiority complex towards modern and contemporary philosophy, revealing to me their anti-human and anti-Christian background.²²

Kierkegaard's ingenious intuitions on freedom, the ego, and the need to be founded in the Absolute will be of fundamental importance for Fabro's study. As can be seen by his recurrent citations of *The Sickness unto Death*, the *Diary*, and *Practice in Christianity*, Fabro draws many ideas from Kierkegaard.

Just to give a few examples of these ideas:²³

- The ego is a synthesis of the finite and the infinite, of time and eternity.
- The ego must become itself, but it can only become itself when, once made transparent to itself, that is, aware of its own finitude, it finds itself in God.
- Fabro will be inspired by Kierkegaard in his way of considering the triple relationship of the ego to itself, to God, and to Christ, coining new expressions such as the "metaphysical ego," the "Christological ego," the "theological ego" (the first two expressions are Fabro's, the third is taken directly from Kierkegaard).
- Another typically Kierkegaardian expression: "The ego is qualitatively that which is its measure."
- The measure of the ego is that in front of which the ego puts itself... . Thus the ego can relate to the finite, to itself, to God, to Christ... . The higher the measure, the higher the ego... . Christ has the particular characteristic of being at once both measure and goal.

Kierkegaard is an inventive author and Fabro knows how to take from him the most profound insights without stopping at a simply aesthetic or

ethical reading of his writings; instead, Fabro succeeds in gathering the existential and metaphysical roots of his thought.

For further study on this topic, we can point to the numerous articles that Fabro has written on Kierkegaard, in addition to the lengthy and interesting introductions to his volumes of Kierkegaard that he translated into Italian.

Let us return to where we started, that is, from Fabro's own presentation of his research itinerary. Fabro concludes his presentation by summarizing the points of the journey he has taken.

The three moments, we recall, are:

- 1) the overcoming of essentialistic scholasticism with the metaphysics of participation
- 2) the resolution of modern immanence in atheism
- 3) the vindication of the Kierkegaardian existence of the *single individual* and the *choice* of the Absolute

4. HIS YEARS OF TEACHING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PERUGIA IN ITALY

We ought to make one final reference to his years of teaching at the University of Perugia in Italy. Fabro recounts that when he began his courses at Perugia in 1965, there were two problems he wanted to solve:

- 1) the relationship between experience and knowledge
- 2) the relationship between the intellect and the will²⁴

This second problem, the intellect-will relationship, became the predominant one, thanks to his study of modern thought and his commitment to the study and translation of Kierkegaard. Fabro dedicated the courses he gave at Perugia from 1965 to 1980 almost exclusively to this question, drawing ever nearer to the essence of the problem.

For Fabro, freedom is the existential constituent of the person: "just as nature provides for the body's fundamental development which leads us to birth and growth, so each person must provide for the development of his consciousness by means of his own freedom."²⁵

I would like to conclude with a few of Fabro's aphorisms, taken from his courses on freedom. In his classes it is possible to grasp not only his profound theoretical clarity but also his genuine existential character:

We are born from a possibility, and we become by means of freedom.
(no. 524)

It is as if each one of us, taking the finger of freedom, painted our own

faces with the brush of this freedom, with the colors of this brush. It is something tragic and infinitely beatifying. (no. 525)

Freedom is the universal language of the human spirit, that language which speaks from the depths of its silence in its radical request: freedom is that which most unites us, and the exercise of freedom is that which most distinguishes us and sets us apart. (no. 540)

The will is the faculty of faculties, which moves all our spirit and is not moved except by God; it even moves the intellect, even the imagination, but it is moved only by itself and by God. It is therefore the will which opens the window of time on the horizon of eternity; it is freedom which establishes, which configures, which is the structure of our interior, of our ego, of our life. (no. 414)

The will does not have its own communication and it cannot be communicated; it is so high, so original, so constitutive of our ego that if we could communicate the will and freedom we would communicate the ego itself; it would be completely transferred in the other. The entirety of freedom for us and for God is to make the radical choice: of the finite or of the infinite. (no. 429)²⁶

To conclude this brief exposition, a word of gratitude is extended to the patient reader and their attention given to this work, as well as to all of those who have aided in its translation from Italian to English.²⁷

¹ “Journey through the Destiny of Being” was the title that Fabro had wanted to give to the notes that he was writing about his intellectual itinerary. Cf. “Presentazione,” in Cornelio Fabro, *Appunti di un itinerario. Versione integrate delle tre stesure con parti inedite*, ed. Rosa Goglia and Elvio Fontana (Segni: EDIVI, 2011), 9n4.

² For this presentation, I made extensive use of the the 2011 EDIVI edition of Fabro’s book *Appunti di un itinerario*, which contains the complete versions of his three drafts with previously unpublished sections. These sections contain Fabro’s reflections on his intellectual itinerary. The translations of these texts from Italian to English is ours.

³ *Essere e Libertà. Studi in onore di Cornelio Fabro* (Rimini: Maggioli Editore, 1984).

⁴ Cf. Fabro, *Appunti*, 28, 108, 127.

⁵ The original title of his thesis in Latin was: “Principii causalitatis. Necessitas objectiva. Ostenditur et defenditur secundum philosophiam scholasticam ab impugnationibus Humii.” The title of his work for the competition was: “Il principio di causalità. Origine psicologica, formulazione filosofica, valore necessario ed universale.”

⁶ Fabro, *Appunti*, 30 f.

⁷ Fabro, *Appunti*, 31.

⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 40.

⁹ C. Fabro, *La nozione metafisica dipartecipazione secondo Tommaso d’Aquino*, 1st ed. (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1939), 2nd ed. (Turin: SEI, 1950), 3rd ed. (Turin: SEI, 1963), 4A ed. repr. in *Opere Complete*

3 (Segni: EDIVI, 2005).

¹⁰ F. Van Steenberghen, *Siger de Brabant d'après ses œuvres inédites*, vol. 2, Les Philosophes Belges, vol. 13 (Louvain: Institut supérieur de philosophie, 1942), 481–482. Cf. Fabro, *Appunti*, 43.

¹¹ C. Fabro, *Partecipazione e causalità*, 1st ed. (Turin: SEI, 1960), 2nd ed. repr. in *Opere Complete* 19 (Segni: EDIVI, 2010).

¹² C. Fabro, “The Intensive Hermeneutics of Thomistic Philosophy: The Notion of Participation,” trans. B. M. Bonansea, *Review of Metaphysics* 27, no. 3 (March 1974): 449–491, repr. in *Selected Articles on Metaphysics and Participation*, Selected Works of Cornelio Fabro, vol. 1 (Chillum, MD: IVE Press, 2016), 65–103.

¹³ Fabro, *Partecipazione e causalità* (Segni: EDIVI, 2010), 9. The translation from Italian to English is ours.

¹⁴ ST I-II, q. 94, a. 2: “illud quod primo cadit in apprehensione, est ens.”

¹⁵ Cf. Fabro, *Appunti*, 67–71.

¹⁶ For this second point of Fabro’s intellectual itinerary, we consider, in addition to the above cited *Appunti di un itinerario*, some other key points from *Introduzione all’ateismo moderno*.

¹⁷ Cf. C. Fabro, *Introduzione all’ateismo moderno*, *Opere Complete* 21 (Segni: EDIVI, 2013), 58, 1035.

¹⁸ Cf. Fabro, *Introduzione all’ateismo moderno*, 995–996.

¹⁹ Fabro, *Appunti*, 176.

²⁰ C. Fabro, *God in Exile*, trans. and ed. Arthur Gibson (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1968). The English translation was made from the first edition of *Introduzione all’ateismo moderno* (1964), and is therefore missing some topics that were added to the 1969 second edition.

²¹ Cf. Fabro, *Appunti*, 181.

²² Fabro, *Appunti*, 181.

²³ Cf. *ibid.*, 183–185.

²⁴ Cf. Fabro, *Appunti*, 98–99.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 103.

²⁶ C. Fabro, *Libro dell’esistenza e della libertà vagabonda*, ed. Rosa Goglia, Giuseppe Mario Pizzuti, and Emanuele Morandi (Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 2000). The translation from Italian to English is ours.

²⁷ In a particular way, I want to thank Sr. Czarna Madonna, SSVM, Fr. Theodore Trinko, IVE, and Fr. Nathaniel Dreyer, IVE, for translating different parts of the text. I also thank Fr. Brian Dinkel, IVE, for his precious help in making the final revision of this translation.

You've Just Finished your Free Sample

Enjoyed the preview?

Buy: <http://www.ebooks2go.com>