

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

An Hexaëmeral Reading of Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Theology and Religious Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Daniel Wade McClain

Washington, D.C.

2016

An Hexaëmeral Reading of Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*

Daniel Wade McClain, Ph.D.

Director: Joshua Benson, Ph.D.

This dissertation examines the structure of Bonaventure's *Breviloquium*, a brief synthesis of theology produced in 1257 at the end of his tenure as Master at the University of Paris.¹ Previous studies of this text have complicated its structure by emphasizing a distinction in genre between the prologue and the "body," and by reading the "body" either in terms of the Platonic scheme of procession and return, or in terms of origin, procession, and return, which is a scheme supplied by Bonaventure himself.² While attending to Bonaventure's unique theology of the Trinity and Christ as

¹ Cf. Jacques-Guy Bougerol, *Introduction à Saint Bonaventure* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1988), 197; Marianne Schlosser, "Bonaventure: Life and Works," in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. Jay M. Hammond, Wayne Hellmann, and Jared Goff (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 24–26.

² Pedro Bordoy-Torrents, "Técnicas divergentes en la redacción del Breviloquio de San Bonaventura," *Cientia Tomista* (1940): 442–51; Paula Jean Miller, F.S.E, *Marriage: the Sacrament of Divine-Human Communion* (Quincy, IL: Franciscan Press, 1995); Dominic Monti, O.F.M., "Introduction," in *Breviloquium* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2005), xlvi–xlix; and Joshua C. Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, 247–287.

medium, these studies have overlooked significant resources in Bonaventure's use of the six days of creation and the seventh day of rest which can help further illumine the structure of the *Breviloquium*. Indeed, from the resources that are available today, it appears that Bonaventure drew material and inspiration from commentaries on Genesis 1–2:4a, and synthesized them with his own distinctive theological program. This at least seems to be the case from the evidence in the critical edition of Bonaventure's works and from a comparison of the structure and content of the *Breviloquium* and those commentaries. This synthesis, as this dissertation argues, becomes particularly important in the relationship that Bonaventure draws between God's operations in creation, restoration, and perfection and the division of the Hexaëmeron into creation, distinction, and adornment, formulated at least by Bede the Venerable and transmitted by theologians like Hugh of St. Victor. This study argues that this relationship helps to clarify the structure of the text and, moreover, offers to resolve the problem of the prologue's relation to the body by appeal to the structure of the Hexaëmeron, as Bonaventure understands it.

This dissertation by Daniel Wade McClain fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in Systematic and Historical Theology approved by Joshua Benson, Ph.D., as Director, and by Mark Clark, Ph.D., and Robert Trent Pomplun, Ph.D. as Readers.

Joshua Benson, Ph.D, Director

Mark Clark, Ph.D., Reader

Robert Trent Pomplun, Ph.D., Reader

To Kate

with all my heart

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Reception of the <i>Breviloquium</i>	5
Analysis of the Structure of the <i>Breviloquium</i>	11
Creation and Re-Creation in the Theology of the <i>Breviloquium</i>	25
The Procedure of This Dissertation.....	31
CHAPTER TWO: BONAVENTURE’S PROLOGUE IN LIGHT OF HEXAËMERAL LITERATURE	34
Bonaventure’s Prologue.....	38
Commentaries on Genesis 1–2:4a	47
Philo and the <i>De opificio mundi</i>	50
Origen and the <i>De principiis</i> and <i>In Genesim homiliae</i>	56
Basil of Caesarea and the <i>Homilies on the Hexaëmeron</i>	60
Ambrose and the <i>Exaëmeron</i>	65
Augustine and <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i>	68
Bede and <i>In principium Genesis</i>	77
Hugh of St. Victor and the <i>De sacramentis</i> and <i>De tribus diebus</i>	84
Peter Lombard and the <i>Sentences</i>	93
Robert Grosseteste and the <i>Hexaëmeron</i>	95
Alexander of Hales and the <i>Summa Fratris Alexandri</i>	98
Bonaventure’s Reception of the Hexaëmeral Genre.....	100
CHAPTER THREE: HEXAËMERAL ORDER IN <i>BREVILOQUIUM</i> II.1–2.....	109
<i>Brev.</i> II.1–2: Exposition	112
The Procedure and Structure of Part Two	113
<i>Brev.</i> II.1—Divine Perfection and Created Order	114
<i>Brev.</i> II.2—The Hexaëmeron, Seminal Reasons, and Divine Perfections	124
Divine Perfections in the thought of Hugh of St. Victor and <i>Brev.</i> II.2.....	127
Hexaëmeral Operations: Creation, Distinction, Adornment	130
The Theological Relevance of the Hexaëmeron	134
Conclusion	138
CHAPTER FOUR: THE HEXAËMERAL STRUCTURE OF THE <i>BREVILOQUIUM</i>	143
The Work of Distinction: Part One—the Trinity	149
The Work of Distinction: Part Two—Creation	153

Creation prefigures restoration: <i>Brev.</i> II.5 & 12.....	156
Adornment is Prefigured in Distinction	162
The Work of Distinction: Part Three—Sin	168
The Work of Adornment: Part Four—the Incarnation.....	174
The Work of Adornment: Part Five—Grace	190
The Work of Adornment: Part Six—Sacraments	201
The Work of Perfection: Part Seven—The Last Judgment.....	207
Conclusion	216
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION.....	219
Summary of the Argument	219
Objections to the Thesis	226
Problems in the Interpretation of the <i>Breviloquium</i>	233
Bonaventure’s Synthesis	238
BIBLIOGRAPHY	246

PREFACE

My argument in this dissertation is that the *Breviloquium*, a text which is ostensibly written for the sake of theological formation, and which was written at height of Bonaventure's career as a Master at the University of Paris and in the same year that he became minister general of the Friars minor (1257), imitates, or takes as its structure a particular rendition of the structure of the Hexaëmeron, the six days of creation and seventh day of rest in Genesis 1–2:4a. This argument can make an important contribution to the study of not only the *Breviloquium* but also Bonaventure's theology insofar as it attempts to locate the Seraphic Doctor within a tradition of Scriptural commentary, frame his theological synthesis in light of that tradition, and shed further light on what many take to be an esoteric and enigmatic aspect of his thought, namely his penchant for structure and number.

Setting the context for Bonaventure's use of the Hexaëmeron and hexaëmeral commentaries in structure of the *Breviloquium*, chapter one examines the text in light of Bonaventure's life and other texts, and the various studies of the *Breviloquium*, and sets out the general contours of this tightly structured and argued text, as well as Bonaventure's aims in writing it. While recent studies read the *Breviloquium's* structure in terms of the procession from and return to God, chapter one proposes that Bonaventure's language of creation and re-creation, or restoration, suggests a different

orientation that allows him to concentrate on God's operations of creation, redemption, and perfection.

Chapter two looks at Bonaventure's use of the Hexaëmeron as a paradigm for understanding the length of Scripture, history, and the microcosm of the human person (*Brev. prol. 2*), and contextualizes this usage with the genre of hexaëmeral commentary, from Philo of Alexandria to Alexander of Hales. Among the treatises in this genre, Bonaventure relies heavily on Augustine's *De genesi ad litteram*, Bede the Venerable's *In principium Genesis*, and Hugh of St Victor's *De sacramentis Christianæ fidei* and *De tribus diebus*. He also utilizes Peter Lombard's *Sententiarum libri quattuor*, the *Summa Fratris Alexandri*, and Robert Grosseteste's *Hexaëmeron* to name just a few more sources certainly in his repertoire. These texts provide Bonaventure with most of the building blocks for his understanding of creation. They also convey a tension between reading the six days of creation simultaneously or temporally.¹

Chapter three shows that Bonaventure attempts to reconcile these tensions with his use of the Hugonian division of creation-distinction-adornment (*Brev. 2.1–5*). He employs Hugh's description of God's threefold perfections of power, wisdom, and

¹ It is also likely that Bonaventure employed Peter Comestor's *Historia Genesis*. A final critical edition of this text is being prepared. On Bonaventure's library, cf. Marianne Schlosser, "Bonaventure: Life and Works," 12.

goodness, but modifies this description to emphasize God's benevolence, by which God creates, restores, and perfects his creation.²

Chapter four argues for the importance of creation, distinction and adornment for understanding the hexaëmeral structure of the *Breviloquium* by setting this triad in light of his the further use of the triad of God as *principium effectivum, reffectivum, and perfectivum* (*Brev.* 1.1). Indeed, this triad of God's operations helps us to understand the full sense of the hexaëmeral structure, for it is the key to linking restoration (*Brev.* 4) and the operation of adornment (which begins on the fourth day). Moreover, this link provides a way to include earlier models of perfection under Hugh's triad.³

Chapter five then presents this distinct combination of hexaëmeral themes in the *Breviloquium* as serving Bonaventure's larger projects, including presenting theology as

² Hugh of St. Victor, *De tribus diebus*, 27.4, ed. Dominique Poirel, *Corpus Christianorum Continuato Medievalis* 177 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002). English translation from Hugh of St. Victor, "On the Three Days," in *Trinity and Creation*, ed. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter (New York: New City Press, 2011), 61–102. On Hugh's use of power, wisdom, and goodness, cf. the explanation in Dominique Poirel, *Livre de la nature et débat trinitaire au XIIe siècle, Le De tribus de Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 368–82; Matthias Perkams, "The Origins of the Trinitarian Attributes: potentia, sapientia, benignitas," *Archivum Verbi* 1 (2004): 25–41; Coolman, *The Theology of Hugh of St. Victor: an Interpretation*, 86–87, and Boyd Taylor Coolman, "General Introduction," in *Trinity and Creation*, ed. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 56–58.

³ Cf. Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis Christianae fidei* 1.1 on the triad of creation-distinction-adornment.

an affective science and Christ as the *medium* of creation. This dissertation concludes by proposing that this hexaëmeral reading allows one to solve the problem, inherent in earlier studies of the text, of the relationship of the prologue to the body of the text. Further, it allows us to see how the *Breviloquium* anticipates the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*'s use of similar themes under the banner of the six days of creation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of writing a dissertation can be an alienating one, and I experienced my fair share of loneliness, doubt, setbacks, and frustrations. I am happy to acknowledge, however, that the joys of community, fraternity, and solidarity abundantly outweighed the woes.

I'd like to first acknowledge the depth of influence and impact made by Dr. Joshua Benson, my director, who has helped to cultivate my love for Bonaventure's complex and rewarding theological style. Under Dr. Benson's tutelage, I came to recognize, appreciate, and feel at home amongst the many and subtle connections that run throughout Bonaventure's prose, especially in the *Breviloquium*. Likewise, Dr. Robert Trent Pomplun, has been a trusted mentor and an essential voice in my academic formation since I taught my first adjunct course at Loyola University Maryland in 2008. More recently, Trent stepped in at a crucial moment in the writing of this project, galvanizing the project with his wisdom and time—which also happened to be the beginning of his sabbatical. I am also grateful for Dr. Mark Clark's thoughtful and penetrating questions. My scholarship will undoubtedly be stronger and more precise because of his input. I would also like to recognize the positive contributions made by Fr. Regis Armstrong, O.F.M. Cap., in the early stages of my research.

I would have never contemplated a dissertation on Bonaventure without the suggestion of Dr. Chad Pecknold. Chad, moreover, has been a tireless advocate and mentor to me. Dr. Frederick Bauerschmidt (Loyola University Maryland) and Dr. Kevin Hughes (Villanova University) both read drafts of this dissertation and offered invaluable feedback. I indebted to them for their insightful comments and conversation. It is also deeply gratifying to know that in bringing together scholars like Fritz, Kevin, and Trent, I am participating in a small way in healing the divide between Thomist and Franciscan theology. I am also thankful for the friendship of Dr. John O'Keefe at Creighton University and Dr. Anthony Baker. Each offered constant encouragement, often at particularly difficult stages along the way.

Since 2012, I have been full-time at Loyola University Maryland, where I have been blessed by the scholarly support and friendship of outstanding colleagues like Joshua Brown, James Buckley, Daniel Castillo, Angela Christman, John Conley, S.J., Lesley DiFransico, Rebekah Eklund, Stephen Fowl, John Kiess, Claire Mathews McGinnis, Matthew Moser, Joseph Rossi, S.J., and Arthur Sutherland. These fine folks welcomed me into what I now consider to be my academic home. Each of them has offered generously of their time and resources, particularly Steve Fowl, Matt Moser, and Angela Christman. Thanks also to Dale and Jim Snow for reading and editing chapters.

Many thanks also go to my students at Loyola, especially those that were courageous enough to enroll in my Theology of Aquinas and Bonaventure seminar in the Spring of 2015. Of course, I had no other choice but to assign the *Breviloquium* as one of two required texts. I've also been blessed by the presence of many quick-witted, lively, and generous MTS students at Loyola including David Russell, Philip Porter, and Justin Hagerman, and many others.

Many friends supported me in my research and writing. Very special thanks go to Drs. Gregory Voiles, Brendan Sammon, Joshua Brockway, and Brooks Barber who were comrades in arms at CUA, fellow attendees at many conferences, and, above all, faithful companions at local coffee shops. And in Greg's case, a housemate and childminder. I'd also like to recognize the special contribution that Drs. Matthew Moser and Matthew Tapie have made in the last couple of years. Not only is Dr. Moser a colleague at Loyola; he has also become a kindred spirit. I was very fortunate to work with Dr. Tapie as a co-editor on our volume, *Reading Scripture as a Political Act*. Matt's tireless work in all stages of production became a model work ethic for me.

Many other people have come into my life during the time I have worked on this dissertation and offered support, friendship, and help. Although I may not have named them here, and in many cases may have been assisted by them unaware, I offer them my thanks. Whatever is noteworthy about this project is surely as a result of the

guidance, good will, wisdom, and exemplary testimonies that I have received from so many people. The errors are of course my own.

I also wish to thank my family. My parents, Tom and Sheryl McClain, and my sister, Karen, and my grandparents, although mystified by all the fuss over this obscure, medieval theologian, have never doubted my calling or my passion. Sandra Glahn, a distant Texas relative, offered not only excellent editorial support, but also very good advice. My four sons – Henry, Jude, Felix, and Ezra—have always been a source of inspiration, and I am amazed by their patience with a project that is older than some of them. They, no doubt, will be thrilled that I can finally build that tree house.

Above all, my wife, Kate, has been an incredible advocate and companion. I can never repay the gift of her friendship and support. I can only hope that, in some small way, these pages will honor the many sacrifices she has made on my behalf.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

St. Bonaventure (c. 1217-1274) was born Giovanni di Fidanza to a merchant class family in Bagnorea, a *comune* in the Papal States, in the province of Viterbo.¹ In 1235, Bonaventure began his studies at the University of Paris.² In 1244, he entered the

¹ J. Guy Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José de Vinck (Patterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1964), 3f and 171. Much has been done to revise Bougerol's comprehensive chronology. Cf. John Francis Quinn, "Chronology of St. Bonaventure (1217-1257)," *Franciscan Studies* 32 (1972): 168–86, and Jay M. Hammond, "Dating Bonaventure's Inception as Regent Master," *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 179–226, esp. 199. Quinn favors a birth date of 1217, siding Giuseppe Abate, "Per la storia e la cronologia di S. Bonaventura, O. Min. (c. 1217-1274)," *Miscellanea Francescana* 50 (1950): 97–111. Abate argued that Bonaventure must have been born before 1221 in order to have incepted in 1254, thereby conforming to a statute passed in 1215 that masters must be at least 35. Hammond cites three sources as evidence of a 1221 birth: the *Chronica XXIV Generalium* and two independent testimonies, both written in 1304—the *Catalogus Generalium Ministrorum* and the *Catalogus XIV vel XV Generalium*—all three of which, Hammond argues, favor a 1221 birth date given his death at 53 in 1274. Most recently, Marianne Schlosser maintains the 1217 date on the grounds that Bonaventure should have been 40 when assuming the minister generalship of the Order. Marianne Schlosser, "Bonaventure: Life and Works," trans. Angelica Kliem, in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. Jay M. Hammond, Wayne Hellmann, and Jared Goff (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 9.

² Bougerol believes that Bonaventure does not arrive until 1236, while Quinn and Hammond agree on 1235. Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 5 and 172; Quinn, "Chronology of St. Bonaventure (1217-1257)," 186; Hammond, "Dating Bonaventure's Inception as Regent Master," 197–98.

Franciscan order.³ Roughly ten years later, Bonaventure, having written a commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*,⁴ completed his studies and incepted as a Master in the faculty of Theology.⁵ In 1254–1257, the years of his regency, Bonaventure produced the

³ Bougerol favors 1243; Quinn and Hammond date Bonaventure's novitiate as 1243, and profession and official entry into the Order in 1244. Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 172; Quinn, "Chronology of St. Bonaventure (1217-1257)," 178; Hammond, "Dating Bonaventure's Inception as Regent Master," 197–98.

⁴ All references to Bonaventure's writing, unless noted otherwise, are to volume and page number in the Quaracchi edition, *Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia* (Ad Claras Aquas: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1882-1902). Bonaventure's *Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum* can be located in the first four volumes.

⁵ In 1964, Bougerol proposed that Bonaventure incepted as Master *aulatus* in 1253, receiving his license to teach, and then teaching in the School of the Friars minor, but was formally recognized as a Master *cathedratus* only in 1257. Quinn, however, sees no evidence that the secular masters blocked Bonaventure from inclusion in the University as they had the Dominicans. Thus, Quinn, like Hammond, favors a 1254 date of inception. Bougerol revised his position in 1988, conforming to Quinn's position. Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 6 and 172; Quinn, "Chronology of St. Bonaventure (1217-1257)," 184; Jacques Guy Bougerol, O.F.M., *Introduction à Saint Bonaventure* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1988), 5; Hammond, "Dating Bonaventure's Inception as Regent Master," 217.

works typical of a medieval master of theology,⁶ including the *Breviloquium*,⁷ and what we know as the *Reduction of the Arts to Theology*, his inaugural sermon preached in 1254.⁸

On February 2, 1257, John of Parma, the Minister General of the Franciscan order, appointed Bonaventure as his successor.⁹ For the next eighteen years, Bonaventure

⁶ *Quaestiones disputatae de scientia Christi* (*Opera omnia* V, 3–43), hereafter *De scientia Christi*; *de mysterio Trinitatis* (V, 45–115), hereafter *De mysterio Trinitatis*; and *de perfectione evangelica* (V, 117–198), hereafter *De perfectio evangelica*. For English translations of the disputed questions, Bonaventure, *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1979); Bonaventure, *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1992); Bonaventure, *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection*, trans. Robert J. Karris (Saint Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2008). Cf. Schlosser, “Bonaventure: Life and Works,” 20–23.

⁷ *Breviloquium* (V, 201–291), hereafter *Brev.* English translation, unless otherwise noted, is from Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, trans. Dominic Monti, O.F.M. (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2005).

⁸ Cf. Joshua Benson, “Bonaventure’s Inaugural Sermon at Paris: *Omnium artifex docuit me sapientia*, Introduction and Text,” *Collectanea franciscana* 82 (2012): 517–562, otherwise known as *Opusculum de reductione artium ad theologiam* (V, 319–325), hereafter *Reduction*. For English translation, Bonaventure, *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*, trans. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M., *Works of St. Bonaventure* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1996). On the date and circumstances of the *Reduction*, cf. Joshua C. Benson, “Identifying the Literary Genre of the *De reductione artium ad theologiam*: Bonaventure’s Inaugural Lecture at Paris,” *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 149–178.

⁹ Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 172; Quinn, “Chronology of St. Bonaventure (1217–1257),” 168–69; Hammond, “Dating Bonaventure’s Inception as Regent Master,” 182ff.

presided over the order and wrote the authoritative life of St. Francis of Assisi,¹⁰ numerous spiritual and mystical treatises, and three *collationes*, including the unfinished *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*.¹¹ In 1273, Bonaventure was made Cardinal and Bishop of Albano by Pope Gregory X. In 1274, he died at the Second Council of Lyon, having prepared materials at the Pope's request for a dialogue with Constantinopolitan representatives and having preached at a Mass celebrated by representatives of the Eastern and Western churches.

Bonaventure wrote the *Breviloquium* in 1257, the same year that he concluded his three years as master and became Minister General.¹² Written after the three disputed

¹⁰ *Legenda maior sancti Francisci* (*Opera omnia* VIII, 504–565). For English translation, *Francis of Assisi: The Early Documents, vol. 2: The Founder*, ed. Regis Armstrong, O.F.M. Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M., William J. Short, O.F.M. (New York: New City Press, 2000).

¹¹ The *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*, hereafter *Hex.*, exists only as a *reportatio*, and in two different editions: Marie Ferdinand Delorme, *Collationes in hexaëmeron et Bonaventuriana quaedam selecta ad fidem codd. mss.* (Ad Claras Aquas: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1934); and *Collationes in hexaëmeron sive Illuminationes ecclesiae* (*Opera omnia* V, 327–449). For English translation, Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, trans. Jose de Vinck (Patterson, NJ: St. Anthony's Guild, 1970).

¹² Jacques-Guy Bougerol dates the *Breviloquium* "with certainty around the year 1257" (Bougerol, *Introduction à Saint Bonaventure*, 197). Bougerol and Dominic Monti both rely on the Troyes manuscript, one of the earliest extant copies of the text, for this date, which argues, "*Explicit breuiloquium boneuenture de ordine fratrum minorum ad intelligenciam sacre scripture et fidei christiane. Anno domini, Mo. CCo. Lo. VII*" (Ms. Troyes 1891 [Clairveux K. 46], fol. 286r-33r). Cf. Dominic Monti, O.F.M., "Introduction," in *Breviloquium* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2005), xiv n.6. For

questions (c. 1254–56), but before the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* (c. 1259)¹³ and the *Legenda maior* (c. 1261),¹⁴ the *Breviloquium* occupies what Emmanuel Falque calls a “liminal space” in Bonaventure’s corpus.¹⁵ Whereas the three *quaestiones disputatae* follow the procedures peculiar to their genre, the *Breviloquium* proceeds deductively, demonstrating various theological conclusions by means of “necessary reasons.”¹⁶

Reception of the *Breviloquium*

Composed to help young theologians to find a “more lucid” (*clarius*) path through the “forest” of Scripture, the *Breviloquium* proved to be a popular text in the Middle Ages. Jean Gerson, chancellor of Paris from 1395–1429), declared that “nothing

a comparable assessment, cf. Balduinus Distelbrink, *Bonaventurae scripta: authentica dubia vel spuria critice recensita* (Roma: Istituto Storico Cappuccini, 1975), 3–4. Cf. also Jacques Guy Bougerol, O.F.M., *Manuscripts franciscains de la Bibliothèque de Troyes* (Ad Claras Aquas, Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1982), 262.

¹³ *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* (*Opera omnia* V, 296–313), hereafter *Itin.* For English translation, Bonaventure, *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum*, trans. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2002).

¹⁴ Timothy J. Johnson, “Bonaventure's *Legenda Maior*,” in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, 456.

¹⁵ Emmanuel Falque, *Saint Bonaventure et l'entrée de Dieu en théologie* (Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 2000), 25.

¹⁶ Monti, “Introduction,” xxiii–xxiv.

at all surpasses" the *Breviloquium* and the *Itinerarium*.¹⁷ Yet, there is also a sense that the *Breviloquium* has been subject to scholarly neglect, though the source of this neglect is in dispute. The Quaracchi editors claim that the preoccupation with *Sententiae* led to the meager attention given to the *Breviloquium*, implying perhaps that the *Breviloquium* has been treated as merely summary of or introduction to the exhaustive scholarly analysis of the *Sentences* commentary.¹⁸ Dominic Monti, on the other hand, judges that the *Breviloquium* has been overshadowed by many of Bonaventure's other works, especially the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*.¹⁹ Joshua Benson is of the opinion that the *Breviloquium*

¹⁷ Jean Gerson, *De libris legendis a monacho*, 5-6, *Opera J. Gerson* (Strasbourg, 1515), fol. XIX, G; cited in Monti, *Breviloquium*, xiii. Cf. also Gerson's *Tractatus de examinatione doctrinarum*, 1, cited by the Quaracchi editors in Bonaventure, *Opera Omnia* V, xv: "*Sicut apud grammaticos Donatus de partibus orationis, et apud logicos Summulae Petri Hispani traduntur ab initio novis discipulis Breviloquium Bonaventurae, quod incipit: Flecto genua mea, videretur salubriter imponendum, iuncto Itinerario suo mentis in Deum, quo incipit: In principio primum principium. Itaque laus omnis inferior est his duobus opusculis, quorum vim agnoscere etiam sola credulitate non parvus est profectus.*"

¹⁸ *Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, xv: "*Per sex saecula ita divulgata est fama et laus huius opusculi, mole quidem exigui, sed sententiarum gravitate ingentis.*" Unfortunately, the editors do not specify sources of the *Breviloquium*'s "*fama et laus*" aside from quoting Gerson. Most modern treatments of the *Breviloquium* (e.g. Scheeben, Bougerol, Falque, Miller) include the same quote by Gerson.

¹⁹ Monti, "Introduction," xiv: "The *Breviloquium* has remained comparatively neglected." There are 227 extant manuscripts of the *Breviloquium*, compared with 138 manuscripts of the far better known *Itinerarium*. In 1882, the Quaracchi editors counted 23 mss. catalogued in the Vatican, and another 204 throughout Europe.

often plays a supporting and bridging role in the Bonaventuran corpus, stating that the text “has often functioned as a point on the way between the long but early commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (1250-1252) and the late but unfinished *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* (1273).”²⁰

Those scholars who have studied the *Breviloquium* often compare it to the *Summae* or the *Compendiae* of Bonaventure's contemporaries.²¹ Although the Quaracchi editors classify the *Breviloquium* as an *opusculum*, not a *summa* or *compendium*, Matthias Scheeben had previously identified it as a *summa*, even a theological “jewelry box.”²² Similarly, Ephrem Bettoni argued that the *Breviloquium* demonstrates “a concrete application of the Bonaventurian method. It is a brief *summa* of dogmatic theology that

²⁰ Joshua C. Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, 249.

²¹ Cf., for instance, Paula Jean Miller, *Marriage: the Sacrament of Divine-Human Communion*, 8–9; Ian Christopher Levy, “The Study of Theology in the Middle Ages,” in *The Routledge History of Medieval Christianity: 1050–1500*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 71. Miller qualifies her conclusion, however, explaining that the *Breviloquium* is not simply a “abbreviated *summa*,” but is written in “a literary genre original to the Middle Ages” (28).

²² Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*, 2 ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1948), I.549: “Es is ein wahres Juwelenkästlein, welches, mit jedem worte eine grosse Frage lösend.” Scheeben notes the deductive method of beginning with the First Principle, praising it as a systematic move on Bonaventure's part. He cites this methodology in his decision to treat the *Breviloquium* as a *summa*.

is divided into seven parts.”²³ Emanuel Falque agrees, likening it to Aquinas’ *Summa Theologiae* in content, language, and audience.²⁴ Marianne Schlosser echoes this interpretation, saying, “[The *Breviloquium*] constitutes a small ‘*summa*’ of theology. . . .”²⁵

Jacques-Guy Bougerol resists the *summa* designation; distinguishing the synthetic nature of the *Breviloquium* from both *summae* and the *quaestiones disputatae*, he associates what he considers to be the “loosely knit doctrinal system” of Bonaventure’s *Commentary on the Sentences* in connection with the *quaestio*, in contrast to the “precise style” of the *Breviloquium*.²⁶ In his opinion, what distinguishes the *Breviloquium* from Bonaventure’s own commentary on the *Sentences*, is not so much its content, as it is its novel presentation and structure: “The structure of the chapters of the *Breviloquium* appears clearly from this example [of the intelligible circle in the prologue].”²⁷

²³ Ephrem Bettoni, *S. Bonaventura* (Brescia, Italy: La Scuola, 1945).

²⁴ Falque, *Saint Bonaventure et l’entree de Dieu en theologie*, 33–45: “. . . de cette somme bonaventurienne de théologie. . . .”

²⁵ Schlosser, “Bonaventure: Life and Works,” 24. Likewise, see Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 248-49: “. . . his short *summa* of theology, the *Breviloquium*.”

²⁶ Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 108.

²⁷ Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 112. Just before this passage, Bougerol explains that the content of the *Breviloquium* is nearly identical to that of the *Sentence* commentary. “Bonaventure repeats the thoughts elaborated in the preamble to

Alexander Gerken emphatically declares the *sui generis* character of the *Breviloquium*: "It is no *Summa*."²⁸ The *Breviloquium*, Gerken argues, is plainly distinct in form and scope from the commentaries, disputed questions, as well as the *compendiae*. "One might call it a compendium, but a compendium of a special sort, of Bonaventurian stamp. It is precisely not an abbreviated *Summa*. It is not a complete presentation of the material in stenographic notes. Its purpose is the bringing together of every branch of theological knowledge at its center. Or better: having each branch of theological knowledge linked to the basic origin."²⁹

Dominic Monti includes the *Breviloquium* among the great *summae* of the thirteenth century, comparing it to the *Summa fratris Alexandri* and Aquinas' *Summa*

the *Commentaries*. The formulas illuminate each other; the fundamental position is the same."

²⁸ Alexander Gerken, O.F.M., "Identität und Freiheit: Ansatz und Methode im Denken des heiligen Bonaventura," *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 37 (1974): 101; translated by Myles Parsons, "Identity and Freedom: Bonaventure's Position and Method," *Greyfriars Review* 4.3 (1974): 93. Gerken continues, "It is no *Commentary on the Book of Sentences*. Nor is it a *Quaestio disputata*. In the *Summa* or the *Commentary on the Book of Sentences* of the Middle Ages, the whole order of theological and philosophical knowledge was developed. By contrast, the *Quaestio disputata* confined itself to a single question and discussed it from a variety of viewpoints. The *Breviloquium* is none of these. It is a presentation of all of theology in a brief form."

²⁹ Gerken, "Identity and Freedom: Bonaventure's Position and Method," 93.

Theologiae.³⁰ Monti, distinguishes the *summa* genre from others, however, agreeing with Bougerol that the *Breviloquium* is a “logical synthesis,” bearing Bonaventure’s distinct signature.³¹ In Monti’s opinion, the *Breviloquium*’s efficiency and method distinguishes it from other *summae*: whereas Aquinas continued to employ the “dialectical” and “inductive” methods of the *quaestio*, Bonaventure’s method in the *Breviloquium* relies solely on “necessary reasons” in order to demonstrate “Christian belief.”³² Monti describes this method as “totally deductive, appealing to no outside evidence whatsoever. He begins from an implicit premise: that one First Principle is the cause of all things. . . . This premise leads by necessity through a chain of corollaries to his conclusion. . . .”³³

Joshua Benson avoids identifying the genre of the *Breviloquium*, but also implies a distinction between “synthesis” and the *quaestio* methodology. Whereas many previous commentators applied the term synthesis to a variety of Bonaventure’s text, including the *Sentences* commentary, Benson concludes that the *Breviloquium* is “Bonaventure’s

³⁰ Monti, “Introduction,” xx.

³¹ Others who have described the *Breviloquium* as a Bonaventurian synthesis include Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale* (Paris: Aubier, 1961), vol. 1.2, 425; and Falque, *Saint Bonaventure et l’entrée de Dieu en théologie*, 27.

³² Monti, “Introduction,” xxvi and xxix.

³³ Monti, “Introduction,” xxvi.

only synthesis of theology, the harvest of his seasons as a student and Master at Paris, the well from which he would draw in his later works. . . ."³⁴

Analysis of the Structure of the *Breviloquium*

Scholars have also disagreed in their interpretations of the *Breviloquium*'s structure, particularly on the question of the nature of the relation of the prologue to the seven parts that follow.³⁵ In 1940, Pedro Bordoy-Torrents argued that their fundamental difference in style and methodology indicated that what was thought to be a single text is in fact two texts exhibiting two different disciplinary approaches: Scriptural exegesis and systematic theology.³⁶ According to Bordoy-Torrents, Bonaventure wrote the prologue as an inception sermon commending Scripture, later editing it and adding it to the separately-composed, seven-part, dogmatically-focused body. A decade later, Marie-Dominique Chenu offered a similar solution, dividing the prologue and body according to purpose, genre, and method, distinguishing between the "exposition and

³⁴ Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 249. He states earlier that the *Breviloquium* is "a powerful, synthetic presentation of his theological vision at the culmination of his academic career at Paris" (247).

³⁵ The *Breviloquium* is divided into a prologue and seven parts that address the Trinity, creation, sin, Christ, grace, the sacraments, and the Last Judgment respectively.

³⁶ Pedro Bordoy-Torrents, "Técnicas divergentes en la redacción del Breviloquio de San Bonaventura," *Cientia Tomista* (1940): 442-51.

exegesis” of the former and the “sacred doctrine” of the latter.³⁷ Bougerol similarly treated the prologue of the *Breviloquium* as “*l’oeuvre scripturaire*,” while reading the body of the *Breviloquium* as “*l’oeuvre théologique*.”³⁸ So, too, Thomas Reist says that the prologue resembles a “medieval university sermon” and notes the discrepancy between the prologue’s exposition of Scripture and the body’s apparent lack of exegesis.³⁹ As a result, he treats the first four sections of the prologue without commenting on its last two sections or any of the seven parts of the body. Falque, likewise, distinguishes the *Breviloquium* according to its vision of the relationship of Scripture (prologue) and

³⁷ Marie-Dominique Chenu, *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1957), 54: “*doctrine sacrée*,” in contrast to a “*programme et méthode d’un expositor, d’un exegete*.” This is perhaps what Chenu is driving at in his distinction between the procedures of the twelfth and thirteenth century masters: “No longer did men simply comment on sacred texts, or explain them in homilies, catechisms, or glosses, or arrange them in a coherent order so as to elucidate sacred history—not even, as at Saint-Victor, to construct on the basis of this history an allegorical edifice by clothing the events of the sacred past with a typological interpretation. Henceforth, [thirteenth century] men wished, in the light of faith and by using the heritage of revelation, to intellectualize and systematize their beliefs and to explain the word of God in a human way” (Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*, trans. Jerome Taylor [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997], 236).

³⁸ Bougerol, *Introduction à Saint Bonaventure*, 167-68, 96-201.

³⁹ Thomas Reist, O.F.M. Conv., *Saint Bonaventure as a Biblical Commentator: A Translation and Analysis of his Commentary on Luke, XVIII, 34–XIX, 42* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985), 29. Curiously, Reist does not acknowledge Bordoy-Torrents as a source for his conclusion.

theology (body), which “complètent ainsi mutuellement dans une chiasme irréductible: la seconde en héritant de la première son unique mode de procéder (la description), et la première conférant à la seconde les clefs de sa compréhension (l’exposition ou la «mise en lumière»).”⁴⁰

Whereas Falque grants the division of Scripture and theology, he challenges the idea that they represent two different methods for Bonaventure. In his mind, the *Breviloquium* employs one method, the reduction (“*La réduction bonaventurienne*”), in which all things are resolved in God through the reciprocal hermeneutical relationship of Scripture and theology.⁴¹

Monti is skeptical of attempts to divide the prologue and body according to the disjunction of Scripture and theology for two reasons.⁴² First, he argues that the

⁴⁰ Falque, *Saint Bonaventure et l’entrée de Dieu en théologie*, 47. Falque’s develops this position further in an exchange with Henry Donneaud. See Henry Donneaud, “Le sens du mot *theologia* chez Bonaventure: Étude critique à propos d’un ouvrage récent,” *Revue Thomiste* 102 (2002): 271–95; and Emmanuel Falque, “Le contresens du mot *theologia* chez Bonaventure: Réponse au frère Henry Donneaud,” *Revue Thomiste* 102 (2002): 617; as well as summary of the debate in Gregory. LaNave, “Bonaventure’s Theological Method,” in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, 84–85.

⁴¹ Falque, *Saint Bonaventure et l’entrée de Dieu en théologie*, 50–51; quoting *Brev. prol.* 6 (V 208). Falque proposes Paul Ricœur’s “*un cercle herméneutique*” as “*l’hypothèse fondamentale*” for reading the chiastic relationship of Scripture and theology, and by extension the entire “*somme*” of the *Breviloquium* (47).

⁴² Monti thinks Bordoy-Torrents’ argument reflects the opinion of “most scholars” regarding the relationship of the prologue and the body (Monti, “Introduction,” xxxix).

prologue and body share a unified vision of theology that emphasizes the role of faith and centrality of Christ. Monti argues that Scripture, the object of the prologue, is necessary to the vision of restoration described in the body: "This inner, personal knowledge of God achieved through faith in Christ has an integral and reciprocal relation with Sacred Scripture"⁴³ Secondly, Monti maintains that for Bonaventure the terms "Sacred Scripture" and "theology" are so nearly synonymous that it is impossible to separate them.⁴⁴ For Bonaventure, the theologian must present Scripture as something intelligible, so that people may not only believe, but understand what they believe.⁴⁵

In addition to the question of the structural relationship of the prologue to the seven parts that follow, scholarship of the last decade has given greater attention to the role of structure and textual patterns in Bonaventure's corpus as a whole.⁴⁶ The growing awareness of the volume of patterns in Bonaventure's writing has led to difference in

⁴³ Monti, "Introduction," xlv.

⁴⁴ Monti, "Introduction," xlv; *Brev. prol. init.* (V 201), and 1.1 (V 210).

⁴⁵ Monti, "Introduction," xlv.

⁴⁶ See Kevin L. Hughes, "St. Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*: Fractured Sermons and Protreptic Discourse," *Franciscan Studies* 63 (2005): 108–09; LaNave, "Bonaventure's Theological Method," 97; and Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 250.

opinion over which pattern, if any, is dominant. J. A. Wayne Hellmann's *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology* draws attention especially to Bonaventure's routine use of patterns of three. Three signifies beginning, middle, and end, and is indicated in Bonaventure's writing by terms like *principium*, *medium*, and *ultimum* (first, middle, and last). Hellmann explains, "It makes no difference how Bonaventure uses the terms. . . because *he is always speaking of the number three*."⁴⁷ The threefold pattern reflects Bonaventure's basic understanding of order; it is the univocal order that permeates all of reality, "created and uncreated," the "overarching background" of order shared by God and creation.⁴⁸ Similarly, Paula Jean Miller sees the triad of *expressio-impressio-expressio* (expression-impression-expression) at the heart of Bonaventure's thought.⁴⁹ Gregory LaNave adopts a broader approach to structure in Bonaventure's work, distinguishing three different structures found in Bonaventure:

⁴⁷ J. A. Wayne Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology*, trans. Jay M. Hammond (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2001), 10 (emphasis added). Zachary Hayes agrees that this is the fundamental structural disposition of Bonaventure's thought, further clarifying, however, that it is Christ's centrality to this scheme of three that truly distinguishes Bonaventure's theology. Cf., for instance, Zachary Hayes, O.F.M., "Bonaventure's Trinitarian Theology," in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, 226–27.

⁴⁸ Hellmann, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology*, 14.

⁴⁹ Paula Jean Miller, F.S.E., "Cosmic Semiosis: Contuiting the Divine," *Semiotica* 178 (2010): 303–44, esp. 307–308.

emanation-return (*Breviloquium*, *De scientia Christi*), ascent (*Reductione*, *Itinerarium*, and *Hexaëmeron*), and the “parallel” and “oscillating” development of natural reason and graced reason (*De mysterio Trinitatis*, and *Itinerarium*).⁵⁰ His proposal gives greater weight to a variety of organizing schemes in Bonaventure’s writing, while simultaneously observing the threefold flow of the order of reality that Hellmann finds central.⁵¹ “Each of these structures,” he says, “allows for a distinctive and progressive ordering of theological knowledge.”⁵²

⁵⁰ LaNave, “Bonaventure's Theological Method,” 98: “One structure is that of emanation and return, found especially in the *Breviloquium* and *De scientia Christi*. Notably, both of these texts are divided into seven parts: three pertaining to the divine pole of the topic, one focused on the human point of contact with the divine, and three on the transformation of the human and its reorientation to God. Such a structure reflects the whole of our salvation, displaying at every point *nostra metaphysica* (*Hex.* 1.17). and our proper and multiform relation to God. The center point in such a structure is critical. It marks the turning point, the beginning of our explicit return to God. It is also, in Bonaventure, invariably Christological. As Christ is the midpoint of the Trinity, and the center of all knowledge, so he is always at the turning point.” Although LaNave recognizes the fundamental centrality of the number three, he does not wed emanation/return to Bonaventure’s use of threefold patterns. LaNave also comments on the significance of terms like *principium radicale*, *totum integrale*, and *totum universale* (99).

⁵¹ Cf. LaNave, “Bonaventure's Theological Method,” 99, and Hellman, *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure’s Theology*, 25–28.

⁵² LaNave, “Bonaventure's Theological Method,” 98–99.

An important structure in Bonaventure's writing to which previous commentators have paid little attention is one drawn from the Hexaëmeron: the six days of creation that led to the seventh day of God's rest in Genesis 1–2:4a.⁵³ Not only did Bonaventure write a series of *collationes* (lectures) on the Hexaëmeron, he treated the six days of creation in his commentary on the Sentences, the *Reduction*, the *Breviloquium*, and the *Itinerarium*.⁵⁴ In many of these texts, Bonaventure offers interpretations of the various days, and he explicitly organizes the *De scientia Christi*, the *Itinerarium*, and the *Breviloquium* with a septenary structure, all of which suggest, implicitly or explicitly, the perfection of the seventh day that followed the Hexaëmeron.⁵⁵

⁵³ Some commentarial literature also refers to an eighth day of resurrection. See chapter two of this study.

⁵⁴ *In 2 Sent.*, 12.2 (II, 296); *Reduction* ¶6 (V, 321–322); *Brev.* prol. 2 (V, 202); *Itinerarium* 1.5–6 (V, 297), and 14 (V, 299), 2.10 (V, 302), 7.1 (V 312).

⁵⁵ *Itinerarium* prol. 5 and 7.1 (V 296 and 312); *Brev.* I.1 (V 210). On the significance of this number for Bonaventure's theology, cf. Joseph Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1989), 18. On the structure of the *De scientia Christi*, cf. Joshua C. Benson, "Structure and Meaning in St. Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de scientia Christi*," *Franciscan Studies* 62 (2004): 67–90. On the structure of the *Itinerarium*, cf. Leonard J. Bowman, "What Kind of Journey is Bonaventure's *Itinerarium*?" in *Itinerarium: The Idea of Journey: A collection of papers given at the Fifteenth International Congress of Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 1980*, ed. Leonard J. Bowman (Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg, 1983), 94–112; Jay M. Hammond, "Order in the *Itinerarium*," in *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology* (St. Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, 2001), 192–271; Jay M. Hammond, "Bonaventure's *Itinerarium*: A Respondeo," *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 301–22; and Gregory. LaNave, "Knowing God through and

Bonaventure's *Breviloquium* uses a wide variety of patterns. Consisting of a prologue followed by seven parts in seventy-two chapters,⁵⁶ the text contains a large number of triads, many of which refer to God as *ortus-progressus-status* (origin-mode-end),⁵⁷ *ortus-usus-fructus* (origin-enjoyment-fruit),⁵⁸ *efficientis-exemplaris-finalis* (effective-exemplary-final cause),⁵⁹ and *principium et exemplar effectivum-refectivum-perfectivum* (effective-refective-perfecting source and exemplar).⁶⁰ Bonaventure also distinguishes God as both the principal source of creation (*creatio*) and the principal source of redemption (*redemptio*), suggesting a creation/re-creation structure akin to Hugh of St. Victor's *De sacramentis*.⁶¹ Patterns of seven also permeate the text, not least in its seven

in All Things: A Proposal for Reading Bonaventure's *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*," *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 267–99.

⁵⁶ Cf. *Brev.* prol. 6 (V 208). Bonaventure's explicit mention of the seventy-two chapters is perhaps an allusion to the seventy-two disciples sent out in Luke 10.

⁵⁷ *Brev.* prol. init. 1 (V 201). The three opening paragraphs of the prologue fall before the first section of the prologue, and will be referred to as "init.," short for "initium."

⁵⁸ *Brev.* VI.1 (V 265).

⁵⁹ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219).

⁶⁰ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210).

⁶¹ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210): "*Deus non tantum sit rerum principium et exemplar effectivum in creatione, sed etiam refectivum in redemptione et perfectivum. . .*"

parts; in fact, Bonaventure employs twenty-eight different septenary lists in the *Breviloquium*.⁶²

Several scholars have addressed the structure of the seven parts of the *Breviloquium* and the variety of its patterns. Monti argues that the text has a structure that is indexed to *exitus-reditus* (procession-return).⁶³ According to Monti, the first three parts “describe the process of *exitus*. . . Part I locates the origin of this process in the fact that God is Triune: the Highest and First Principle is itself a mystery of self-diffusive love.”⁶⁴ Creation (part II) is the “‘going out’ of the universe from God through the Word,” whereas part III presents “the negative dimensions of the *exitus*. . . [rendering humans] incapable of grasping the deeper significance of reality and taking the steps

⁶² *Brev.* I.2 (twice); I.8 (three times); II.2 (twice); II.3; II.5 (twice); III.9; IV.4; IV.7; V.2; V.4; V.5; V.6; V.7; V.9; V.10 (twice); VI.3; VI.11; VI.12; VII.7. These may be classified into three different kinds: patterns of pure perfection, which typically are used to describe God’s perfect attributes (*Brev.* I.2, I.8, IV.7, and V.7); “hexaëmeral” patterns, or patterns that Bonaventure does not hesitate to associate with the days of creation and rest, imply perfection and rest in creation, Christ’s human qualities, the virtues, and the gifts of the Spirit (*Brev.* prol. 2, II.2, II.3, II.5, IV.4, V.4, V.5, V.6, V.7, V.10, and VI.12); and various sevenfold lists that do not correspond, at least on first sight, to any other septenary pattern (*Brev.* V.2, V.9, V.10, VI.3, VI.11, and VII.7).

⁶³ Monti, “Introduction,” xlviii–xlix. Gregory LaNave agrees, proposing that “One structure is that of emanation and return, found especially in the *Breviloquium* and *De scientia Christi*” (LaNave, “Bonaventure’s Theological Method,” 98–99).

⁶⁴ Monti, “Introduction,” xlviii.

necessary to achieve their fulfillment in God.”⁶⁵ The *reditus* of the text occurs in parts IV–VI. Part IV presents the Incarnation as the initiator of “the *reditus* (return) of creation to its source, by revealing again to fallen humanity the true meaning of their existence and through his death and resurrection empowering them again to rise again to God.”⁶⁶ Monti argues that the Incarnate Word is the *medium* of the *exitus/reditus* movement, coming “precisely at the mid-point. . . at the bottom of the descent away from God.”⁶⁷ Insofar as the Incarnation is the source of the return to God, the parts that follow part IV “detail the process of return,” including the treatments of grace and sacraments.⁶⁸ The seventh and final part “describes the ‘end’” of the return “into the fulness of the divine life.”⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Monti, “Introduction,” xlix.

⁶⁶ Monti, “Introduction,” xlix.

⁶⁷ Monti, “Introduction,” xlix. Monti’s interpretation of the structure of the *Breviloquium* shows the influence of Zachary Hayes’ theory that Christ is the center of all of Bonaventure’s theology. Cf. for instance Zachary Hayes, O.F.M., “Christology and Metaphysics in the Thought of Bonaventure,” *The Journal of Religion* 58: Supplement: Celebrating the Medieval Heritage (1978): S9282–96; cited in Monti, “Introduction,” xlii.

⁶⁸ “The remainder of the text details the process of the ‘return’ . . . through the grace of the Holy Spirit. . . mediated through the created means of the sacraments” (Monti, “Introduction,” xlix). Similarly, LaNave states, “As Christ is the midpoint of the Trinity, and the center of all knowledge, so he is always at the turning point” (LaNave, “Bonaventure’s Theological Method,” 98).

⁶⁹ Monti, “Introduction,” xlix.

Joshua Benson agrees with Monti regarding the central function of Christology and the Incarnation in the seven-part structure.⁷⁰ Benson states that, “the broad meanings Bonaventure gives to the incarnation of the Word. . . guide his reflections in part IV and also guide the structure of the *Breviloquium* as a whole.”⁷¹ Benson observes, however, that previous scholars have downplayed the significance of the *Breviloquium* for understanding Bonaventure’s Christology.⁷² By contrast, Benson argues that rather than characterizing Christ’s role in part IV simply as the beginning of a much-needed *reditus*, the twofold significance of the Incarnation is reflected in its “double meaning of cosmic completion and the healing of humanity.”⁷³ This twofold significance, then, gives one license to interpret the movements of procession and return in a more integrated way. For Benson, the triad *ortus-progressus-status* (or *ortus-modus-fructus*) maps onto the overall arc of the text: “part I on the Trinity functions as the *ortus* of the entire text, much as the Trinity is described as the *ortus* of scripture itself in the

⁷⁰ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 253.

⁷¹ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 248.

⁷² Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 249.

⁷³ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 248.

prologue.”⁷⁴ Parts II–VI form the *progressus*, “since these parts involve much of what Bonaventure details as the *progressus* of scripture in the prologue: the knowledge of all things insofar as that relates to our salvation.”⁷⁵ Part VII is “the *status* of the entire work, as it will ultimately describe the ‘fullness of everlasting happiness’: the *status* of scripture described in the prologue.”⁷⁶

Benson also sees the triad *ortus*, *progressus*, *status* in two separate clusters in parts II–VI. He says,

The key to understanding this [twofold] unit of parts is that the incarnate Word plays a double role in this series, as both *fructus* and *ortus*. This double role of the incarnate Word in the structure of the text is consistent with the double meaning of the incarnation of the Word. . . . [H]e cosmically completes the universe and heals humanity.⁷⁷

On Benson’s reading, the fourth part of the *Breviloquium* is both the “fulfillment” of the first cluster (parts II–IV) and the *ortus* of a second cluster (parts IV–VI).⁷⁸ In terms of the first cluster, Benson explains, “We can infer that part II, on creation, forms the *ortus* of

⁷⁴ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 254. Cf. *Brev. prol. init.* (V, 201); Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 251.

⁷⁵ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 254–55.

⁷⁶ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 254–55, quoting *Brev. prol. init.* (V, 201).

⁷⁷ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 255.

⁷⁸ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 255.

creation's temporal movement out from God. Part III describes the horrifying turn in the *progressus*, the *modus* that deformed creation: sin. Part IV, on the incarnation of the Word, brings these two movements to completion. . . ."⁷⁹ And in terms of the second cluster, Benson says,

[T]he incarnate Word is the foundation, the *ortus*, of humanity's re-creation through grace. . . . [W]e can then see how part V on grace functions as the *modus* of our re-creation, which heals the *modus* of sin introduced into creation in part III. Supporting this interpretation, Bonaventure describes the incarnation at the outset of part V, on grace, as the 'origin and wellspring of every gratuitous gift.' Grace has its *ortus* in Christ. Part VI, on the sacraments, is then the *fructus* of the movement of re-creation flowing from the incarnate Word. At the outset of part VI, Bonaventure explicitly calls Christ the *ortus* of the sacraments.⁸⁰

Benson's scheme, while not contradicting Monti's *exitus/reditus* interpretation, shows a deeper integration of parts I–VII within the two clusters (parts II–IV, and IV–VI), as well as across the clusters themselves. Part IV, according to Benson, reflects the fact that Christ is both the goal (*fructus*) of creation as well as the source (*ortus*) of re-creation. Part V reflects the way that grace, as a mode of proceeding (*modus*), overcomes the corrupted mode of sin. Lastly, Benson argues that part VI presents the sacraments as the goal (*fructus*) of matter (part II) that find their source in Christ (part IV), thereby

⁷⁹ Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 255.

⁸⁰ Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 256.

reinforcing the way that Christ is both *ortus* and *fructus*.⁸¹ Thus, Christ is the *medium* of the *Breviloquium* insofar as he is the *medium* of the structure of *ortus-modus-fructus*.

We can see two tensions arise from Monti's and Benson's interpretations. First, it will become clear in this study that the *Breviloquium* relies on a variety of other textual structures than *exitus-reditus* or *ortus-progressus-status*. In fact, Bonaventure does not employ the terms *exitus-reditus*, and uses the triad of *ortus-progressus/modus-status-fructus* only once in prologue of the *Breviloquium*.⁸² Rather than emphasizing procession and return, Bonaventure's terms emphasize the relationship of creation and re-creation, or foundation and restoration, thereby reflecting an influence that is decidedly more Victorine than Platonic (at least, as Monti conceives of Platonic), a fact which appears in the structure of the text, and will become evident in chapter four of this study.⁸³

⁸¹ Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 257–60.

⁸² *Brev. prol. init* (V 201): "*in hoc verbo aperit sacrae scripturae quae theologia dicitur **ortum progressum et statum** insinuans ortum scripturae attendi secundum influentiam beatissimae trinitatis progressum autem secundum exigentiam humanae capacitatis statum vero sive fructum secundum superabundantiam superplenissimae felicitatis.*"

⁸³ This comparison refers to Monti's assessment that *egressus-reditus* is a Platonic scheme, and is not meant to unnecessarily oppose Platonic metaphysics as such and the theology of the Victorine school, which was itself influenced by Platonism. Cf. Franklin Harkins, "Historia, Reading, and Restoration in the Theology of Hugh of St. Victor" (University of Notre Dame), 96.

Second, these interpretative proposals downplay the question of the relationship of the prologue to the body, and thereby diminish the importance of the dynamic relationships in other parts of the text. Indeed, the emphasis on Christ as *medium* in a seven-fold structure, as Monti and Benson describe it respectively, can minimize the important contribution that the prologue makes to the structure and content of the *Breviloquium*. Monti's proposal is especially susceptible to this critique, as he ostensibly treats the prologue as a mere preface to the main act of the body. Benson's model, by contrast, draws the triad of *ortus-progressus-fructus* directly from the prologue, thereby drawing attention to the mediating role of Christ in both the prologue and the body. Yet, his emphasis on the two clusters of *ortus-progressus-fructus* (parts II-IV and parts IV-VI) accentuates the concentric or chiasmic, and not parallel, movement in Bonaventure's text. The hexaëmeral structure, proposed below, helps clarify the parallel relationship of the parts as an additional model that emerges from Bonaventure's language of God's principiality.

Creation and Re-Creation in the Theology of the *Breviloquium*

Instead of describing his own project in terms of *exitus-reditus* (Monti), Bonaventure envisions the breadth of theology in terms of Scripture's revelation of God

as the source of the works of *creation and re-creation*.⁸⁴ In so doing, Bonaventure shows the likely influence of Hugh of St. Victor's *De sacramentis*. Hugh had divided his great work into two books, the first of which pertains to foundation, and the second to restoration. Along similar lines, Bonaventure claims that God is not just the source and exemplar of creation, but also the source of refreshment and perfection. This description of God, stated in *Brev.* 1.1, factors into the structure of the *Breviloquium*, as will be described below.

Moreover, following his discussion of the divine attributes in part I, Bonaventure describes God as *omnipotentissimum, sapientissimum et benivolentissimum* at points in the text that are crucial to its structure (I.6, II.2, IV.1). The power, wisdom, and benevolence of the Trinity shine through in both operations of creation and re-creation, such that the same power, wisdom, and goodness by which the Trinity is manifested to reason and faith (part I) is also manifest in the Incarnation (part IV).

This structural parallel of part I and part IV is repeated in subsequent parts: the divine benevolence that makes the soul (part II) also restores it through grace (part V); and the corruption of that image in sin (part III) is repaired, restored, and strengthened through the remediating work of the sacraments (part VI). Bonaventure describes the

⁸⁴ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210).

corresponding action of parts II and V in this way: “just as the image of God emanates immediately from God, so too does the likeness of God, which is the same image but in its God-conformed perfection. It is called, therefore, the image of the re-creation [*imago re-creationis*].”⁸⁵ That is, the image created in the days of creation (part II) is perfected in the likeness of God through grace (part V). Finally, the re-created human is healed of the corrosive aspects of sin (part III) through the “remedies” of the Sacramental medicine (part VI), and is thereby restored and drawn toward the likeness which is ultimately fulfilled part VII.⁸⁶

The parts of the text are not only related through these parallel links (I-IV, II-V, and III-VI); Bonaventure also implies a division such that the first three parts explore the work of the *principium et exemplar effectivum*, and the second three parts explore the work of the *principium et exemplar refectivum*. This division also introduces a way of understanding the final part, which pertains to God’s work as the *principium et exemplar perfectivum*, wherein God consummates all things supernaturally in reunion with himself.

⁸⁵ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220).

⁸⁶ *Brev.* VI.1 (V 265).

To read the *Breviloquium* according to the *principium et exemplar effectivum-refectivum-perfectivum*, and to divide the parts accordingly, suggests a link to Bonaventure's explanation of the Hexaëmeron in *Brev.* II.2, wherein he divides the days of creation in Genesis 1–2:4a into three operates: creation-distinction-adornment. The first operation, “creation from nothing,” takes place “before any day.” The operation of “distinction” takes place over the first three days. “Adornment” takes place over the second three days. This division of the days, which appears to originate in Bede the Venerable's *In principium Genesis* and is adopted by Hugh of St. Victor in his *De sacramentis*, neatly relates both to the parallel operations of creation and re-creation, such that “distinction” correlates to the *principium effectivum* and parts I through III, “adornment” correlates to the work of the *principium refectivum* and parts IV through VI, and the seventh day correlates to the *principium et exemplar perfectivum* and part VII—which Bonaventure implies in part II, but describes explicitly in section two of the prologue.⁸⁷

Moreover, this relationship of God's three-fold activity and identity, and the three hexaëmeral operations of foundation reveals a deeper role for the prologue in the structure of the text. The prologue is primarily preoccupied with discussing Scripture

⁸⁷ *Brev.* prol. 2 (V 204).

and revelation, which with faith, Bonaventure explains, is the foundation of Christian teaching. Bonaventure's description of the foundational role of Scripture corresponds with his understanding of the first stage of the Hexaëmeron, "*creatio ex nihilo*." Just as "creation" is the foundation of the subsequent days, and Scripture is the foundation of theology, so too the prologue is the foundation of the whole program of the *Breviloquium*. Thus, Scripture, which descends "from the Father of lights," is to doctrine as the prologue is to the body. The interweaving relationship of God's three operations as *principium et exemplar effectivum, refectivum, et perfectivum*, the three-fold division of the Hexaëmeron into three operations, the relationships of Scripture–prologue and Theology–body of the *Breviloquium*, and the cross-referencing between the different parts of the *Breviloquium* all help illuminate Bonaventure's own description of his project as primarily concerned not with *egressus* and *reditus*, but with creation and re-creation.

The benefit of reading the *Breviloquium* this way is that, in addition to giving a clearer picture of the relationship of the parts of the body to each other, we see Christ as the *medium* in a fuller and different sense than that which is explored in previous interpretations of the text. Christ is the *medium* of the text as the new beginning, the source of the spiritual adornment and completion of the universe in the work of redemption. This adornment restores the "intelligible circle" and leads to the perfection

of *Brev.* VII. Additionally, this hexaëmeral reading helps resolve the problem of the relationship of the prologue to the body of the text, posed by older analyses of the *Breviloquium*. The prologue, analogous to the operation of *creatio ex nihilo*, as described above, is reflective of God's self-revelation, the source from which doctrine flows, and to which all things return. This, too, pertains to the restoration of the soul as the intelligible circle. This reading gives a deeper understanding of models of the Hexaëmeron that Bonaventure receives from the genre of commentary on Genesis 1–2:4a, including Bede's *In principium Genesis* and the first part of Hugh's *De sacramentis*. Bonaventure's application of the various literal and spiritual interpretations of the days, as well as his adoption of Augustine's theory of the seminal reasons, and the structure of the three operations of creation-distinction-adornment, help resolves some of the tensions that linger in that genre (e.g. temporal vs. atemporal/simultaneous creation), while also showing a greater range of application, manifest not only in Bonaventure's own treatment of the days of creation, but applied to his whole theological program. Finally, revealing the hexaëmeral structure of the *Breviloquium* suggests the later perfection of the spiritual interpretation of the first week of Genesis 1 in his later, unfinished *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*. The *Collationes* take a more radical approach to the spiritual exegesis of the six days of creation and seventh day of rest; but we see that this

approach is actually in accord with earlier hexaëmeral commentaries, such as Origen's radically spiritual interpretation of Genesis 1.

The Procedure of This Dissertation

In order to substantiate the argument that the structure of the *Breviloquium* is hexaëmeral and that reading it accordingly gives greater clarity to the overall theology of the text, this dissertation will proceed as follows. Chapter Two discusses Bonaventure's treatment of the Hexaëmeron in the second section of the prologue, and compares it to the genre of commentary on Genesis 1–2:4a. This chapter explores Bonaventure's intentions in writing the *Breviloquium*, how the Hexaëmeron is situated in his understanding of Scripture and Theology, and his reliance on the genre of hexaëmeral commentary. Doing so shows not only that Bonaventure is familiar with the variety of interpretations of the days of creation and rest, but also that he uses resources from this commentarial genre to achieve his goal of showing how doctrine proceeds from Scripture.

Chapter Three develops Bonaventure's understanding of the Scripture in light of the hexaëmeral genre introduced in chapter two. His description of Scripture in the prologue as an "intelligible cross on which the entire world machine can be described" becomes the interpretive crux that the rest of the *Breviloquium* tries to solve. This chapter argues that the doctrine of creation, and the fuller analysis of the days of creation,

offered in part II, are central to the resolution of this interpretive crux. Indeed, it is in part II that Bonaventure lays out and seemingly adopts both Augustine's theory of the seminal relationship of the days of creation to the ages of history, and the Bedean/Hugonian division of creation-distinction-adornment.

Chapter Four correlates the division of creation-distinction-adornment to God's identity as the *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum*, and shows how for Bonaventure it is God's perfection, seen in his benevolent actions, that is the connecting thread that holds these different paradigms together in one structure. Indeed, it is not that the Trinity is divided amongst the operations, but instead that God's perfect power, wisdom, and benevolence is manifest in creation. It is God's benevolence, as distinct from God as *summum bonum*, that animates both the process of creation, which was initially intended for perfection, and re-creation, which restores creation to its originally intended telos.

Thus, this dissertation concludes, the structure of the *Breviloquium* is not simply a Bonaventuran *exitus-reditus* (procession-return). Nor does the triad of *ortus-progress-status* (origin-mode-end) entirely explain the structure of the text. Instead, this dissertation shows that Bonaventure's understanding of the Hexaëmeron illuminates the dual role of Christ as source and goal, identified by Benson, while also recognizing a parallel structure of creation and re-creation, which progresses toward perfection. The

parallel between the work of distinction and the work of adornment, read in light of God as the effective-refective-perfecting principal and exemplar (*principium effectivum–refectivum–perfectivum*), plausibly places Christ as both *medium* and the new Adam, propelling creation toward supernatural perfection in part VII.

CHAPTER TWO

BONAVENTURE'S PROLOGUE IN LIGHT OF HEXAËMERAL LITERATURE

This chapter looks at Bonaventure's use of the Hexaëmeron in the prologue of the *Breviloquium* as a paradigm for understanding the length of Scripture, history, and the microcosm of the human person (*Brev. prol. 2*), and demonstrates that the historical and literary context of Bonaventure's usage can be found in the genre of hexaëmeral commentary, from Philo of Alexandria's *De opificio mundi* to Alexander of Hales's *Summa Fratris*. Among the treatises in this genre, Bonaventure relies heavily on Augustine's *De genesi ad litteram duocecim*, Bede the Venerable's *In principium Genesis*, and Hugh of St Victor's *De sacramentis Christianæ fidei* and *De tribus diebus*. A brief examination of these texts in light of the prologue to the *Breviloquium* demonstrates not only commonality, but also the tensions that are latent in the various readings of the six days of creation. Showing this will then better inform our reading in chapter three of Bonaventure's more detailed treatment of the *Hexaëmeron* in *Brev. II*, as well as the manner in which he employs the *Hexaëmeron* at the broad level of the structure of the *Breviloquium*, which will be examined in chapter four.

Bonaventure wrote the *Breviloquium* during a time of dramatic transition, both in his own life as well as those of his confreres and colleagues at the University of Paris

and in the Franciscan Order. Dominic Monti notes that the writing of the *Breviloquium* in 1257 marks a “pivotal” moment in the career of the young master Bonaventure, whose teaching career ended in the same year with his election as minister general of the order of the Friars Minor.⁹³ The *Breviloquium* can be seen from two lights, therefore: it is both the capstone of his brief tenure as a master (1254–1257) and it is the inaugural text of his much longer tenure as minister general (1257–1273).⁹⁴

The stated aim of the *Breviloquium* is to dispel the confusion of new theologians over Scripture.⁹⁵ “New [*novi*] theologians,” Bonaventure says sympathetically, “often dread Sacred Scripture itself, feeling it to be as confusing, disordered, uncharted as some impenetrable forest. This teaching,” he continues, “has been transmitted. . . in

⁹³ Monti, “Introduction,” xiv–xvii. Cf. Bert Roest, *A History of Franciscan Education* (c. 1210–1517) (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 126.

⁹⁴ In 1257, Bonaventure was just thirty-six years old (b. 1221). On Bonaventure’s biography and relevant secondary literature, see chapter 1 (page 1 n. 1 and 2) of this study.

⁹⁵ In his four books of the *Sentences*, Peter Lombard attempted to overcome the confusion caused by the great mass of the deposit of the faith by consolidating the diverse opinions of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church into a systematic whole. Lombard describes his *Sentences* as a collection: “In this brief volume, we have brought together the sentences of the Fathers and the testimonies apposite them, so that the one who seeks them shall find it unnecessary to rifle through numerous books, when this brief collection effortless offers him what he seeks” (*Sent.* I, prol.; trans. Guilio Silano [Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2007]).

such a diffuse manner that those who come to learn about Sacred Scripture are not able to read or hear about it for a long time.”⁹⁶ His response to this problem was a *breviloquium*, literally “a brief word,” through which he proposed to “summarize not all the truths of theology, but some of the things that are more opportune to hold,”⁹⁷ in order to help these new theologians navigate “the forest of Sacred Scripture.”⁹⁸

Because theology is, indeed, discourse about God and about the First Principle, as the highest science and doctrine it should resolve everything in God as its first and supreme principle. That is why, in giving the reasons for everything contained in this little work or tract, I have attempted to derive each reasons from the First Principle, in order to demonstrate that the truth of Sacred Scripture is from God, that it treats of God, is according to god, and has God as its end.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ *Brev. prol. 6 (V 208): “propter quod etiam novi theologi frequenter ipsam Scripturam sacram exhorrent tanquam incertam et inordinatam et tanquam quandam silvam opacam. Et quia haec doctrina tam in Scriptis Sanctorum quam etiam doctorum sic diffuse tradita est, ut ab accedentibus ad Scripturam sacram audiendam non possit per longa tempora videri nec audiri. .”*

⁹⁷ *Brev. prol. 6 (V 208): “summatim non omnia, sed aliqua magis opportuna ad tenendum breviter tangerentur.”*

⁹⁸ *Brev. prol. 6 (V 208): “per sacrarum Scripturarum silvam.”* Cf. Bert Roest, *Franciscan Literature of Religious Instruction Before the Council of Trent* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 239.

⁹⁹ *Brev. prol. 6 (V 208): “veritatem sacrae Scripturae esse a Deo, de Deo, secundum Deum et propter Deum.”* Bonaventure expresses a similar concept in *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* 1.17 (V 331–332): “In hoc ergo medio consistit tota metaphysica scilicet de emanatione de exemplaritate de consummatione egredi a summo transire per summum et reduci ad summum”; similar passages can be found in the *Breviloquium* in both prol. 2 (V 204), and 2.1 (V 219): “efficientis, exemplaris et finalis.” See Leonard J. Bowman, “The Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure,” *The Journal of Religion* 55 (1975): 193–94.

This chapter argues that Bonaventure applies his understanding of Scripture's procedure (from God, according to God, and with God as its end) to his book, and that this is evident in the structure of the book.¹⁰⁰ He says, "In order to make sure that the development [of the *Breviloquium*] is lucid, I have taken the trouble to set down in advance the particular chapter headings, to aid the memory and give a clearer prospect of what will be treated. There will be in this work seven parts."¹⁰¹ He aspires for his book to imitate the lucidity (*clarius*) of Scripture, and proposes that the seven-part structure assists with this goal by offering an easily memorizable pattern that imitates Scripture in both procedure and content. However, it is not immediately apparent how the book's seven-part structure imitates Scripture's procedure.

To respond to this concern, this chapter proposes that the discussion of the Hexaëmeron, the ages of the world, and the stages of human life reveal a correspondence between the days of creation, later developed in part two, and the

¹⁰⁰ Bonaventure's *Breviloquium* is not a commentary to Scripture, and he quotes few Scriptural passages after the prologue. Rather, the *Breviloquium* is an introduction to Scriptural knowledge, or doctrine. He indicates earlier in the prologue that the terms "Scripture" and "Theology" may be somewhat interchangeable: ". . . *sacrae Scripturae, quae theologia dicitur*. . ." (*Brev. prol. init.* [V 201]). Cf. Beryl Smalley, "The Bible in the Medieval Schools," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 198.

¹⁰¹ *Brev. prol. 6* (V 208).

structure of the *Breviloquium*, and that Bonaventure's impetus to employ the Hexaëmeron comes in part from the genre of commentary on Genesis 1–2:4a.

Bonaventure's Prologue

Bonaventure introduces the *Breviloquium* with Ephesians 3:14–18.

For this reason I bow my knees before the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom every fatherhood in heaven and on earth takes its name, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened through his Spirit with power in your inner being, and that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; that being rooted and grounded in love, you may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length, and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ that surpasses all knowledge, so that you may be filled with all the fullness of God.¹⁰²

In this passage, Bonaventure argues, “the great ‘doctor of the Gentiles and preacher of truth,’ filled with the Holy Spirit as a chosen and sanctified instrument, discloses the source [*ortus*], procedure [*progressus*], and purpose [*status*] of Holy Scripture, which is called theology.”¹⁰³ Bonaventure's interprets Paul's language of “source” through James 1:17, proposing that Scripture's comprehensive knowledge *originates* in “the Father of lights. . . through [whose] Son, Jesus Christ. . . the Holy Spirit flows into us.”¹⁰⁴ Insofar

¹⁰² *Brev. prol. init. 1* (V 201).

¹⁰³ *Brev. prol. init. 1* (V 201). On the various uses of *ortus*, *progressus et status* (and similar triads) in the *Breviloquium*, cf. Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 253–57.

¹⁰⁴ *Brev. prol. init. 2* (V 201), quoting Jas. 1:17.

as it is divine knowledge, he argues, “no one can begin to comprehend it, unless that person has been infused with faith in Christ.”¹⁰⁵ Scripture *proceeds* according to “supernatural inspiration” through faith, and not through human reason: “The procedure of Sacred Scripture—unlike the other sciences—is not confined by the laws of reasoning, defining, or making distinctions, nor is it limited to only one aspect of the universe.”¹⁰⁶ Rather, its procedure is informed by its source, God, but corresponds to “the very nature of our human capacities,” which themselves “reflect the whole complex of created reality, not only naturally but supernaturally.”¹⁰⁷ Originating in God and proceeding according to human limitations, Scripture gives “us human wayfarers as much knowledge as we need to achieve salvation.”¹⁰⁸ Finally, Scripture leads to the overflowing happiness found only in the divine life, insofar as it contains “the words of

¹⁰⁵ *Brev. prol. init. 2* (V 201).

¹⁰⁶ *Brev. prol. init. 3* (V 201): “*Progressus autem sacrae Scripturae non est coarctatus ad leges ratiocinationum, definitionum divisionum iuxta morem aliarum scientiarum et non est coarctatus ad partem universitatis.*”

¹⁰⁷ *Brev. prol. init. 3* (V 202).

¹⁰⁸ *Brev. prol. init. 3* (V 201): “*cum secundum lumen supernaturale procedat ad dandam homini viatori notitiam rerum sufficientem, secundum quod expedit ad salutem . . .*” In arguing this, Bonaventure adheres to the vision of science as prescribed by Aristotle, yet also shows the ways in which Scripture exceeds the limitations of Aristotelian science (cf. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics* 1.1-3 and 1.7). Cf. also Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, 25–27.

eternal life. . . recorded, not only that we might believe but also that we might possess that life everlasting.”¹⁰⁹ Knowledge of Scripture does not lead to perfect ideas, but rather perfect love, the “measureless love of the Blessed Trinity.”¹¹⁰ Scripture leads back to its source.

It is in the explanation of Scripture’s *progressus* that we find the first mention of the Hexaëmeron in the *Breviloquium*.¹¹¹ Scripture, he maintains, encompasses

the contents of the entire universe, and so covers the breadth; it narrates the course of history, thus comprehending the length; it portrays the excellence of those who will ultimately be saved, thus manifesting the height; and it depicts the misery of those who will be damned, thus plumbing the depth, not only of the universe, but of the very judgments of God. Accordingly, every theological doctrine falls into this category.¹¹²

In its breadth, it includes both the Old and New Testaments; in its length, it extends from the first to the last age; in its height, it encompasses the celestial, angelic, and ecclesial hierarchies; and in its depth, it contains “mystical senses.”¹¹³ Describing Scripture in these terms, Bonaventure conveys a sense of comprehension and

¹⁰⁹ *Brev. prol. init. 4* (V 202), quoting John 6:68 and 20:31.

¹¹⁰ *Brev. prol. init. 5* (V 202).

¹¹¹ *Brev. prol. init. 6* (V 202).

¹¹² *Brev. prol. init. 3* (V 201).

¹¹³ *Brev. prol. init. 6* (V 202).

universality of Scripture, for it spans the entire universe, the course of history, the saved, and the damned.¹¹⁴ He reiterates this universal scope at the end of the prologue, saying, “Scripture, then, deals with the whole universe: the highest and the lowest, the first and the last, and everything that comes in between. It takes the form of an intelligible cross on which the entire world machine can be described and in some way seen in light of the mind.”¹¹⁵ Not only is the reference to the intelligible cross an important allusion to the centrality that Bonaventure ascribes to Christ in his theology, as we will see later, but it also describes the relationship of the world to God, and alludes to an earlier reference to the world in the second section of the prologue.

The first mention of the Hexaëmeron comes in the explanation of Scripture’s length, the history of God’s action in the world. This history is universal and comprehensive; it spans “the full compass of time,” and divides time into six ages (Adam, Noah, Abraham, David, Exile, Christ), that lead to a seventh age, which runs concurrent to the sixth age.¹¹⁶ The seventh age begins, however, not with the Nativity,

¹¹⁴ Cf. Hans Josef Klausk, “Theorie der Exegese bei Bonaventura,” in S. *Bonaventura IV* (Grotteferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1973), 82.

¹¹⁵ *Brev. prol.* 6 (V 208).

¹¹⁶ *Brev. prol.* 2 (V 204).

but with the “repose of Jesus in the tomb.”¹¹⁷ Hence, the ages of history, far from merely chronicling human life on earth, present the history of God’s deeds to bring his creation to salvation and perfection.

These ages correspond to the days of creation in Genesis 1-2:4a. “These seven ages are thus distinguished by the signs found in their beginnings, whereby they correspond to the days of the world’s creation.”¹¹⁸ The confirmation of angels and the fall of demons in the first age corresponds to the distinction of light and darkness on the first day. The flood in the second age corresponds to the division of the firmament which separates the waters of the second day. The call of Abraham and the covenantal promise of the third age corresponds to the division of dry land from the waters. The establishment of the Davidic kingdom and priesthood amongst the covenantal people in the fourth age corresponds to the adornment of the firmament on the fourth day with heavenly lights—the sun, moon, and the stars. The exile of God’s people in the fifth age corresponds to the adornment of the water on the fifth day with fish and fowl. The Incarnation of Christ in the sixth age corresponds to the creation of the first human being on the sixth day. And the everlasting rest of souls at the end of the seventh age

¹¹⁷ *Brev. prol. 2* (V 203).

¹¹⁸ *Brev. prol. 2* (V 204).

corresponds to the divine rest from creation on the seventh day. In this way, Bonaventure shows that the invisible seeds of God's work in history are sown already in the visible order of the six days of creation and seventh day of rest.

He also compares the six ages to the six stages of a human life. Infancy, which is an oblivion to adult memory, corresponds to the first age when ends in the flood. Childhood corresponds to the separation of languages after Babel. Adolescence, in which "the procreative power becomes active," corresponds to call of Abraham, the father of nations. Young adulthood, the "prime" of human life, corresponds to synagogue and Davidic kingdom. "Decline," or middle age, corresponds to the Babylonian exile. "Old age," which leads to death but also the wisdom of elder years, corresponds to "the sixth age of the world [which] ends with the Day of Judgment, but [also] in it wisdom advances through the teaching of Christ."¹¹⁹ Accordingly, while Bonaventure indirectly correlates the days of creation with the stages of life, by way of the ages of the world, one can infer, from the first interpretation of the ages according to the days, that the work of salvation in history and the seminal order instilled in creation are evident in the microcosm of an individual human life.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ *Brev. prol.* 2 (V 204).

¹²⁰ Bonaventure receives this connection of the days of creation, ages of history, and stages of life from Philo of Alexandria, Basil of Caesarea, and Augustine. Cf. Philo,

Bonaventure thus associates the six days of creation and the seventh day of rest with the six ages of history leading to a seventh age of consummation, and with the six stages of an individual human life leading to a seventh and final transformation.¹²¹

He appears, too, to link these sevens to the seven parts of the *Breviloquium* by way of the intelligible cross. Although the scope of God's action encompasses all four aspects of Scripture (breadth, length, height, depth), history (length) alone is seven-fold. Whereas the universality of Scripture is fourfold, he presents a seven-fold division of Scriptural teaching as a way to explain the intelligible cross.

To understand this cross, one must know about God, the First Principle of all things, about the creation of those things, about their fall, about their redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ, about their reformation through grace, about this healing through the sacraments, and finally, about their remuneration through punishment or everlasting glory.¹²²

De opificio §105; Basil, *Hexaëmeron* 10.13; Augustine, *Civitate Dei* 10.4, 16.43 and 22.30; and Bede, *In principium Genesis* 38. For more, cf. footnotes 73 and 137 (below).

¹²¹ *Brev.* prol. 2 (V 204). Although the correspondence is made primarily with the seven days of creation and seven ages of human life—"the full compass of time. . . rightly passes through seven ages"—Bonaventure at times refers to an eighth age. He describes "a sixth age [which runs] from Christ until the end of the world; the seventh, which runs concurrently with the sixth, commences with the repose of Jesus in the time, and lasts until the general resurrection, which marks the beginning of the eighth." Bonaventure's reference to the eighth age implies the "end of the world and time," and alludes to an implied eighth day of creation, the beginning of the new week.

¹²² *Brev.* prol. 6 (V 208).

This description of Scriptural teaching is at first glance unremarkable; it follows the basic paradigm already set in Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, beginning with God and proceeding through creation, fall, redemption, and restoration/eschaton. These seven topics, as Bonaventure enumerates them, however, set the stage for the seven topics of the *Breviloquium*. More relevant to our purposes, here, however, is the fact that this seven-fold list of topics, coming immediately after, and in fact as an elaboration of the intelligible cross of Scripture upon which the world can be described, provide a foundation for a synthesis of Scriptural knowledge and the days of creation.

An objection immediately arises, however: the seven parts of the *Breviloquium* do not seem to follow Bonaventure's delineation of the seven ages of the world or the seven ages of human life. In particular, it is not clear that the seven parts correspond directly to the days of creation or the ages of the world. For instance, Bonaventure offers a correlation between the third day, wherein dry land and vegetation emerges from the waters, and the third age, wherein Abraham's seed is established in Israel. However, the third part of the *Breviloquium* does not seem to correspond with the organic and natal imagery of the third day and age. Similar problems arise considering other days, although one could infer correspondences between the first day and part (God as source), the second day and part (firmament and creation), the fourth day and part (the sun and Christ), and the seventh day and part (God's rest and the Last Judgment).

To address this objection one can look at Bonaventure's claim that in Scripture, "the whole course of this world is shown to run in a most orderly fashion from beginning to an end, like an artfully composed melody."¹²³ This statement suggests that the harmony of Scripture is "seminally" present in the days of creation, which display God's wisdom. Bonaventure expresses a similar idea about Scriptural time in section two, implying a relationship between divine wisdom and divine operations.¹²⁴ "The full compass of time, running according to a triple law—innately given, externally imposed, and infused from above—rightly passes through seven ages, reaching its consummation at the end of the sixth."¹²⁵ Scripture is authoritative, Bonaventure concludes, in revealing "God's governance of the universe" because Scripture alone has the comprehensive

¹²³ *Brev. prol. 2 (V 204)*.

¹²⁴ Borrowing Augustine's term—*rationes seminales*—which Bonaventure employs in *Brev. II.2–4*. On Augustine, see below. On Bonaventure's use of the seminal reasons, see chapter three of this study.

¹²⁵ *Brev. prol. 2 (V 204)*. This division of time into three distinct divine operations corresponding to the three attributes of power, wisdom, and goodness will be repeated with regard to the creation of the world in part two where Bonaventure divides the Hexaëmeron into three operations: creation from nothing before the days, distinction of the elements on the first of the three days, and adornment of the elements on the second of the three days, and that this division of the days reflects not only God's wisdom, but his power and goodness as well.

knowledge of God's attributes and their reflection in creation, particularly in the revelation of the days of creation and ages of the world.

Insofar as Bonaventure holds that Scripture, creation, and time share in the same structuring order, and, moreover, insofar as he sees the task of theology as mirroring and elucidating the structure and content of Scripture, one has good reason to suspect that the *Breviloquium*, too, may reflect that order.

Commentaries on Genesis 1–2:4a

The seven parts of the *Breviloquium*, however, do not seem to follow Bonaventure's delineation of the seven ages of the world or the seven stages of human life. In particular, while one can easily observe a kind of correspondence between the first day (light) and the first part of the *Breviloquium* (the Trinity), and the seventh day (Sabbath rest) and the seventh part (eschatology), establishing correspondence between the other five parts is more difficult.

To be able to address this objection, one can look at the genre of hexaëmeral commentaries. These works, while ostensibly exegeting the text of Genesis 1–2:4a, are pregnant with a variety of spiritual interpretations of the days. Hexaëmeral authors apply their interpretations to a diversity of interpretive outcomes. Indeed, the six days are susceptible to different orders and patterns. One of the more common interpretative applications is Christological in nature, as commentators would show the role of Christ

as both Eternal Art on the first day and the Second Adam on the sixth day. Christ is also shown to be the mode of perfection on the seventh day. Recognizing the diverse interpretive agendas in this genre can help us understand how Bonaventure used the Hexaëmeron to structure and inform his own work.

Commentaries on the days of Genesis 1-2:4a were an established genre of Scriptural exegesis; as early as Origen's *De principiis*, reflection upon the days was a central aspect of theology. At its most basic level, the term "Hexaëmeron" refers to the six days of creation in Genesis 1. By contrast, the second account of creation in Genesis 2:4b-25, the Garden of Eden story, eschews the order and division of the first, accentuating instead the dominion of man, naming of animals, and creation of Eve.¹²⁶ J. C. M. Van Winden claims that the narrative of the first week in Genesis is one of the most explicated passages of Scripture.¹²⁷ Commentaries and sermons, such as Philo's *De*

¹²⁶ Despite their titles—for "*Hexaëmeron*" means "six days"—we will see that a great majority of "hexaëmeral" texts also treat the seventh day on which God rested in Genesis 2:1-4a. The term "hexaëmeral" also refers to the scholarly, pastoral, and poetic literature that treats the days of creation in Genesis 1-2:4a. Cf. Frank Egleston Robbins, "The Hexaëmeral Literature: a Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis" (Ph.D., University of Chicago, 1912), 1: "The use of the name may be extended to cover the whole body of literature dealing with the subject, including formal or incidental accounts of the creation of the world, based upon Genesis, and poetical versions of the narrative." Robbins even classifies Milton's *Paradise Lost* as hexaëmeral literature.

¹²⁷ J. C. M. Van Winden, O.F.M., "In the Beginning: Some Observations on the Patristic Interpretation of Genesis 1:1," *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963): 106. Compare

opificio mundi, Basil's *Hexaëmeron*, and Ambrose's *Exameron*, books 1–5 of Augustine's *De genesi ad litteram*, book 1 of Hugh of St. Victor's *De sacramentis*, distinctions 12–17 of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, and Robert Grosseteste's *Hexaëmeron*, to name just a few authors, interpret the days of Genesis 1–2:4a in a wide variety of ways. For instance, Origen only treats the six days of creation, omitting commentary on the first Sabbath; most of the other commentators include commentary on the seventh day. In what follows I will examine a few of these authors in order to show the variety inherent in the genre, thereby establishing that Bonaventure's two distinct treatments of the *Hexaëmeron* in the prologue and part II of the *Breviloquium* accord with patterns and practices already established long before the thirteenth century. Recognizing the difference in Bonaventure's own treatments, in light of the genre, shows that an "hexaëmeral" progression, or structure, need not be simply a pattern of six leading to seven. Rather, as Bede and Hugh understand the *Hexaëmeron* in their commentaries and treatises, the progression of God's action is one from distinction to adornment. The hexaëmeral pattern that is particular to Bede and Hugh is what we see in the structure of the *Breviloquium*.

Gregory T. Armstrong, *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche. Die drei Kirchenväter* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962).

Philo and the *De opificio mundi*

Philo's *De opificio mundi* (c. AD 30) is the first sustained commentary on the six days of creation and seventh day of rest in Genesis 1:1–2:4a.¹²⁸ Philo is convinced that the first week of Genesis is fundamental to understanding the rest of the Torah, because it reveals the divine order that undergirds providence and the Law. Moses, Philo says, “made a splendid and awe-inspiring start to his laws. He did not immediately state what should be done and what not. . . [but first gave] an account of the making of the cosmos.”¹²⁹ Moses' purported goal in narrating the creation of the world is to give his people something to assist contemplation. Particularly, Philo argues, the Jews should contemplate their lives in light of the patterns of nature that are established during the

¹²⁸ All Philonic sources from Philo of Alexandria, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* ed. L. Cohn, P. Wendland, and S. Reiter (Berlin: Reimer, 1896–1915), All English translation of *De opificio mundi* (hereafter *Opif.*) from Philo of Alexandria, *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). On the date of *Opif.* cf. Runia's introduction, 2–3. On Philo's life, and sources of Philo's life, cf. Jean Daniélou, S.J., *Philo of Alexandria*, trans. James Colbert (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2014), 1–24. On Philo's influence over the genre, cf. Robbins, “The Hexaëmeral Literature: a Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis,” 24; Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, 5th ed., vol. 1, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 1ff.; David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 73; and Peter C. Bouteneff, *Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2008), 27–28.

¹²⁹ *Opif.* §2–3. Cf. Wolfson, *Philo*, 338 and 48.

first week. "The man who observes the law is at once a citizen of the cosmos, directing his actions in relation to the rational purpose of nature, in accordance with which the entire cosmos also is administered."¹³⁰

Philo divides the six days in two different ways. He initially divides them between the first day and those that follow in order to explain the primacy of the number one in Greek philosophical thought. He distinguishes between the noetic order established in the Logos on day one, following which God establishes a sensible order, the material creation, on days two through six. The noetic order is the pattern—"a beautiful model," "the archetypal and intelligible idea," an "incorporeal and most god-like paradigm"—after which God fashions the material order—"the corporeal cosmos, a younger likeness."¹³¹ Hence, all numbers originate on day one, which Philo stresses is not the "first" of several days of a temporal sequence, but rather the archetype and unity of the days; as such, he calls it "one day."¹³² "One day" in this sense is God's own

¹³⁰ *Opif.* §3. On perfect order and the number six, cf. David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria, On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses, Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 117–18; Wolfson, *Philo*, 316.

¹³¹ *Opif.* §16. Moreover, Philo equates the day one to an "outline... which served [God] as a model when he completed the sense-perceptible cosmos as well" (*Opif.* §19).

¹³² *Opif.* §15. Wolfson reads the creation of the intelligible order on the first day as the equivalent to Plato's receptacle in the *Timaeus* which harbored the seminal ideas by

reason, His *logos*, as it is engaged in making.¹³³ Hence, what happens on the second through the sixth days is already encapsulated on this day in an archetypal way, since day one is the *reason and source of order* of all subsequent days.

In the second division, or interpretation of the days, Philo attends to the numerical significance of each day, showing a progress toward the perfect number six. Although the number one reflects the ideal beauty of God in the archetype of the “heavens,” subsequent days also reveal divine order, albeit to a lesser degree insofar as the medium of matter diminishes their transparency to God’s perfection. Two, for example, is the first even number, which Philo sees as reflective of the most basic distinction in creation between light and dark (note however that the Biblical text seems to indicate that this happens on the first day), evening and morning, and the firmament

which the rest of creation is created. Cf. also *Opif.* §27, and Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 156.

¹³³ “If you would wish to use a formulation that has been stripped down to essentials, you might say that the intelligible cosmos is nothing else than the Logos of God as he is actually engaged in making the cosmos” (*Opif.* §24). The role of ὁ λόγος in Philo’s work has been much discussed. Cf. Norman Bentwich, *Philo-Judæus of Alexandria* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1910), 149–51; Wolfson, *Philo*, 310; Frederick E. Brenk, “Darkly Beyond the Glass: Middle Platonism and the Vision of the Soul,” in *Platonism in Late Antiquity*, ed. Stephen Gersh and Charles Kannengiesser (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1992), 49; Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 151–52; and Pierre Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002), 237–38.

above and the firmament below.¹³⁴ Three is the first odd number, since Philo does not count one as odd, and is reflective of the number of angles in a triangle. There are three dimensions of a physical body,¹³⁵ and three is equal to half the perfect number six.¹³⁶ Four, the day of the luminaries, is the number of the elements, and is reflective of musical ratios,¹³⁷ the cube and pyramid, and “the measure of justice and equality.”¹³⁸ Five represents the senses and animals, those things that are not yet rational, but which, as “animate,” adorn the inanimate creation.¹³⁹ Six is the perfect number, equal in sum to its product ($1+2+3=1\times2\times3$),¹⁴⁰ “of all the numbers. . . the most productive.”¹⁴¹

For Philo, the number six has the richest symbolism of any number. It represents the creation of the rational human being, who is the symbol of both completion and perfection in the material creation. Philo likens the first human to a guest invited to a

¹³⁴ *Opif.* §9.

¹³⁵ *Opif.* §16.

¹³⁶ *Opif.* §3.

¹³⁷ *Opif.* §15.

¹³⁸ *Opif.* §16.

¹³⁹ *Opif.* §20.

¹⁴⁰ *Opif.* §16.

¹⁴¹ *Opif.* §3.

banquet, who comes only after “all the preparations for the feast have been completed.”¹⁴² Six also represents the relationship of the microcosm and macrocosm. Man is like a “miniature heaven who carries around in himself numerous star-like beings as divine images, taking the form of arts and sciences and noble theories corresponding to each excellence.”¹⁴³

Whereas six represents created perfection, seven represents divine holiness for Philo. “Its nature. . . extends to the whole of visible reality, reaching as far as heaven and earth, the limits of the universe. After all, what section of the cosmos is not philhebdomatic [characterized by love for the seven-day week], overpowered by love and desire for the seven?”¹⁴⁴ Philo envisions, therefore, a desire in the work of the six days that, in a sense, naturally yearns for something more than the completion and perfection represented by the number six.

¹⁴² *Opif.* §78.

¹⁴³ *Opif.* §82.

¹⁴⁴ *Opif.* §111. Philo spends thirty-eight sections (§90-§128) extolling praise for the number seven. Cf. Wolfson, *Philo*, 385-94, who says, “It is clear that the great length of [this] section is intimately connected with the function of arithmology in Philo’s exegesis and is moreover influenced by the special role of the number seven in both Jewish and Greek tradition.”

The seventh day, therefore, is significant not because it adds anything to creation, but because it symbolizes a perfection that is greater than creation. Humans are invited to contemplate this perfection through ritual practice. God gives the Jews a day of rest from work in order “to concentrate on one thing only. . . the improvement of their character. . . and the examination of their conscience.”¹⁴⁵ In order to conform to the perfect order of the six, humans must perform the rigorous program of moral purity called for by the Law. The narrative of the Hexaëmeron is authoritative, therefore, because it connects creation to the Law, and Law is the singular medicine for the disorder of the passions to which the first humans succumbed.¹⁴⁶ Philo’s correlation of cosmic and moral order would become a common feature among hexaëmeral commentaries that followed his. His conflation of completion and perfection in the work of the sixth day, however, is the plausible source for a tension in the genre, especially for Christian interpretation which would distinguish between natural perfection, or completion, and the perfection introduced in the Incarnation. We will elaborate on this tension below.

¹⁴⁵ *Opif.* §128.

¹⁴⁶ Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 18. David Dawson considers this to be a defining feature of Alexandrian Jewish exegesis, which “sought to revise Hellenistic life and thought in light of the authoritative text of the Greek Pentateuch” (Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, 75).

Origen and the *De principiis* and *In Genesim homiliae*

The Christological hermeneutic developed by Origen of Alexandria (c. 185–254) in the century after Philo is another significant influence for Christian commentators. Origen develops his reflections on the days of Genesis 1–2:4a in two key texts: *De principiis* (4.2.5 and 4.3)¹⁴⁷ and the first homily of *In genesim homiliae*.¹⁴⁸ His concentration on the progressive nature of the days, which reach their summit in the sixth day,¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ Origen, *De Principiis*, *Origenes Werke V* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1913); Koetschau's edition has been translated: Origen, *On First Principles*, trans. G. W. Butterworth (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973). On the exigencies of transmission and translation of *De principiis*, cf. R. J. Rombs, "A Note on the Status of Origen's *De Principiis* in English," *Vigilae Christianae* 61 (2007): 21–29. Peter Bouteneff observes that Christian authors before Origen avoided Genesis 1–2:4a, commenting instead on the second creation account beginning in Genesis 2:4b, making Origen's homily on Genesis 1 the first explicit treatment of Genesis 1–2:4a. Cf. Bouteneff, *Beginnings : ancient Christian readings of the biblical creation narratives*, 89: "No formal [Christian] material before Origen counts as Scripture scholarship" — although Bouteneff counts Tertullian and Hippolytus as exceptions. Hardly anything remains of Hippolytus's work, however, and Tertullian only tersely refers to the first week of Genesis, clearly favoring the Gen 2:4b account.

¹⁴⁸ Origen, "In Genesim homiliae," in *Origenes Werke VI: Homilien zum Hexateuch*, ed. W. A. Baehrens, Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1920), hereafter *In genesim*, followed by sermon and paragraph number. Origen's homilies on Genesis have been translated: Origen, *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, trans. Ronald Heine, *The Fathers of the Church* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1982).

¹⁴⁹ A number of passages, such as *De principiis* 4.1.1, wherein Origen contrasts Christ and Moses as lawgivers, show an awareness of Philo's *De opificio* §2. On the Philonic legacy, cf. David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: a Survey* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 183. Philo's influence is present in Origen's homily on the

comes from his hermeneutical interest in the six days as a resource for figural and spiritual interpretation.¹⁵⁰ Critical of literal interpretation of the six days, he observes, for example, that morning and evening on the first, second, and third days take place without a sun and moon.¹⁵¹ In fact, Origen argues that, insofar as Jesus Christ is the preeminent spiritual meaning of all Scripture, the text of Genesis 1–2:4a is principally Christological. He asks, “*In the beginning God made heaven and earth*. What is the beginning of all things except our Lord and ‘Savior of all,’ Jesus Christ?”¹⁵² For Origen,

first week as well as *De principiis*: Mosaic teaching is proclaimed as the preeminent law among mortal lawgivers; the temporal and material actions ascribed to God in Genesis 1–2:4a must be interpreted figurally; the world was created in six days because six is a perfect number. In fact, Origen takes the latter two items (God’s attributes and the perfection of the number six) as license to interpret the whole of the six days figurally (*De principiis* 4.2.5). Cf. J. C. M. Van Winden, O.F.M., “In the Beginning: Early Christian Exegesis of the Term *archè* in Genesis 1:1, inaugural address, Leiden 1967,” in *Arche: A Collection of Patristic Studies*, ed. J. Den Boeft and David T. Runia (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 88–89; Bouteneff, *Beginnings*, 98–99.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. C. P. Bammel, “Adam in Origen,” in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honor of Henry Chadwick*, ed. Rowan Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 63; Karen Jo Torjesen, “Hermeneutics and Soteriology in Origen’s *Peri Archon*,” *Theological Studies* 21 (1989): 346; and Bouteneff, *Beginnings*, 96.

¹⁵¹ *De principiis* 4.3.1. Origen concludes that the account of these days, “cannot be accepted as history,” but contain instead, “a spiritual meaning.” Restating what he takes to be a first principle of Christian instruction, laid out in the preface of book one, he adds, “I do not think anyone will doubt that these statements are made by scripture in a figurative manner, in order that through them certain mystical truths may be indicated.”

¹⁵² *In genesim* 1.1.

the eternal *Logos* is both the archetype of creation as well as perfect image of the Father by which all is made and restored.¹⁵³

The latter aspect of the *Logos* and his relationship to salvation is the subtext of the First Homily on Genesis, the primary focus of which is the process of re-creation. Although Origen offers brief literal interpretations of each day, his interest is in the spiritual symbolism of each moment in the narrative. The separation of light from darkness represents the division of good from evil; dividing the waters represents abstaining from anything that might keep one from God; the fertile ground of the third day represents a soul that is spiritually productive; the sun and moon on the fourth day represent Christ and the Church, who together give light and nourishment to Christians; fish and fowl represents good and evil impulses respectively; the beasts represent the animalistic impulses of humanity; and the first humans represent the soul itself created in God's image.

Origen clearly sees the human soul as the summit of the creative act; the soul moves the person toward the "highest good... to become as far as possible like God."

¹⁵³ *De principiis* 1.2. Here, Origen suggests an important distinction between *ascesis* (Philo's moral formation) and salvation. Salvation is more than moral purity; it is a divine work of reformation that mirrors the work of creation. Origen thereby also distinguishes between Philo's use of holiness on the seventh day as a condition of being set apart morally, and the Christian understanding of the seventh day as salvific or eschatological.

The source of the image of God in humanity is Christ, who is the perfect image of the Father. The soul is the subject of the re-creative process. However, while the powers of re-creation are focused on the soul, the unity of creation and re-creation is Christ, who is both the Beginning and End.¹⁵⁴

Origen does not comment on the seventh day in *In genesim* or *De principiis*.¹⁵⁵ Like Philo, Origen locates his reflections on (human) perfection in his comments on the sixth day. Unlike Philo, however, Origen unites created perfection and divine holiness under the auspices of the image of God in mankind, instilled on the sixth day, which is itself prefigurative of Christ. Thus, Origen calls for reflection, like Philo. Unlike Philo, however, Origen's reflection on the sixth day is explicitly Christological.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁴ *In genesim* 1.13: Christ is the beginning in three ways: the source of all things that are created, the source of the human essence, and the beginning of spiritual progress as humanity learns to separate spiritual darkness from light. So too, Christ is also the goal in three ways: the creator to which all returns, the perfect human being, and the goal of the spiritual journey as one begins to "contemplate the image of God" in order to be "transformed to his likeness."[®]

¹⁵⁵ Cf. *De principiis* 3.5 for Origen's comments on eschatology.

¹⁵⁶ *De principiis* 3.6: Origen develops Philo's anthropocentric notion of the completion of creation: the consummation of the world is concealed in the account of the creation of humankind in the image of God. In fact, he links spiritual fruits to the contemplation of the image of God in Christ. He also extends the moral significance of the Hexaëmeron into his exposition of other passages. For example, he offers the episode of the wedding at Cana (John 2:6–10) as an example: the six vessels filled with

Basil of Caesarea and the *Homilies on the Hexaëmeron*

Basil of Caesarea's (c. 329–379) eleven *Homilies on the Hexaëmeron* (c. 378) adopt Philo's and Origen's emphasis on providential direction instilled in the first day. For Basil, that direction culminates not in the sixth day as it did for Origen, or a seventh day of moral contemplation as it did for Philo, but a seventh day in which the image of God in humanity grows into the likeness of God. This seventh day points toward an eschatological eighth day, a day of universal re-creation governed by Christ. Basil sees great ascetic value in the *Hexaëmeron*, a value that grows out of an expansive literal reading. He provides a detailed exposition and illustrates it with a plethora of observations from the natural world.¹⁵⁷ Because God speaks through *both* the book of

water that turn to wine represent "those who are being purified while living in the world [which was] finished in six days, which is a perfect number" (*De principiis* 4.2.6).

¹⁵⁷ All references to homilies 1–9 are from Basil, *Homélies Sur L'hexaéméron*, ed. Stanislas Giet (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968), and homilies 10–11 from Basil, *Sur l'origine de l'homme*, ed. Alexis Smets and Michel van Esbroeck (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1970), hereafter *Hexaëmeron*. References will cite the passage by homily number followed by paragraph number. English translation from Basil, *Saint Basil: Exegetic Homilies*, trans. Agnes Clare Way, *The Fathers of the Church* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963) and Basil, *On the Human Condition*, trans. Nonna Vernon Harrison (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005). On Basil's life, cf. Paul J. Fedwick, "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea," in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, ed. Paul J. Fedwick (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981), 3–20; Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 1–26. On Basil's relationship to the "literalist" Antiochene school, cf. John J. O'Keefe, "'A Letter That Killeth': Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore and

Scripture *and* the book of the world, Basil argues that awareness of the particularity and diversity of the physical realm is absolutely necessary. That the cosmos—replete with a staggering variety of organisms and processes—reflects its divine author is a cause of inexhaustible wonder. This literal reading flows organically into a figural reading that resembles, in form, Origen’s ascetic interpretation of the days. Echoing Origen somewhat, Basil presents the cosmos as a school for souls.¹⁵⁸ In order to read the cosmos rightly and thereby come to understand the human being truthfully, the sinful mind must be re-formed first by Scripture.¹⁵⁹ Read figurally, the *Hexaëmeron*, ostensibly a narrative about creation, also narrates the process of re-formation. The six

Theodoret on the Psalms,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8 (2000): 83–104. On Basil’s use of figural exegesis, cf. Stephen Hildebrand, *Basil of Caesarea* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 48.

¹⁵⁸ *Hexaëmeron* 5.9, translated by Hildebrand, *Basil of Caesarea*, 56: “I want the marvel of creation to gain such complete acceptance from you that, wherever you may be found and whatever kind of plant you chance upon, you may receive a clear reminder of the Creator.”

¹⁵⁹ *Hexaëmeron* 1.1, and 2.1; Hildebrand, *Basil of Caesarea*, 18, 57.

days reflect a six-part journey¹⁶⁰ toward the ancient homeland, the ἀρχαία πατρίς.¹⁶¹

Read figurally, therefore, the Scriptural narrative of the days constitutes an itinerary for a journey, the end of which is salvation, represented by the soul on the sixth day, and eschatological perfection, represented by the rest of the seventh day.¹⁶²

Basil offers an example of this order in the division of the stages of human life, taken from Philo;¹⁶³ principles of growth are not extraneous to a person, but are rather instilled in the womb. "This one word, 'grow,' spoken wisely, structures things providentially."¹⁶⁴ Read symbolically, he suggests, the human being grows in spiritual stature according to principles instilled through the image of God, that lead toward

¹⁶⁰ *Hexaëmeron* 2.1 (138). Basil's word here is "ἀκατασκεύαστος" conveying a sense of both the unfinished characteristic of humanity, and the momentum toward completion. Cf. *Hexaëmeron* 2.1; Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 319. On the progressive nature of journey and the destination, cf. *Hexaëmeron* 1.3: "If there has been a beginning do not doubt of the end."

¹⁶¹ *Hexaëmeron* 6.1. Basil's term for the ancient homeland of the Father (ἀρχαία πατρίς) suggests the cosmological discourse that begins with the *Timaeus* and which is focused on the ἀρχή. Basil employs this phrase again in his *On the Holy Spirit* 27.66 Cf. Van Winden, "In the Beginning: Some Observations on the Patristic Interpretation of Genesis 1:1," 105.

¹⁶² *Hexaëmeron* 3.10 and 11.7. Basil is mostly silent on the significance of number, except for his discussion of the number seven in Jewish custom (*Hexaëmeron* 11.8).

¹⁶³ Philo, *De opificio* §105.

¹⁶⁴ *Hexaëmeron* 10.13.

growth into the likeness of God. "For I have that which is according to the image in being a rational being, but I become according to the likeness in becoming a Christian."¹⁶⁵

Basil's reflections on the seventh day, while brief, signify a further development of the genre: the seventh day, which indicates supernatural perfection, points to an eighth day. "Seven-ness" marks the providential manner in which God works with his people,¹⁶⁶ and reveals the unspeakable "mystery" of the Christian life, entailed on the seventh day, the day of resurrection which, for Basil, bears the image of remission from sins,¹⁶⁷ and in so doing points toward cosmic completion at the end of time.¹⁶⁸ This is

¹⁶⁵ *Hexaëmeron* 10.16. He continues, "By our creation we have the first [the image], and by our free choice we build the second [the likeness]."

¹⁶⁶ *Hexaëmeron* 11.8: Seven, he says, is "honored as the Sabbath," which makes it an essential part of determining high holy days for Jews and Christians. The number is also part of Deuteronomical law. It regulates land possession in Leviticus. It has both legal and theological significance in undergirding the year of the Jubilee. Enoch, who "did not see death," is the seventh from Adam. Of Enoch's connection with the number seven, Basil writes, "this is the mystery of the Church." He goes on to observe that Moses is "seventh from Abraham." And Christ is "the seventy-seventh generation from Adam." Basil sees in all these sevens God's providence unfolding in the generations of his chosen ones.

¹⁶⁷ Christ, Basil reminds his audience, forgives not seven times, but seven times seventy. Christ commands an excess of forgiveness. Christ's "superabundance" of grace undoes the patterns, habits, and cosmic stains of sin (*Hexaëmeron* 11.10, citing Romans 5:20, "Where sin abounded, grace superabounded").

¹⁶⁸ *Hexaëmeron* 11.10.

immediately apparent, Basil suggests, in the celebration of the Eucharist: “This seventh day [of the week] is truly a type of that seventh day.”¹⁶⁹ Seven-fold graces culminate in Christ’s judgment and eternal reign, which inaugurate the “eighth day,” on which the power of Christ’s forgiveness exceeds the power of sin and penalty.¹⁷⁰

The Greek legacy of commentary on Genesis 1–2:4a continued in the Latin West as a result of Ambrose of Milan (c. 337–397) and the homilies he delivered (c. 386–390)¹⁷¹ around ten years after Basil gave his homilies.¹⁷² Like Origen and Basil, Ambrose proposes to read the text Christologically, and, therefore requires a strong account of the correlation of the Incarnation and the sixth and seventh days. He argues more

¹⁶⁹ *Hexaëmeron* 11.11.

¹⁷⁰ *Hexaëmeron* 11.11.

¹⁷¹ Ambrose, *Exameron*, CSEL 32.1 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1897). All references to Ambrose’s *Exameron* according to homily (not day) and chapter number. English translation according to Ambrose, *Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*, trans. John Joseph Savage (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1961).

¹⁷² According to Boniface Ramsey, *Ambrose*, trans. Boniface Ramsey, *The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 1997), 54–56, Ambrose imparts to Augustine and later Latin theologians the combined legacy of Philo, Origen, and Basil. Cf. Neil B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 57. On the resemblance of Ambrose’s sermons to Basil’s, cf. John Moorhead, *Ambrose: Church and Society in the Late Roman World* (London: Longman, 1999), 73; Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino, trans. Placid Solari (Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics, 1986), IV:153.

forcefully and more extensively than any author preceding him that the Incarnation is the key to understanding Genesis 1–2:4a.¹⁷³

Ambrose and the *Exaameron*

Ambrose's goal in preaching the Hexaëmeron is twofold: to present the truth about humanity and to preach Christ. Regarding the former, he says, "We cannot fully know ourselves without first knowing the nature of all living creatures."¹⁷⁴ This self-knowledge, however, must be soteriological; although it seems that the literal sense of Genesis 1–2:4a entails the creation of the visible world, it also treats the invisible order. "No wonder that God, who contains all things in His power and incomprehensible majesty, created the things that are visible, since He also created those things that are not visible. Who would assert that the visible is more significant than the invisible..."¹⁷⁵ In this respect, the visible world is full of signs of God's invisible work.¹⁷⁶ The capacity of the visible to symbolize and contain the invisible resembles a similar capacity in

¹⁷³ As he says in the third homily, one cannot appreciate the work of the Master Artist without seeing the finished product (*Exameron* 3.5).

¹⁷⁴ *Exameron* 9.2.

¹⁷⁵ *Exameron* 1.3.

¹⁷⁶ *Exameron* 1.5: "This world is an example of the workings of God, because, while we observe the work, the Worker is brought before us." Cf. Ramsey, *Ambrose*, 145; Moorhead, *Ambrose*, 81.

Scripture, which contains “prophetical” words, hidden within the letter of text. Moses’ words of creation—“*In principio fecit deus*”—symbolize salvation.¹⁷⁷

Second, insofar as Genesis 1–2:4a speaks symbolically of salvation, Ambrose argues, it also speaks prophetically of Christ, and because the instrument of salvation is not simply the Eternal Word but the Incarnate Word, Ambrose argues that Genesis 1 signifies the Incarnation. He says, “The Lord is holy above all creatures for the very reason that He assumed a body.”¹⁷⁸

Ambrose also sees Christ, who is signified by the work of the sixth day, as the ultimate goal of the Hexaëmeron. All creatures are created to serve man; the first five days of creation lead to and culminate in the sixth day on which man is created. However, for Ambrose, spirit, and not flesh, is the true epitome of creation. “What is God: flesh or spirit? Surely not flesh, but spirit, which has no similarity to flesh. This is material, whereas the spirit is incorporeal and invisible.”¹⁷⁹ Thus, it is the human soul that reflects the Incarnate Son: “The soul... is made to the image of God, *in form like the Lord Jesus*.”¹⁸⁰ However, the human body is also important because with it the human

¹⁷⁷ *Exameron* 9.2.

¹⁷⁸ *Exameron* 1.5.

¹⁷⁹ *Exameron* 9.7.

¹⁸⁰ *Exameron* 9.8.

being participates in the sacraments. "That hand is placed on the holy altars as conciliator of divine grace, Through it we offer as well as partake in the celestial sacraments."¹⁸¹ Moreover, the diverse parts of the human body reflect spiritual states. "The leg," for example, "expresses the emotion of humility," while, "the knee is the gift of the most high Father to His Son: 'that in the name of the Lord every knee [shall bow]. . . .'"¹⁸²

The seventh day, and not the sixth, is the culmination of the full progress of creation, on which God "found repose in the deep recesses of man, in man's mind and purpose, for He had made man with the power of reasoning, an imitator of Himself, a striver after virtue, and one eager for heavenly grace."¹⁸³ It is only after creating man that God rests, because man fulfills the salvific purposes behind God's creation of the material world; "It may well be that He had given a symbolic picture. . . of the future Passion of the Lord, thus revealing that in man one day Christ would find repose. He anticipated for Himself repose in the body for the redemption of mankind. . . ."¹⁸⁴ In Ambrose's view, then, the Incarnate Son is the principle and pattern by which creation

¹⁸¹ *Exameron* 9.9.

¹⁸² *Exameron* 9.9.

¹⁸³ *Exameron* 9.10.

¹⁸⁴ *Exameron* 9.10.

is made, healed, and reunited with its creator. "From him, therefore, is the material; 'through him,' the operation by which the universe is bound and linked together; 'unto him,' because as long as He wishes all things remain and endure by His power and the end of all things is directed toward the will of God, by whose free act all things are *resolved*."¹⁸⁵

Augustine and *De Genesi ad litteram*

The opening of Genesis preoccupied Augustine (354–430), Ambrose's most well-known proselyte, from the time of his conversion to the later years of his life, as evidenced by personal testimony in the *Confessions*,¹⁸⁶ and his three commentaries

¹⁸⁵ *Exameron* 1.5.

¹⁸⁶ *Confessions*, trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin (London: Penguin, 1961), V.14: "I began to believe that the Catholic faith, which I had thought impossible to defend against the objections of the Manichees, might fairly be maintained, especially since I had heard one passage after another in the Old Testament figuratively explained. These passages had been death to me when I took them literally." It is not certain that Augustine is here referring to Ambrose's hexaëmeral sermons. Cf. Savage's introduction in Ambrose, *Exam.*, vi, as well as Ramsey, *Ambrose*, 20–28. Savage argues that Ambrose's preaching of the *Exameron* (c. 386–90) coincided with Augustine's baptism (387). Lewis Ayres notes debate about whether Augustine "knew this text [Ambrose's *Exameron*] or only its basic contents from Ambrose's preaching" (Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 64).

on Genesis¹⁸⁷ — *De genesi contra manichaeos libri duo* (c. 389), *De genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* (393), and, *De genesi ad litteram libri duodecim* (c. 415).¹⁸⁸

Whereas Ambrose, with some exceptions, largely transmits the genre as he receives it, Augustine takes a novel approach to the text of Genesis 1. Augustine's most significant contribution to the genre is his third and last commentary on Genesis, *De genesi ad litteram*.¹⁸⁹ As his title indicates, Augustine, unlike Origen, was convinced that the six days could be interpreted literally.¹⁹⁰ Like both Philo and Origen, however, Augustine resists a temporal reading, but precisely on account of his literal reading of

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Lewis Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2010), 61–62; and Roland J. Teske, “*De genesi ad litteram liber*,” in *Augustine through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*, 377.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Frances M. Young, “Creation and Human Being: The Forging of a Distinct Christian Discourse,” in *Studia Patristica XLIV*, ed. J. Baum et al. (Lueven: Peeters, 2010), 346.

¹⁸⁹ Augustine, *De genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, CSEL 28 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1894); hereafter, *De genesi ad litteram*. On Augustine's chronology, cf. Taylor's “Introduction,” in Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2 vols. (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), and Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: a biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 280 and 380. On *De genesi contra Manichaeos* (c. 389) and the unfinished *De genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, cf. Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 61–62. Augustine also discusses the six days in book XIII of the *Confessions*, book X of the *City of God*, and *De Trinitate* 4:4–6.

¹⁹⁰ Young, “Creation and Human Being: The Forging of a Distinct Christian Discourse,” 346. Cf. also Taylor, “Introduction” in Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 9.

the text, not because of a preference for figural interpretation. In his view, the whole Hexaëmeron takes place simultaneously, but is described in temporal terms in order to indicate what is an otherwise indescribable process of spiritual, or more specifically “angelic,” illumination. This illumination takes place *within* the Eternal Word, and as such shares in divine perfection.

Somewhat akin to Philo’s arithmological fascination with the number six, Augustine divides the six days according to the three parts of the perfect number six (1–2–3), separating the days into three clusters: the first day, then the second and third day, and, finally, the fourth through sixth day. These six days are perfection just as the number six is perfect because they derive from God’s essential perfection. For Augustine, the seventh day represents creaturely participation in God’s eternal perfection. What makes *De genesi* particularly significant in the hexaëmeral genre is that Augustine interprets the quality and perfection of the six days in relation to God’s perfection.

Thus, the whole process of creation, inaugurated on the first day reflects the perfection of the Creator. The creation of light on the first day most reflects the perfection of the creator because it takes place within the eternal Word. “It becomes quite clear that light was made through Him when God said, ‘Let there be light,’ and so

this utterance of God is eternal.”¹⁹¹ The utterance of light is an invitation to subsequent creatures to *be* and to *become* perfect by turning to the Word, for whom “living is the same thing as living wisely and happily.” For creatures, by contrast, “living is not the same as possessing a life of wisdom and happiness.”¹⁹² Insofar as creaturely being tends toward an unformed life,¹⁹³ creatures must receive being and form by turning from non-existence toward the Word, the source of all spiritual and corporeal life.¹⁹⁴ Moreover, they find the perfection of their being in the “imitation” of the source of their existence and form.¹⁹⁵

In this respect, “day one,” for Augustine, is both the source of creaturely being and perfection. He thereby appears to adopt Philo’s adaptation of the Platonic ideas to Genesis 1, and builds on this foundation by explaining how creatures emerge from the initial light, which is the formal pattern as source of individual creatures.

¹⁹¹ *De genesi* 1.2.6; cf. also 2.6.10–14.

¹⁹² *De genesi* 1.5.10.

¹⁹³ *De genesi* 1.5.10: “*potest habere informem uitam.*” The *informis vita* sets the stage for the life and form that creatures receive from the Word.

¹⁹⁴ *De genesi* 1.5.10, and 2.8.16.

¹⁹⁵ Robert J. O’Connell, S.J., *Art and the Christian Intelligence in St. Augustine* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), 28–39.

Augustine points out that holding too strict a temporal interpretation of the lights of Genesis 1:3 and 1:14 creates discrepancies that cannot be resolved with a temporal interpretation.¹⁹⁶ The days of creation, Augustine argues, are not temporal, insofar as the action takes place in the Word. Instead, these days indicate to Augustine the process of intellectual illumination.¹⁹⁷ Borrowing Plotinus's terminology, Augustine explains that illumination proceeds from the Logos to form created wisdom; illumination is "a movement produced by the eternal Godhead through the eternal

¹⁹⁶ *De genesi* 1.10–11 and 1.20.40. He asks, for instance, whether the initial light gives way to the sun on the fourth day; and if the light of Genesis 1.3 is material, does God extinguish it to make way for the dark of night (*De genesi* 1.9.17 and 1.17.32). Augustine responds to these questions by distinguishing spiritual and corporeal light, the work of the first and fourth days. The first light is a spiritual light, the illumination of the "formless and chaotic state." This is angelic illumination and not subject to the darkness of corporeal night. The second light is corporeal. "The first mention of light is to be taken as the formation of the spiritual creation and that afterwards the corporeal creation, this visible universe was made in its turn." This suggests two stages, or operations, in the creative process, distinguishing the angelic from the material. "This universe, then, was created in two days in view of the two great parts that compose it, namely, heaven and earth" (*De genesi* 1.13.27). Bede and Hugh of St. Victor answer this question in the affirmative, and avoid Augustine's illuminationistic interpretation. Cf. Bede, *In principium Genesis* 9, and Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1.1.9.

¹⁹⁷ *De genesi* 4.31.48–4.32.49, and 4.34.54. Augustine likens this non-chronological sequence of perception in the angelic intellect to the arrangement of objects in a field of visual perception. One can gaze upon the entire field simultaneously, or one can attend to individual objects, one after the other. The former is like God's knowledge of his creation, whereas the latter is like angelic knowledge of God and creation.

Word in a spiritual creature.”¹⁹⁸ While day one for Philo was a singular moment of spiritual creation that informs the making of the material cosmos, illumination for Augustine is a sempiternal event in which the angels know all things in God through the illumination by the Word. Although he believes that this instantaneous “day” of creation encapsulates creation in its entirety, thereby relativizing the element of time in the hexaëmeral account, he nevertheless holds that the sequence of days reveals the nature of finite, creaturely being.¹⁹⁹ The elements are distinguished, vegetation grows, the planetary spheres mark the flow of time, and on the last two days, God brings forth animal and human life, so too all living creatures have the innate capacity to produce and develop “according to their kind” because God has placed within creation a

¹⁹⁸ *De genesi* 1.9.17. Cf. Plotinus, *Enneads* 2.4 and 6.7. Cf. Christopher O’Toole, C.S.C., “The Philosophy of Creation in the Writings of St. Augustine” (The Catholic University of America, 1944), 34–37, and A. H. Armstrong, *Spiritual or Intelligible Matter in Plotinus and St. Augustine* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1954), 277–83.

¹⁹⁹ *De genesi* 5.5.15: “Through this knowledge [the illumination of the light], creation was revealed to it [the first day] as if in six steps called days, and thus was unfolded all that was created; but in reality there was only one day.” Augustine maintains that his use of the word “day” is literal insofar as the days of creation are exemplary days: “It is not true that material light is literally ‘light,’ and light referred to in Genesis is metaphorical light? For where light is more excellent and unfailing, there day also exists in a truer sense” (*De genesi* 4.28.45). On Bonaventure’s treatment of Augustine’s theory of simultaneous creation in both the *Breviloquium* and the second book of his *Commentary on the Sentences* (dist. 12), cf. chapter three (below).

seminal tendency toward perfection.²⁰⁰ In this way, Augustine's theory of the seminal reasons develops an idea inchoate in Philo's comments on "one day."²⁰¹

According to Augustine, the six days indicate the perfection of the original "simultaneous" creation because six is a perfect number. "We must say that God perfected his works in six days because six is a perfect number. Hence, even if these works did not exist, this number would be perfect; and if it had not been perfect, these works would not have been perfected according to it."²⁰² God made the world and reveals himself therein "according to a pattern, in steps, as it were, that match the

²⁰⁰ *De genesi* 3.12.19. Cf. Michael John McKeough, "The Meaning of the Rationes Seminales in St. Augustine" (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1926), 29–59, especially 46–59.

²⁰¹ *Opif.* §15 (and above).

²⁰² *De genesi* 4.7.14. Augustine expands his notion of the perfection of creation through a second model, that of "measure, number, and order," derived from Wisdom 11:21. Augustine takes these three to be divine ideas that are the abiding form of the world imparted through the divine exemplar. On these three, cf. *De genesi* 3.16.25 and 4.3.7. Earlier instances include *De genesi adversus Manicheos* 1.16.26 and *De Natura Boni* 3. Cf. also W. J. Roche, "Measure, Number, and Weight in St. Augustine," *The New Scholasticism* 15 (1941): 350–76; Vernon J. Bourke, *St. Augustine's View of Reality, The St. Augustine Lecture* (Villanova, PA: Villanova Press, 1964), 18–23; Olivier Du Roy, *L'Intelligence de la Foi en la Trinité selon Saint Augustin. Genèse de sa Théologie Trinitaire jusqu'en 391* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1966), 267; Carol Harrison, *Beauty and Revelation in the Thought of Saint Augustine* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 107–10; Rowan Williams, "'Good for Nothing'?: Augustine on Creation," *Augustinian Studies* 25 (1994): 9–24; Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 61–62.

aliquot parts of six.”²⁰³ Scripture, Augustine observes, is full of references to sixes.

Scripture incorporates six as prolifically as it does because of “mystical reasons,” which is to say that six reflects a spiritual perfection.²⁰⁴ The integrity and perfection of the natural order, however, is found not in creation itself, but in God.²⁰⁵ The perfection of the six days is not a consequence of God’s work as such, but is rather symbolic of participation in the perfection that is inherent to God’s essence. Æ

Whereas the six-ness of creation accentuates the relationship of creaturely nature to the Eternal Logos, Augustine’s account of the seventh day, by contrast, emphasizes the difference between perfect creation and perfect God. Finite creatures, albeit *created* perfectly, find their ultimate perfection, their rest in God. This demonstrates that there is a twofold sense of perfection for creatures. “For the perfection of each thing according

²⁰³ *De genesi* 4.3.7. Aliquot parts are such that when divided the remainder is a whole number or integer. An aliquot sum is a sum of aliquot parts. A perfect number is a whole number that is equal to the sum of divisible parts. Augustine equates perfect numbers and aliquots, and as such considers six to be the first aliquot worth mentioning. Cf. Serafina Cuomo, *Ancient Mathematics* (London: Routledge, 2001), 253–55.

²⁰⁴ *De trinitate* 4.6.10. In *De trinitate*, and elsewhere, Augustine relates the six days to the ages of mankind in *De Trinitate* 4.4–6; *Civitate Dei* 11.6–8.

²⁰⁵ This is why Augustine follows his description of the perfection of six with a clear reminder that the order that underwrites the cosmos is not itself a creation, but rather a divine idea, encapsulated in the discussion of measure, number, and weight.

to the limits of its nature is established in a state of rest, that is, it has a fixed orientation by reason of its natural tendencies, not just in the universe of which it is a part, but more especially in Him to whom it owes its being, in whom the universe itself exists.”²⁰⁶ In other words, one can describe a being’s perfection in relation to its source, or one can describe a being’s perfection in relation to the final completion of the being, which is to come to rest in God; this is the seventh day. The seventh day, moreover, has a morning but no evening, because there is no limit to God’s rest in himself, or the rest that a creature finds in God.²⁰⁷ Hence, the six days lead to the seventh, but the seventh day does not lead to another.²⁰⁸ He concludes, “The whole creation, which was finished in six days, has a certain character in its own nature and another character in the order or orientation by which it is in God, not as God Himself is, but in such a way that there is no repose to give it its proper stability except in the repose of Him who desires nothing outside of Himself.”²⁰⁹

²⁰⁶ *De genesi* 4.18.34.

²⁰⁷ *De genesi* 4.18.31–32.

²⁰⁸ Augustine, however, discusses an eighth day in *Contra Faustus* 16.29.

²⁰⁹ *De genesi* 4.18.34. Cf. also 4.17.29. O’Toole says, “God Who, through creation has produced creatures from nothing, other than Himself, by His administrative action does not cease to call them back to Himself so that they may find their goal in Him, not to be identified with the divine substance but in order to continue in the being which they already possess. It is a noble thing to have been created by God; it is still more

Bede and *In principium Genesis*

Following Augustine's *De genesi*, the genre of hexaëmeral commentary receives some much needed consolidation. Bede the Venerable (672–735)²¹⁰ indicates that he wrote *In principium Genesis* (c. 709)²¹¹ for students who were unable to obtain the many classic commentaries on Genesis. He tells his readers explicitly that he has access to and has drawn from not only *De genesi*, but also Eustathius' Latin translation of Basil's

noble to rest in Him" (O'Toole, "The Philosophy of Creation in the Writings of St. Augustine," 100).

²¹⁰ While Bede is best known for the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, he did not primarily write history, but rather commentaries on Scripture, sermons, and at least three single-volume copies of the Bible. Cf. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Historical Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 2; and Michelle P. Brown, "Bede's Life in Context," in *The Cambridge Companion to Bede*, ed. Scott DeGregorio (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 9–10. Cf. also Rosalind Love, "The World of Latin Learning," in *The Cambridge Companion to Bede*, ed. Scott DeGregorio (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 51 and 137.

²¹¹ Beda Uenerabilis, *Libri quattuor in principium Genesis usque ad natiuitatem Isaac et eiectiōem Ismahelis adnotationum*, ed. Charles W. Jones, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 118A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967), hereafter *In principium Genesis* and cited by paragraph number. English translation: *Bede, On Genesis*, trans. Calvin Kendall (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008). On the date of *On Genesis*, cf. Charles Jones prefatory comments to the *Corpus Christianorum* edition, viii; Timothy J. Furry, *Allegorizing History: The Venerable Bede, Figural Exegesis, and Historical Theory* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publishers, 2013), 68; Charles Plummer, *Venerabilis Baedae opera* historic (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896), 1:cxlix; and Calvin Kendall's "Appendix 1" in *On Genesis*, ed. Calvin Kendall (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), 323–26.

Hexaëmeron, and unnamed writings by Ambrose.²¹² Bede sets forth “to gather from all of these, as if from the most delightful fields of a widely blooming paradise, those things which would seem sufficient for the needs of the weak.”²¹³

Bede argues that the very first sentence of Genesis proclaims the excellence of the Creator. “By introducing the creation of the world in the first sentence, Holy Scripture appropriately displays at once the eternity and omnipotence of God the creator.”²¹⁴ Bede takes this passage to be introduction to the Father, whereas the following verses introduce the Son and Spirit: the Spirit hovers over the waters, and the Son is the Word spoken.²¹⁵ Hence, the narrative of the first day shows that creation is a work of the whole Trinity.²¹⁶

²¹² Cf. Kendall’s comment in Bede, *On Genesis*, 65 n. 2.

²¹³ *In principium Genesis* preface 1.

²¹⁴ *In principium Genesis* 3.

²¹⁵ *In principium Genesis* 8. He reinforces this reading with reference to John’s prologue and Psalm 32:6: “By the word of the Lord the heavens were established”

²¹⁶ Bede points to the creation of humanity as the best proof of the Trinity, in whose image man was made, an example of “cooperative power” of the Trinity (*In genesim* 27). Because all of creation is a work of the Trinity, Bede proposes that the triad of “make” phrases, “God said, let it be made... And God made... And God saw that it was good,” is evidence that the Trinity is at work in the entire creative process (*In principium Genesis* 26). Bede’s source for this is Augustine, *De genesi* 2.8.16–20, 4.29.6, 4.31.48. Bonaventure adopts this triadic formula in *Breviloquium* II.12.

Bede departs from Augustine's non-temporal interpretation of the first day. He holds that the light withdrew so that the darkness of evening could cover the earth: "*And there was evening*, with the light setting after the completed period of the length of the day."²¹⁷ The primordial light has a corporeal effect such that its movement creates a markedly different state of affairs on earth. He writes, "If someone asks what kind of daily light there could have been before the creation of the heavenly bodies, it is not wide of the mark to suppose that it would have been such as we see every day in the morning—that is, when the sunrise approaches. . . ."²¹⁸ Moreover, Bede believes that the length of the day on the first day is twenty-four hours. "At this point, *one* day was completed—without a doubt a day of twenty-four hours."²¹⁹ The word "day" follows the common use of the term, a point that he reiterates in his comments on the fourth day; although the celestial bodies are created to divide time, the "normal" division of days and nights already exists.²²⁰

Although Bede avers that the days should be interpreted temporally, he nonetheless adopts Augustine's three-fold division of the days according to the aliquot,

²¹⁷ *In principium* Genesis 9. Compare with Augustine, *De genesi* 1.9.17 and 1.17.32.

²¹⁸ *In principium* Genesis 18.

²¹⁹ *In principium* Genesis 9.

²²⁰ *In principium* Genesis 15–16.

and names the parts of this division “production,” “distinction,” and “formation” or “completion.” The work of production happens on the first day, distinction on the second and third days, and formation on the final three days. This division of days, corresponding to the perfect number, leads to perfect form in the world. “The world proceeded in perfectly proper order from unformed matter to harmonious form.”²²¹ The firmament divides water from water, establishing “limits prescribed for them in the Word of God.”²²² Like Ambrose, Bede proposes that this formative and bounding work is part of drawing the world toward its perfection, which is not “the completion of the work but... the predestination of [God’s] own will.”²²³

Following the general contours of the hexaëmeral genre, Bede understands the perfection of creation in anthropocentric terms. Drawing creation toward form and completion is for the benefit of humans who, in perceiving the goodness of creation, are drawn to the contemplation of God.²²⁴ “But after the habitation of the earth had been

²²¹ *In principium* Genesis 15.

²²² *In principium* Genesis 11.

²²³ *In principium* Genesis 14.

²²⁴ *In principium* Genesis 19; Bede cites Augustine, *Contra aduersarium* 1.7.10.

made and adorned, it remained for the inhabitator and lord of things himself to be created, for whose sake all things were ordained."²²⁵

Humanity is distinct from God's making of the rest of the world insofar as the pattern and image after which the human is created is God himself in his triune essence. Adam was created "just, holy, and true." However, unlike Ambrose's interpretation of the Incarnational symbolism of the human body, Bede emphasizes the ascetic importance of formation. Hence, Adam's body does not *prefigure* the body of Christ, *per se*, but rather Adam's uprightness makes his body suitable to receive the soul and thereby reflects the moral uprightness of his Creator.²²⁶ Sin, by contrast, results in the loss of humanity's rectitude and dominion. Adam's healing requires the restoration of creation through a "second Adam," one who is "without change in the image of God. . . in order to restore his image and likeness in us. . . "²²⁷ Thus, Christ restores Adam to the image of God by the human's living in harmony with the source of the image. Bede even reinforces the correspondence of the days of creation and the ages of history with

²²⁵ *In principium Genesis 24: "Facta autem atque ornata habitatione mundana, supererat ut ipse etiam propter quem omnia parabantur habitator ac dominus rerum crearetur, sequitur, et ait, faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram."*

²²⁶ *In principium Genesis 26. Cf. Augustine, De genesi 6.12.*

²²⁷ *In principium Genesis 25–26.*

the “second Adam” Christology of Romans: just as the days of creation progress toward

Adam, who is a type of Christ, the ages progress toward Christ, the new Adam.²²⁸

Indeed, the events of the sixth day—the creation of the land animals and mankind—

prefigure the sixth age, which is the age of salvation.²²⁹

In the sixth age of the world, in addition to many sinners, who could rightly be compared to serpents and beasts... there [were] also born many saints among the people of God, who knew how to ruminate the word of God in the likeness of clean animals chewing the cud, to maintain the hood of discretion on the road, to bear the yoke of the good work of the divine Law, and to warm the poor from the fleece of their own sheep.²³⁰

This sixth age heralds the advent of the second Adam, from whose side come the

sacraments that bear forth the Church.²³¹ Likewise, the seventh day indicates an

additional perfection that exceeds the perfection of the number six. The Sabbath

²²⁸ The stepped progress of the days is an allegory for the progress of the ages, which gradually move toward the sixth. Here, Bede draws not on Augustine’s *De genesi*, but rather Augustine’s exposition of the ages of the world in *Civitate Dei* 10.4, 16.43 and 22.30. Bede also cites Wisdom 11:21 in conjunction with the number six, though without explicitly denoting measure, number, and weight as divine ideas, as Augustine had.

²²⁹ Bede composed a hymn about the six days, the second stanza of which reads: “But over the days that correspond / To the Ages of fleeting time / He ornamented the globe and sky / And the whole fabric of the world” (“A Hymn on the Work of the First Six Days and the Six Ages of the World,” in *On the Nature of Things and on Times*, trans. Calvin Kendall and Faith Wallis [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010], 180).

²³⁰ *In principium Genesis* 38.

²³¹ *In principium Genesis* 38.

introduces a “mystical blessing and sanctification” that the sixth day does not possess.²³²

Moreover, seven signifies a coming divine judgment and consummation, an eighth day that points not only to rest, but to re-creation.²³³ Here, Bede departs from Augustine’s eschatological interpretation of the seventh day by interpreting the blessing of rest in soteriological and Christological terms.

For just as the blood of the Lord’s passion, which had to be poured out once for the salvation of the world, was signified by the frequent, indeed, daily sacrifices under the Law, so also by the rest of the seventh day, which always used to be celebrated after the work of the six days, was prefigured that great day of the Sabbath, on which the Lord was to rest once in the grave, after having completed and perfected on the sixth day all his works. . . .²³⁴

Bede’s compiling and consolidating efforts lead to the developments of the Scholastic period, in which thinkers like Hugh and Peter Lombard not only continue to accentuate important structural themes from the hexaëmeral genre, but to make important contributions of their own. Of particular importance is the threefold division of creation, formation-distinction, and adornment, which appears to originate, albeit inchoately, in Bede’s interpretation of Augustine’s aliquot division of the days.

²³² *In principium Genesis* 32.

²³³ *In principium Genesis* 34.

²³⁴ *In principium Genesis* 35.

Hugh of St. Victor and the *De sacramentis* and *De tribus diebus*

Hugh of St. Victor (c. 1096–1141) writes about the Hexaëmeron and the seventh day in at least two places: *De sacramentis Christianæ fidei*²³⁵ and *De tribus diebus*.²³⁶ In *De sacramentis*, he attempts to comprehensively present the truths of the Christian faith according to the logic of creation and re-creation, by which he divides the text into two books.²³⁷ Hugh treats Genesis 1–2:4a near the beginning of the first book, where he proposes, like Bede had, a three-fold order of the six days. Hugh, however, departs from Augustine and Bede by placing God’s simultaneous act of creation before the days,

²³⁵ Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis Christianæ fidei*, ed. Rainer Berndt (Munster: Aschendorff, 2008). English translation from Hugh of St. Victor, *On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007). Cf. Michael T. Girolimon, “Hugh of St Victor’s *De sacramentis Christianæ fidei*: The Sacraments of Salvation,” *Journal of Religious History* 18, no. 2 (1994): 127.

²³⁶ Hugh of St. Victor, *De tribus diebus*, ed. Dominique Poirel, *Corpus Christianorum Continuato Medievalis* 177 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), hereafter *De tribus*, followed by paragraph number. English translation from Hugh of St. Victor, “On the Three Days,” in *Trinity and Creation*, ed. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter (New York: New City Press, 2011), 61–102.

²³⁷ Hugh argues that in order to discuss the work of salvation, or what he calls “restoration” — the proper object of theology — one must know the work of creation, which he calls “foundation.” Hugh’s theology as a whole is grounded in the relationship between foundation and restoration. Cf. Boyd Taylor Coolman’s “General Introduction,” in *Trinity and Creation*, 26–27.

followed by the subsequent processes of distinction and formation.²³⁸ In *De tribus diebus*, Hugh treats the sixth, seventh, and eight days as spiritual states that correspond to Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and Easter Sunday.

Creation, Hugh says, is a “sacrament” or symbol of salvation.²³⁹ By this, he means that the six days provide the groundwork for understanding the grand arc of salvation in six ages. The seeds of restoration are hidden in the work of foundation, and the invisible order is concealed within the visible. For instance, whereas Augustine interprets the light of the first day as a sign of the exemplarity of the creator, Hugh holds with Bede that the light of the first day is corporeal and a dim reflection of what is to come. “This light made in the beginning to illumine corporeal things was without doubt corporeal.”²⁴⁰ Similarly, Hugh stresses that the conversion of unformed things to formed over the six days is a *sacrament* of the restoration of the world in six ages.²⁴¹ The

²³⁸ Hugh also treats the literal sense of Genesis 1 in his *Adnotationes elucidatoriae in Pentateuchum* (PL 175.29–114), following Bede’s structure of creation, distinction, and adornment, but with the amendments offered in *De sacramentis*.

²³⁹ Hugh defines a *symbolum* as a “juxtaposition... of visible forms brought forth to demonstrate some invisible matter,” in his commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius’ *Celestial Hierarchy* 3 (PL 177, 960D); cited in Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*, 103.

²⁴⁰ *De sacramentis* 1.1.9.

²⁴¹ *De sacramentis* 1.1.12: “I think that here a great sacrament is commended, because every soul, as long as it is in sin, is in a kind of darkness and confusion. But it

rational creature was made not only to possess being, imparted on the sixth day, but to become “beautiful being” through “the conversion of love” in the sixth age.²⁴² Hugh argues that the “intervals of time” in the Hexaëmeron are symbolic of the process of formation and growth that was to follow the days of creation. Hence, what was made in the six days was already made in some sense incomplete, even before the corruption of sin, and was destined to become “beautiful.”²⁴³ The work of restoration not only overcomes the corruption of sin; it returns mankind to the original plan of formation.

Like Augustine, Hugh believes that creation from nothing happens simultaneously. However, the narrative of the six days tells us not only of this simultaneous creation, which in Hugh’s mind proceeds the days, but also of God’s imposition of distinction, order, and beautiful form upon creation, acts which entail time and temporal development. “In six days God disposed, and ordered, and *reduced* to form all that he had made. And He completed His work on the sixth day.”²⁴⁴ The

can not emerge from its confusion and be disposed to the order and form of justice, unless it be first illumined to see its evils, and to distinguish itself to order and conform to truth. Thus, therefore, a soul lying in confusion can not do without light, and on this account it is necessary first that light be made. . . .” Cf. *De sacramentis* 1.1.28–29.

²⁴² *De sacramentis* 1.1.3.

²⁴³ *De sacramentis* 1.1.3.

²⁴⁴ *De sacramentis* 1.1.7.

general momentum that is already established in day one—from the lack of form toward greater, more complete form—is expressed in the following days in two ways: in the gradual accrual of form over the six days, on the one hand, and in two distinct processes of distinction on the first three days and adornment on the second three days, on the other.²⁴⁵

The first day brings the distinction of corporeal light and darkness (see above). On the second day, the waters above and below the firmament are distinguished.²⁴⁶ The dry land and vegetation of the third day add greater formation and distinction to the material realm. Thus, the first three days instill “eternal laws” in the operations of the cosmos, such as the motion of light and time, the movement of water, and the cycles of organic life.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁵ Cf. Boyd Taylor Coolman, *The Theology of Hugh of St. Victor: an Interpretation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 39, 43, and 116.

²⁴⁶ *De sacramentis* 1.1.23. The division of waters presents an interesting theological situation: why is it that the waters on earth are gathered together, while the waters in heaven are not? Hugh concludes that condensation and gathering of water on earth reflects the constraining and disciplining of the “lower affection of the soul,” whereas the diffusion of waters in the heavens reflects the extension and diffusion of charity among the saints. The principle behind this interpretation comes from his understanding of the development toward completion that is inherent in corporeal creation, which itself is an application of Augustine’s argument that the lower, visible order always reflects the higher order. Cf. Augustine, *De genesi* 4.4.9.

²⁴⁷ *De sacramentis* 1.1.22 and 1.1.24.

Hugh's view that the light must have been corporeal prompts him, as it did Bede, to comment on the first and fourth days together. He clarifies Bede's position on the corporeality of the light by arguing that only a corporeal and visible light could literally illuminate material and visible things.²⁴⁸ Hugh suggests that the light of the first day is actually the sun in a simple and inchoate state. He asks, "But who knows whether that same light was not afterwards transformed into the substance of the sun, and with increased clarity received a better form. . . ?"²⁴⁹ He answers this question by constructing an analogy of the light and the transformation of water at the Wedding at (John 2). Just as the water is formed into something more complete and perfected through Jesus' miracle, so too the primordial light is brought to a more complete and lasting state on the fourth day. "For there was light before the sun was made; and for this reason there was water before it was changed into wine, not that something else might be made which was displayed as preferable, but that it might be made from the same thing which before was considered cheaper."²⁵⁰

²⁴⁸ *De sacramentis* 1.1.9. Cf. Augustine, *De genesi* 1.10–11 and 1.20.40, and Bede, *In principium Genesis* 18.

²⁴⁹ *De sacramentis* 1.1.15.

²⁵⁰ *De sacramentis* 1.1.15.

Hugh extends the correlation of the first and fourth days to the subsequent days, as he relates the second and fifth days, and the third and sixth days. As the firmament, divided on the first day, is adorned on the fourth day, so too the air and water divided on the second day are adorned on the fifth day, and the land distinguished from the water on the third day is adorned on the sixth day. He adds that the ultimate work of the sixth day is mankind, which transcends the whole process in some sense: “man was made not as an adornment of the earth, but as is lord and possessor, so that his creation, for whose sake the earth was made, should not be referred to the earth.”²⁵¹ The literal truth of the second three days, he argues, is that creation was made for man, but that man, created last of all, is made to adorn the highest heavens.²⁵² In this way, Hugh sees the relationship of microcosm and macrocosm through the lens of mankind, who is created in the image of God.²⁵³ So, just as the world was made unformed, destined to be

²⁵¹ *De sacramentis* 1.1.25.

²⁵² *De sacramentis* 1.1.25.

²⁵³ Cf. Philo, *Opif.* §82. Cf. also Gunar Freibergs, “The Medieval Latin Hexaëmeron from Bede to Grosseteste” (University of Southern California, 1981), 128–31. Compare with Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*, 33.

formed and perfected over the process of the six days, in a similar manner the rational creature is made in the image, destined for greater formation in the likeness.²⁵⁴

Hugh employs Augustine's correlation of the six days and six ages; in the same way that the days progress teleologically toward complete form, history progresses soteriologically toward restoration.²⁵⁵

For we call the works of foundation the creation of all things, when the latter, which were not made to be; but the works of restoration, wherein the sacrament of redemption was fulfilled or was figured by which those things which had perished were restored. Therefore, the works of foundation are those which were made at the beginning of the world in six days; but the works of restoration, those which from the beginning of the world are made in six ages for the renewal of man.²⁵⁶

Hugh does not apply the twofold division of distinction and adornment to the six ages as we might expect him, especially given that he compares the creation of mankind to the Incarnation, thereby implying the same progression from form to beautiful form

²⁵⁴ *De sacramentis* 1.1.5. Hugh takes this to be the overarching agenda in interpreting the Hexaëmeron, as he elaborates in *De sacramentis* 1.1.28: "We have proposed to treat in this work, in so far as the Lord will allow, of the sacrament of man's redemption, which was formed from the beginning in the works of restoration. But since the works of foundation were first in time, we have begun our discussion with these, that thence we may make our way to the other works which follow in their order."

²⁵⁵ *De sacramentis* 1.1.29.

²⁵⁶ *De sacramentis* 1.1.28.

that was inherent in the Hexaëmeron to salvation history. One could infer from this a comparison to distinction and adornment, but Hugh does not make this explicit.

Hugh's development of the seventh day comes primarily in *De tribus diebus*.²⁵⁷

This short work is a two-part treatise on the three divine attributes of power, wisdom, and goodness, which Hugh ultimately likens to the sixth and seventh days of creation, and an eighth day. The first part of *De tribus* is devoted to explaining a three-part process of introspection and return to the Wisdom of God that corresponds to God's attributes, and then returning to creation, seeing it rightly through the divine attributes.²⁵⁸ The second part argues that the attributes correspond to fear, truth, and charity, which themselves correspond to the persons of the Father, Son, and Spirit respectively. Hugh presents this three-fold correspondence as three days and then aligns these days first with the three days of Christ's passion and second with the sixth, seventh, and eighth day of creation. He says, "The first day pertains to death; to the

²⁵⁷ Cf. *De sacramentis* 2.8 for a discussion of Sabbaths internal and external to God. The first is the creation Sabbath, the seventh day. This external Sabbath is the "sacrament" of the eternal rest that is internal to God. The second external Sabbath is that which man observes, and is the sacrament of the internal rest of the mind in God. Hugh ascribes the Sabbath rest internal to man to the Holy Spirit. This Sabbath is achieved through observing the second external Sabbath and by protecting the conscience.

²⁵⁸ *De tribus* 25.3. Cf. Coolman, *Theology of Hugh*, 86–87, and Paul Rorem, *Hugh of Saint Victor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 63.

second, burial; to the third, resurrection.”²⁵⁹ As the soul progresses in contemplation through these three days, it also passes from wonder, to truth, and finally to love. Such a contemplative movement also has a Trinitarian character, as he indicates: “Power arouses fear; wisdom enlightens; kindness brings joy.”²⁶⁰ Thus Hugh posits that the end of contemplation is Love. And he concludes, “On the day of kindness, we rise through love and desire of eternal goods.”²⁶¹

By referring to Christ’s burial rest, Hugh’s allusion to the seventh day of rest is unmistakable.²⁶² Recall that Ambrose established a figural relationship between the sixth day—the creation of Adam—and the first day of the Triduum. Moreover, Ambrose linked the seventh day of rest to Holy Saturday—Christ’s burial and rest in a human body. Hugh completes the correspondence with the Triduum by positing, with

²⁵⁹ *De tribus* 27.3, and at greater length, *De tribus* 27.4: “Christ died on the sixth day, lay buried in the tomb on the seventh, and rose on the eighth day, so that in a similar way through fear the power of God on its day may first cut us away from carnal desires outside, and then wisdom on his day may bury us within the hidden place of contemplation; and finally, kindness on its day may cause us to rise revived through desire of divine love.” Compare with Ambrose, *Exameron* 9.10. Cf. Coolman, *Theology of Hugh*, 95.

²⁶⁰ *De tribus* 27.4.

²⁶¹ Cf. Bonaventure, *Reduction* 26.

²⁶² Contrast with Rorem, *Hugh of St. Victor*, 62–65, who omits reference to the days of creation and the day of rest.

Augustine, an eighth day, the day of the Spirit, which is the day of Christ's resurrection. For the contemplative, the resurrection day signifies the mind's union with God through love. Thus, Hugh sees a progression in the Hexaëmeron, which is completed in the creation of man, and in this respect largely continues the tradition of hexaëmeral interpretation established in the preceding authors. Hugh's interpretation of the seventh day, however, marks a substantial development in figural reading of God's rest and its relationship to humanity. For it is God's rest, read figurally through the work of rational contemplation, the Passion, the divine attributes, and virtue, that provides material for recognizing a supernatural *telos* in the work accomplished over the first six days.

Peter Lombard and the *Sentences*

Peter Lombard (1100–1160) repeats (verbatim at times) Hugh's understanding of the six days.²⁶³ Lombard also differentiates creation (*creare*) and formation (*facere*). He adopts Hugh's division of the process of formation into two series of days: distinction (days 1–3), and adornment (days 4–6).²⁶⁴ The temporal process of creation reflects God's

²⁶³ All references to Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, 2 vol. (Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1971–81); hereafter *Sent.* Citations will include the book number, distinction, chapter, and, when necessary, paragraph number. For English translation, Peter Lombard, *The Sentences*, trans. Guilio Silano, vol. 2 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2008).

²⁶⁴ 2 *Sent.* 12.

providential design: “On these days (1–3), the four elements of the world were differentiated and ordered in their places. But on the next three days (4–6), these four elements were adorned.”²⁶⁵ Thus, Lombard, like Bede and Hugh, modify Augustine’s theory of simultaneity, holding that the entire work of creation, distinction, and formation took place “at intervals of time and over the course of six days.”²⁶⁶ Indeed, he repeats Hugh’s argument that, “In six days God distinguished and reduced to their proper forms all that he had made materially and simultaneously.”²⁶⁷

Lombard affirms Augustine’s belief that the first creative act entails angelic being; it also includes, however, the creation of the elements. This happens not on day one, but “before any day.”²⁶⁸ Elemental matter at this stage was “unformed” and chaotic, an amalgam of the elements. He explains that formless matter was not entirely without form — “since no corporeal thing can exist which has no form” — but rather that

²⁶⁵ 2 *Sent.* 14.9.2.

²⁶⁶ 2 *Sent.* 12.1.2. Lombard comments at length on his view in contrast to Augustine’s in the subsequent chapter (12.2), discussing the debate in the tradition of hexaëmeral genre over the temporality or simultaneity of the days. Sources Lombard cites include Augustine’s *De genesi* and the earlier *De genesi contra Manichaeos*, Gregory’s *Moralia*, Jerome’s *Hebraicae questiones in libro Genesis*, and Bede’s *In principium Genesis*. He also touches on this disagreement again in 15.5.2–15.6.2.

²⁶⁷ 2 *Sent.* 12.5.4. Cf. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1.1.7.

²⁶⁸ 2 *Sent.* 12.1.2

the being was not complete in its form.²⁶⁹ Hence, over the first three days, the material elements (the luminous, translucent, and opaque) were given form that is no longer confused and mixed.²⁷⁰ Lombard describes adornment in the same way that Hugh did in *De sacramentis*: the days of adornment parallel the days of distinction. First, the heavens (firmament) were adorned with the luminaries; second, the waters and air were adorned with fish and fowl; third, the earth was adorned with beasts.²⁷¹ The seventh day, God's rest, represents the completion of the work of the six days and God's blessing and sanctification of that work.²⁷² He also recognizes the symbolism of the eighth day by which the seventh day returns to the first day. Missing, however, is Hugh's commentary on the eschatological and spiritual value of the eighth day.²⁷³

Robert Grosseteste and the *Hexaëmeron*

Robert Grosseteste (1175–1253) also uses the creation-distinction-adornment scheme to divide the six days in his *Hexaëmeron* (c. 1232–1235).²⁷⁴ Creation proceeds

²⁶⁹ 2 *Sent.* 12.5.2.

²⁷⁰ 2 *Sent.* 13.1 (Day 1: light), 14.1 (Day 2: firmament), and 14.7 (Day 3: land).

²⁷¹ 2 *Sent.* 14.9.2.

²⁷² 2 *Sent.* 13.5.4; 15.8.1; 15.9.2; 15.10.3.

²⁷³ 2 *Sent.* 15.10.2.

²⁷⁴ All references from Robert Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron*, ed. Richard C. Dales and Servus Geiben, *Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982);

through the power of the Word.²⁷⁵ While this happens before the first day, the creation of the light is not itself in eternity. Rather, Grosseteste distinguishes, as does Augustine, between the action of God as outside of time, and the result of that action as being in time.²⁷⁶ The creation of light, which happens before the first day, gives rise to an illumination of material light by which the first, second, and third days take place.²⁷⁷ Thus, what takes place before the first day is *creation ex nihilo*, and what follows is the distinction of the elements from this first primordial light. The work of adornment, which follows on the second three days, parallels the first three days. “The ethereal fire. . . had first to be adorned with the luminaries. Then the elements of air and water were to be adorned with the birds and with the fish. . . In the third place, the earth was to be

English translation by Robert Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron*, trans. C. F. J. Martin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996). On the date of the *Hexaëmeron*, cf. Freibergs, “The Medieval Latin Hexaëmeron from Bede to Grosseteste,” 255–256. Freibergs argues that “The *Hexaëmeron* represents, then, probably the closest to what might be a synthesis of Grosseteste’s knowledge and mature thought on the universe, nature and man, acquired over more than a quarter century of scholarly endeavor. It is one of the most important and influential works that he wrote, and a crucial document for our understanding of the philosophy and theology of the early thirteenth century.” On Grosseteste’s sources, cf. Freibergs, 257–258, and Dales and Geiben, “Introduction,” in *Hexaëmeron*, xii–xvii.

²⁷⁵ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 2.1.2–3.

²⁷⁶ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 2.3.2.

²⁷⁷ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 2.4.1.

adorned with animals, so that the human being can be brought into its worldly dwelling place when that dwelling place was completed and adorned."²⁷⁸

Grosseteste sees adornment as a second kind of creation in that those creatures which adorn are not the same as the elements in which they exist. For instance, the fish that swim in the water are not themselves water. The ramification of this point, he indicates, is that the three-step process of creation-distinction-adornment has a momentum toward particular life-forms, and not elemental existence considered generally. However, unlike the hexaëmeral authors before him, he sees this momentum as having been partly resolved in the vegetative souls already created on the third day. He claims, "that which has life is better and nobler than that which is not living, and since plants are living things in virtue of the their vegetative soul, then even if there were no animals and human beings to adorn the earth, the earth would be more nobly adorned by plants than is the firmament by the stars."²⁷⁹ Nevertheless, it is mankind that is the "*summa similitudo*," that one that above all others is most like God.²⁸⁰

²⁷⁸ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 5.1.3.

²⁷⁹ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron*, 142.

²⁸⁰ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 8.1.1. Cf. J.T. Muckle, "The Hexameron of Robert Grosseteste: The First Twelve Chapters of Part Seven," *Mediaeval Studies* 6 (1944): 152; and Freibergs, "The Medieval Latin Hexaëmeron from Bede to Grosseteste," 267.

Grosseteste makes another notable contribution to the genre in that he is the first to comment on the fourth day as the *medium* of the days. He says,

For in the seven days that belong to the establishment of the world, the fourth day, one which the lights were established, has the middle place; for the fourth is the mid-point of an order of seven parts. It is fitting to the beauty of a disposition that when things are disposed according to an odd number, the first should match the last, the second the penultimate, and the third the antepenultimate, and so on: until one reaches the one in the middle, which has a special privilege relative to the things that are disposed on either side.²⁸¹

Beauty, Grosseteste says, is a matter of relative proportion and arrangement. Considering the seven days as a whole, even though the seventh day is not a day of work, the fourth day takes on a “special privilege” in that it mediates the work of the previous three days to the final days. It is curious, however, that Grosseteste does not consider the relationship of the first to the fourth given the correspondence of the luminaries to the primordial light.

Alexander of Hales and the *Summa Fratris Alexandri*

Alexander of Hales (c. 1185–1245), like Hugh and Lombard, does not write a distinct *Hexaëmeron*. Rather, Alexander treats the days of creation within the context of the much larger project of the *Summa Fratris*.²⁸² Alexander repeats Lombard’s

²⁸¹ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 5.1.1.

²⁸² All references to Alexander of Hales, *Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales Summa theologica*, ed. Constantino Koser, 4 vols. (Grottaferrata: Collegii s. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1979); hereafter *Summa Fratris*. Citations will include the book number

differentiation of *creare* and *facere*, by explaining that the work of angelic creation coincides with the work of material creation before day one.²⁸³ All things, the *Summa Fratris* says, are made by God, the “highest perfection,” simultaneously. Yet, God fashions them in the subsequent days.²⁸⁴ Beginning in his comments on day one, Alexander adopts Hugh’s language of distinction and adornment,²⁸⁵ The “*opus divisionus*” occurs on the first three days, and the “*opus ornatus*” takes place on the second three days.²⁸⁶ Alexander, however, frames the work of formation that takes place over the six days in terms of Aristotle’s physics. The work before the days creates a potency that is actualized in form over the six days.²⁸⁷ Likewise, he adopts the language

and part, followed by the inquisition, tractus, question, and, when applicable, chapter and titulus.

²⁸³ *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.2 (305).

²⁸⁴ *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.2.1.c4 (321): “*Deo autem est summa perfectio; ergo simul omnia fecit.*” As such, all things are made in “one day” (“*ergo in una die fecit omnia*”), although per Gregory: “*Gregorius: ‘Omnia simul creata sunt, quia in materia simul facta sunt quae de eis habent originem, sed non in specie, quae sequentibus diebus est ostensa’*” (2.1.3.2.1.4 [321]).

²⁸⁵ *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.1.1 (305).

²⁸⁶ *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.2 (319): “*De rerum corporalium distinctione et ornatu seu de opere sex dierum.*” Against Augustine, Alexander sides with Gregory and Lombard on the temporality of the six days: “*Sed de factione rerum potest esse controversia, et hoc designat Gregorius qui dicit omnia simul esse facta in substantia: fieri enim in substantia est fieri in materia, et hoc est creari. - Quod concedimus*” (2.1.3.2.1 [321]).

²⁸⁷ *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.2.1.1 (319): “*Ad quod videtur dicendum quod, sive ‘factum’ dicatur communiter ad creatum sive proprie, sicut distinguitur in libro Geneseos, omnia*

of *genera* and *species* to discuss distinction and formation. Alexander cites Bede and Peter Lombard on the comparison of the distinction of the first day and the adornment of the fourth day. He is particularly occupied with the question of what happens to the light of the first day with the creation of the luminaries on the fourth.²⁸⁸ In the end, he explains, with Hugh, that the luminaries are the adornment of the distinction of the element of light, which had hitherto been imperfectly formed.²⁸⁹

Bonaventure's Reception of the Hexaëmeral Genre

Bonaventure possessed a great many of the sources examined above, perhaps through the compiling efforts of Bede and the systematic writing of Hugh of St. Victor, whose *De sacramentis* is patterned after a division of creation and re-creation, which Hugh received in a nascent form from Bede, and which Hugh develops in his commentary on the Hexaëmeron. While Philo only appears twice in Bonaventure's works according to the index of his *Opera Omnia* (in the *Collations in Hexaëmeron*), he

dicuntur facta simul ratione materiae; et quia materia non fuit denudata sive nuda a forma aliqua, dicuntur omnia esse facta, sed non in propria forma neque in numero, sed in aliqua forma, quae ratione materiae suae et ratione sui habuit possibilitatem obedientiae ad omne quod voluit Deus facere de illa creatura."

²⁸⁸ *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.2.1.5 (322).

²⁸⁹ *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.2.3.1 (348): "*Ornatus autem est triplex secundum tria genera locorum: caelum et terram et corpus medium, quod continet aërem et aquam. Primo ergo agit de ornatu caeli; secundo de ornatu corporis medii; tertio, de ornatu corporis ultimi."*

approvingly cites the Alexandrian's reading of Genesis 1:25 and subsequent interpretation of the seventh day as symbolic of wisdom.²⁹⁰ Origen, on the other hand, is cited numerous times (twenty-eight instances according to the Quaracchi editors). Although not explicitly in the *Breviloquium*, Origen's *Homilies on Genesis* are cited in the *Apologia pauperum contra calumniatorem*.²⁹¹ He refers, albeit critically, to *De principiis* on two occasions in the Sentence commentary.²⁹²

Basil of Caesarea's *Homilies In Hexaëmeron* are cited a dozen times in the Sentence commentary, nine of which appear in book two.²⁹³ He cites Basil as an authority alongside others, including Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Pseudo-Dionysius, and John Damascene, who hold that matter received form, not simultaneously, but over a duration.²⁹⁴ Bonaventure, like Basil, treats creation like a

²⁹⁰ *Collationes in Hexaëmeron* 6.7 (V 361).

²⁹¹ *Apologia pauperum contra calumniatorem* 7.18 (VIII 278), citing Origen, "Homily 16 on Genesis," 5. Bonaventure attributes this text to Ambrose, however. Cf. the editor's note in *Opera Omnia* VIII 278 n. 2.

²⁹² *In 2 Sent.* 7.1.1 concl. (II 177), and *In 4 Sent.* 44.2.1.1 concl. (IV 921), citing *De principiis* 1.6 both times.

²⁹³ *In 2 Sent.* 4.2.2 (II 137), 13.1.2 (II 314), 14.1.1.1 (II 336–338), 14.2 dub. 2 (II 366), 14.2 resp. (II 368), 35 dub. 6 (II 839).

²⁹⁴ *In 2 Sent.* 12.1.2 (II 296), referring to Basil, *Hexaëmeron* 2.

revealed book which contains the seeds of an end.²⁹⁵ Ambrose of Milan's *Exameron* is influential on Bonaventure's treatment of the first chapter of Genesis in the Sentence commentary; the Quaracchi editors note at least four instances wherein the *Exameron* appears to be a source.²⁹⁶ In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure sees the entire story as ineluctably Christological. The sixth day, on which Adam was created, prefigures the sixth age, in which the second Adam comes.²⁹⁷ Ambrose's influence is, therefore, plausible.

Throughout his career, Bonaventure routinely consults Augustine's three commentaries on Genesis. Most frequently, he cites *De genesi ad litteram duodecim libri*.²⁹⁸ As will become clearer in the following chapter, Bonaventure adopts Augustine's concepts of measure, number, and weight, and the *rationes seminales* as expressions of the archetypal foundation of the cosmos, which is imparted in the work of creation.

²⁹⁵ Basil, Hexaëmeron 1.3, and *Brev.* II.2 (V 220).

²⁹⁶ *In 2 Sent.* 13.3 (II 309, 314), 14.1.3.2 concl. (II 348), 15.1 (II 370).

²⁹⁷ *Brev.* prol. 2 (V 203–204). Cf. Ambrose, *Exameron* 1.5, and 9.9–10.

²⁹⁸ *De genesi ad litteram duodecim libri* appears 178 times in the Sentence commentary, and three times in the *Breviloquium* (II.10, IV.13, VII.7 [V 228, 279, 289], in addition to an allusion in II.5 [V 225]) to Augustine's simultaneous interpretation of Genesis 1 in *De genesi ad litteram* 4, in contrast to what Bonaventure takes to be the position of the majority of the saints and doctors of the Church. Cf. Monti's note in *Breviloquium*, 76 n. 47.

However, Bonaventure sees this foundation as established before day one in the operation called “creation,” and which determines two other hexaemeral operations, namely, distinction and adornment.²⁹⁹ In this way, Bonaventure synthesizes Augustine’s and Hugh’s interpretations of the Hexaëmeron.

Bede’s and Hugh of St. Victor’s treatments of the Hexaëmeron, therefore, are touchstones for the *Breviloquium*. Bonaventure’s claim that a literal (temporal) reading of the Hexaëmeron reflects the opinions of the Fathers in *Brev.* II.5 is perhaps informed more by Bede’s *In principium genesis* than through extensive, first-hand knowledge of hexaëmeral commentaries written prior to Augustine’s *De genesi ad litteram duodecim libri*.³⁰⁰ Hugh’s *De sacramentis* is a source that Bonaventure refers to regularly throughout his works.³⁰¹ Bonaventure treats Bede’s innovation, reworked by Hugh, of the triad of creation-distinction-adornment as the standard division of the days in *Brev.* II.2–5. And, just as Hugh had developed this Christological symbolism as stages of

²⁹⁹ *Brev.* II.2 and II.5 (V 220 and 222): “Thus, in the beginning, before any passing of time. . .”

³⁰⁰ Bonaventure cites Bede’s *In principium Genesis* thirteen times, nine of which are found in *In 2 Sent.*

³⁰¹ 160 times across the corpus; 146 times in the Sentence commentary; four times in the *Breviloquium* (II.11, citing *De sacramentis* 1.6.5; II.12, citing 1.10.2; VI.1, citing 1.9.2; and VI.2, citing 1.8.12 and 1.11.6).

contemplative ascent, stating that love is the end of contemplative ascent, so too, Bonaventure sees the progressive structure of Christian thought as culminating in the “merit and reward of charity.”³⁰² Such charity is achieved in the form of a seven-fold endowment of glory granted in a seventh stage of eschatological rest which one can participate in now through contemplation of God, who is the beginning and end, as well as in prayer. To that end, he ends his *Breviloquium* with Anselm’s prayerful request to be made complete in joy and love.³⁰³

Bonaventure also receives the hexaëmeral genre through more contemporary, scholastic authors like Peter Lombard, Robert Grosseteste, and Alexander of Hales. Lombard’s influence is immeasurable; in the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure adopts Lombard’s modification of Augustine’s account of the foundation, placing it before any day.³⁰⁴ Likewise, Bonaventure follows Lombard and Hales by adopting Bede’s and Hugh’s division of the days of creation according to creation-distinction-adornment.³⁰⁵ He also employs Lombard’s distinction between creation (*creare*) and making (*facere*) in order to further clarify and refine the threefold separation of creation, distinction, and

³⁰² Brev. VII.7 (V 290).

³⁰³ Brev. VII.7 (V 290–291).

³⁰⁴ 2 Sent. 12.1.2; Brev. II.5 (V 222).

³⁰⁵ 2 Sent. 12.5.4, and 14.9.2; Brev. II.2 (V 220).

adornment.³⁰⁶ Accordingly, he is able to hold to a simultaneous *creatio ex nihilo*, while also holding to the temporal progression and correlation of days and age, and not only stages of angelic illumination, as Augustine had. Bonaventure sees Augustine's reading as one valid, yet spiritual interpretation of Genesis 1.³⁰⁷

Bonaventure not only copies directly from Robert Grosseteste's *Hexaëmeron*,³⁰⁸ the Seraphic Doctor's extensive use of the concept of the *medium*, especially within a set of seven, suggests that he knew of Grosseteste's comments in *Hexaëmeron* 5.1. Moreover, Grosseteste develops at length the of triad of creation-distinction-adornment, suggesting that Grosseteste's *Hexaëmeron* is part of the trusted set of texts that influenced Bonaventure's treatment of the *Hexaëmeron* in the *Breviloquium*.³⁰⁹ Lastly,

³⁰⁶ 2 *Sent.* 1.1; *Brev.* II.2 (V 220).

³⁰⁷ Cf. 2 *Sent.* 2.4 on Bonaventure's theory of angelic illumination, particularly article 3, question 2 where he adopts Augustine's language of evening and morning knowledge.

³⁰⁸ *Brev.* prol. 6 (V 208), citing Grosseteste, *De cessatione legalium*, 1.9.4, ed. Richard Dales and Edward King, *Britannici Medii Aevi*, 7 (London: Oxford University Press, 1986), 49. Cf. Monti's note in *Breviloquium*, 20 n. 51. The Quaracchi edition (vol. X, 277), which was completed before the critical edition of Grosseteste's works was completed, observes one occasion in the *Opera Omnia* where Bonaventure cites the Bishop of Lincoln: Grosseteste's *Testamenta duodecim Patriarcharum filiorum Iacob ad filios suos*, cited in *In 4 Sent.* 29. concl. 1 (IV 703).

³⁰⁹ The extent to which Grosseteste influenced his contemporaries is debated; cf. Irena Dorota Backus, *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), xv. However, according to Michael Robson,

Alexander of Hales was likely one of Bonaventure's instructors, and exerted some influence over Bonaventure, as the Quaracchi editors note.³¹⁰ Monti notes many occasions wherein the *Summa Fratris* plausibly supplies source material for

Grosseteste's preference for commentary on Scripture as the starting point of theological speculation is influential to Bonaventure's own method (Robson, "A Mendicant Perspective: Saint Bonaventure of Bagnoregio," in *Biblical Interpretation: The Meanings of Scripture—Past, Present, and Future*, ed. John M. Court [London: T&T Clark, 2003], 71). Kent Emery, moreover, proposes that "Grosseteste may have been an immediate source for Bonaventure on such crucial topics as the nature of light, the illumination of the intellect, and the notion that man is a *minor mundus*" (Emery, "Reading the World Rightly and Squarely," *Traditio* 39 [1983]: 184). Emery cites in support of his proposal, Camille C. Berube and Servus Gieben, "Guibert de Tournai et Robert Grosseteste: Sources inconnues de Saint Bonaventure, suivi de l'edition critique de trois chapitres du *Rudimentum Doctrinae de Guibert de Tournai*," in: *S. Bonaventura 1274-1974*, II, 627–54 (Grotteferrata: Collegio san Bonaventura, 1973), and Etienne Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*, trans. Dom Iltyd Trethowan (Patterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1965), 251–59. Gregory LaNave cites Henri Donneaud's claim that Grosseteste's commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* influences Bonaventure's own treatment of virtue (Donneaud, *Theologie et intelligence*, 476–79, cited in LaNave, "Bonaventure's Theological Method," 95, n. 53). Joshua Benson sees the influence of Grosseteste's *Cessation of the Laws*, among other influences on "the flow of topics" of the *Breviloquium* (Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 252, n. 12). Cf. also Timothy B. Noone, "Truth, Creation, and Intelligibility in Anselm, Grosseteste, and Bonaventure," in *Truth: Studies of a Robust Presence*, ed. Kurt Pritzl (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 102–126.

³¹⁰ Cf. *Opera Omnia*, V ix, xii, and xlvii. Bonaventure cites Alexander's *Summa* in the Sentence commentary. Cf. *In 2 Sent.* 14.2 dub. 2 (II 366), citing Alexander's *Summa* 2.51.1.

Bonaventure.³¹¹ Particularly, Alexander, like Lombard and Grosseteste, adopts the modified Augustinian theory of simultaneous *creatio ex nihilo* in light of the Hugonian three-fold division of creation-distinction-adornment.³¹²

It will become clear in the next two chapters that Bonaventure consolidates and synthesizes a tremendous amount of the hexaëmeral genre in the prologue and part II of the *Breviloquium*. Bonaventure's contribution to the genre in part II, as we will see, is his rigorous application of Augustine's theory of the seminal reasons to understand how temporal order can reflect divine order. Whereas Augustine, in Bonaventure's mind, separates historical time from the days of creation, Bonaventure insists that maintaining the connection between the time of creation and the time of history is essential for understanding time in a seminal manner. In this way, Bonaventure attempts to provide an interpretation of the days that is more faithful to Augustine's theology of seminal reasons than Augustine himself was.

Moreover, Bonaventure holds that the days are exemplary not only of times to come, but also of all creatures, for the days are the first archetype in which all subsequent order in creation is entailed. Here, he is able to draw together the

³¹¹ Cf. *Brev.* II.1 (V 219), and *Summa Fratris* 2.1.1.1.1.3.2 (II.1 9); and *Brev.* II.2 (V 220), and *Summa Fratris* 1.1.1.4.3.2.2 (I 235).

³¹² *Summa Fratris* 2.1.3.2 (319)

soteriological and Christological themes that Ambrose and Hugh developed, together with Augustine's correlation of the days and ages. In this way, Bonaventure gives a robust account of the relationship of micro- and macrocosm, showing not only that the human lifespan is reflected in the days of creation, but also the human person prefigures Christ, salvation history, and even eternal rest.

Looking beyond part II, Bonaventure extends the application of the insights of this genre to the overall task of the science of theology. Most notably, as we will see in chapter four, he synthesizes the threefold process of creation, distinction, and adornment with the attributes and operations of God, considering God “not only as the principle and effective exemplar of all things in creation, but also their restorative principle in redemption and their perfecting principle in remuneration.”³¹³ Hence, he reconciles and harmonizes the various and at times conflicting contributions of Augustine, Bede, and Hugh with the Christological and eschatological interpretations of Origen, Basil, and Ambrose. He applies this synthesis, as the next two chapters will argue, not only to his own discussion of the hexaëmeron in part II, but to the overall form and content of the *Breviloquium*.

³¹³ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210).

CHAPTER THREE

HEXAËMERAL ORDER IN *BREVILOQUIUM* II.1–2

In the last chapter, we saw that there are many ways to interpret Genesis 1-2:4a. Some theologians interpreted the creation account literally, and others interpreted it spiritually. Some emphasized the six days in which God made the world; others emphasized the seventh day upon which he rested; still others celebrated an eschatological “eighth day.” Indeed, considered as a genre, commentary on the Hexaëmeron consisted in a great array of cosmological, historical, and anthropological speculations. Not surprisingly, our commentators made use of a wide variety of interpretive frameworks. Bonaventure is no exception to this rule. In the prologue to the *Breviloquium*, he sees the Hexaëmeron as a symbol of the macrocosm of history and the microcosm of the human life. He refers to the six days of creation, but almost always to imply the seventh day, even if he does not treat it explicitly. He also refers to an eighth day.

The genre’s diversity of themes and interpretive strategies lends itself naturally to Bonaventure’s distinctive power of synthesis. In the prologue to the *Breviloquium*, he proposes to *elucidate* Sacred Scripture in seven parts, suggesting that the Hexaëmeron has a role to play in this task of making Scripture clear to *novi theologi*, just as the seven

days provide a paradigm for the seven ages of history and the seven ages of history provide a paradigm for the seven stages of an individual's life. Bonaventure's discussion of the Hexaëmeron in the second part of the *Breviloquium*, however, goes beyond the brief references in the prologue to give us a clearer and more expansive picture of the Seraphic Doctor's understanding of hexaëmeral order. In order to understand the role that the Hexaëmeron plays in Bonaventure's whole theology as presented in the *Breviloquium*, it is necessary first to understand its function in *Brev. II*, especially II.2. Accordingly, this chapter will explore the role of the Hexaëmeron in the opening chapters of *Brev. II*. The next chapter will apply the findings of this chapter in the form of an hexaëmeral reading of all seven parts of the *Breviloquium*.

Before turning to part two, I return briefly to the prologue in order to remind the reader that Bonaventure's treatment of the Hexaëmeron has ramifications not only for his doctrine of creation, which is ostensibly the major focus of part two, but for his understanding of the procession of Scriptural knowledge, which he explains is the subject of the entire text. In the prologue he presents the whole universe as something that can be "described" within the four dimensions of Scripture's breadth, length, height, and depth, and that he likens these four dimensions to "an intelligible cross."

Scripture, then, deals with the whole universe: the highest and the lowest, the first and the last, and everything that comes between. In a sense, it takes the form of an intelligible cross on which the entire world machine can be described and

in some way seen in the light of the mind. To understand this cross, one must know about God, the First Principle of all things, about the creation of those things, about their fall, about their redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ, about their reformation through grace, about their healing through the sacraments, and finally, about their remuneration through punishment or everlasting glory.³¹⁴

Seeing Scripture and creation in light of salvation as it unfolds in time mirrors the treatment of Scripture's length. Under the auspices of length, Bonaventure proposes that the days of creation, the ages of history, and the stages of human life all emanate from God, the providential source and exemplar of created order. Such an emanation, he believes, proceeds both to the macrocosm of creation and history (time), and the microcosm of human life. Moreover, Scripture, which is, the "highest science and doctrine," enlightens the reader by describing the cosmos according to the plan of salvation; it resolves "everything in God as its first and supreme principle."³¹⁵ He also holds that the mind, guided by faith, interprets this intelligible cross in a seven-fold manner, thereby comprehending the entire world, and, furthermore, therein comes to understand the 1) Creator, 2) the process of creation, 3) the fall of rational beings, 4)

³¹⁴ *Brev. prol. 6 (V 208).*

³¹⁵ *Brev. prol. 6 (V 208).* Scriptural knowledge comes "from God, that it treats of God, is according to God, and has God as its end." Monti suggests that Bonaventure's "*a Deo, de Deo, secundum Deum et propter Deum*" correspond to Aristotle's four causes (*Breviloquium*, 23, n. 57).

their redemption, 5) re-formation, 6) healing, and, ultimately, 7) their reunion with God or punishment.³¹⁶ In this manner, Scripture is shown to be the source from which knowledge about the whole world, its salvation, and its perfection is elucidated in a seven-fold manner.³¹⁷ Indeed, we can therefore already see here in the prologue that the pattern of the days of creation is an important ordering device for Bonaventure's theology in the *Breviloquium*.

***Brev.* II.1–2: Exposition**

In part two, Bonaventure compresses much of the tradition discussed in the previous chapter of this study, while simultaneously expanding his own treatment of creation and anthropology beyond that of the prologue. Before entering into an analysis of part two itself, however, we must first review the method and general structure of the twelve chapters of part two.

³¹⁶ He reiterates this in *Brev.* I.1 (V 210), as we will see in the next chapter.

³¹⁷ Cf. the *resumptio* of Bonaventure's inaugural sermon, "*Omnium artifex docuit me sapientia*," ed. Joshua Benson in, "Bonaventure's Inaugural Sermon at Paris: *Omnium artifex docuit me sapientia*, Introduction and Text," 517–562. There, Bonaventure gives a different seven-fold account of Scripture and the illumination of the mind. Cf. also *De reductione* 6 (V 321–322).

The Procedure and Structure of Part Two

First, we should recall that every chapter of the *Breviloquium* develops in nearly the exact same fashion. Bonaventure first dictates a truth of the faith and then in subsequent paragraphs, he unpacks that doctrine by appealing to some reason pertaining to the attributes of the First Principle (typically the appropriations of power, wisdom, or benevolence). This underscores the importance of the appropriations in Bonaventure's account, about which more will be said below.³¹⁸ From these reasons, he draws deductive conclusions about the topic in question. This is the method of each chapter in the entire "body" of the *Breviloquium*.

Second, we can briefly elaborate the structure of the twelve chapters of part two by dividing them into four interrelated sets. First, chapters 1, 5, and 12 concern the macrocosm of creation from the perspective of church teaching, Scripture, and the redemption of fallen creation. Second, chapters 2, 3, and 4 treat the production, existence, and influence of the physical world. Third, chapters six, seven, and eight discuss the creation, fall, and confirmation of angels. And fourth, chapters 9, 10, and 11 present Bonaventure's anthropology in which he combines his discussion of physical and spiritual nature in the union of soul and body. Bonaventure explicitly discusses the

³¹⁸ On the appropriations, see pages 127–129 and 135, fn. 373 of this study.

Hexaëmeron in two chapters of part two: chapter two, where he introduces the production of the physical world in terms of the Genesis 1 narrative; and chapter five where he doubles down on the Hexaëmeron as divine revelation, and which, therefore, contains knowledge of the First Principle that is both “sublime” and “saving.” In this chapter, we will focus especially on chapter two for in it Bonaventure presents an account of the Hexaëmeron that is deeper than that of the prologue. In order to do so, however, we will need first to see how Bonaventure’s description in *Brev.* II.1 of measure, number, weight, which are reflective of the Trinitarian appropriations, grounds his account of created order in *Brev.* II.2.

Brev. II.1 — Divine Perfection and Created Order

In *Brev.* II.1, Bonaventure thus begins by briefly stating what must be believed regarding the production of things in time. In language perhaps related to the decrees of Latern IV, Bonaventure states:

We should maintain the following belief. . . namely, that this entire world machine was brought into existence in time and from nothing by one First Principle, unique and supreme, whose power, though immeasurable, has arranged all things in measure, number, and weight.³¹⁹

³¹⁹ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219): “Circa quam haec tenenda sunt in summa videlicet quod universitas machinae mundialis producta est in esse ex tempore et de nihilo ab uno principio primo solo et summo cuius potentia licet sit immensa disposuit tamen omnia in certo pondere numero et mensura.” Cf. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1, ed. Norman Tanner (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990), 230: “We firmly believe and simply confess that there is only one true God, eternal and immeasurable, almighty, unchangeable, incomprehensible and ineffable, Father, Son and holy Spirit, three

The triad of measure, number, and weight, which originates in Christian discourse with Augustine, provides Bonaventure with an auspicious opening insofar as it provides him with a way to discuss in subsequent chapters the reflection of the divine attributes in the days of creation as well as in creatures themselves. This connection between the process of creation and divine perfection will help us see the link between the Hexaëmeron and the structure of the *Breviloquium* in the following chapter of this study.

The term “world machine” (*machina mundialis*), it should be noted, was a conventional way to refer to the structure of the world. One finds it, for example, in Hugh of St. Victor’s *De sacramentis*, *Libellus de formatione arche*, and the *Sententiae de divinitate*.³²⁰ In the *Breviloquium*, “world machine” entails the orderly way in which the

persons but one absolutely simple essence, substance or nature. The Father is from none, the Son from the Father alone, and the holy Spirit from both equally, eternally without beginning or end; the Father generating, the Son being born, and the holy Spirit proceeding; consubstantial and coequal, co-omnipotent and coeternal; one principle of all things, creator of all things invisible and visible, spiritual and corporeal; who by his almighty power at the beginning of time created from nothing both spiritual and corporeal creatures, that is to say angelic and earthly, and then created human beings composed as it were of both spirit and body in common.”

³²⁰ Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1.1.24, *Libellus de formatione arche* 11 (160.70), and *Sententiae de divinitate* 1 (929.40–930.85). Peter Lombard and Alexander of Hales also use the term in this way. Cf. Peter Lombard, 2 *Sent.* 14.9 and Alexander of Hales, *Summa Fratris* 2.1, inq. 1, tractatus 1, sectio 1, q. 1, cap. 3, art. 2 (9). Anton Houtepen notes Bernardus Sylvestris and Robert Grosseteste as sources for this term. Cf. “The Dialectics of the Icon: A Reference to God?” in *Iconoclasm and Iconoclasm: Struggle for Religious Identity*, ed. Willem van Asselt, et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 59.

world was made and operates. That order, Bonaventure stipulates, reflects five basic aspects of the Christian doctrine of creation.³²¹

First, God created the world in time, and as such it is not eternal. Bonaventure's most obvious opponent in this matter is Aristotle and certain of his heirs in the Islamic world and the medieval academy who held to the eternity of the world. However, he is also concerned to respond to, or at least modify Augustine's simultaneous model of creation before time, as he understands it.³²²

Second, Bonaventure stipulates that God created the world from nothing, and not from some pre-existing substance. He highlights this in order to reject those Platonic doctrines that maintain the pre-existence of matter.³²³ Yet, in this rejection, he is also setting the terms for explaining how God's perfection, especially his unity and power,

³²¹ These five aspects of creation can be discerned in the Lateran decree, *Firmiter credimus*, the opening canon of the Fourth Lateran decree.

³²² Cf. *Brev.* II.5, and the following chapter of this study on Bonaventure's modification of Augustine's simultaneous model of creation. Regarding debates on the eternity of the world and Bonaventure's role in these debates, cf. Steven Baldner, "St. Bonaventure and the Temporal Beginning of the World," *The New Scholasticism* 63 (1989): 206–228, and "St. Bonaventure and the Demonstrability of a Temporal Beginning: A Reply to Richard Davis," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 71 (1997): 225–236; and Richard C. Dales, *Medieval Discussions on the Eternity of the World* (Leiden: Brill, 1990). Cf. also the excellent summary of the medieval reception of debates surrounding the Hexaëmeron and doctrine of creation in

³²³ Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 30a, and Aristotle, *Metaphysics* Z 9 (1034b12).

relate to the diversity of the world's substance, which is also a Platonic concern. This will allow him to describe the way that the world reflects God's perfections without collapsing the distinction between world and God.

Third, the world was made by "one First Principle" and not from a plurality of principles. The Manichaeans and, later, Cathars both held what Bonaventure took to be a fundamentally illogical position in maintaining more than one source of the world.³²⁴ In rejecting this heretical doctrine, he, again, protects the ontological primacy of God as First Principle.

Fourth, God created the world without any intermediaries, in distinction to certain Platonic theologians.³²⁵ "The limitless productive power" by which the world is

³²⁴ Cf. Antoine Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIIIe siècle, le "Liber de duobus principiis" suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare* (Rome: Istituto storico domenicano, 1939); translated in *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, by Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), 511–591. On the nature and history of Manichaean-Bogomile-Cathar dualism, cf. Heinrich Fichtenau, *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages, 1000-1200*, trans Denise A. Kaiser (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 108–111, and Abolqasen Esmailpour, *Manichaean Gnosis and Creation Myth*, Sino-Platonic Papers 156 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), esp. 29–30. Esmailpour's primary concern is to show the transmission of Manichaean dualism to the Middle East and Persia. On Cathar dualism in Bonaventure's context, cf. Yuri Stoyanov, *The Other God: Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 263–264.

³²⁵ Cf. Monti, *Breviloquium*, 60 n. 5. Monti notes Plotinus's *Enneads* as a source for the idea of mediating intelligences, and Bernardus Sylvestris's *Cosmographia* as an example of the revival of that idea in the middle ages. Cf. Winthrop Wetherbee, *The*

created, resides in God alone.³²⁶ This assertion pertains to protecting God's primacy, simplicity, and perfection, thereby setting the stage for defining what exactly creatures reflect when they reflect the *principium*.³²⁷

Fifth, Bonaventure arrives at the Augustinian triad of "measure, number, and weight," which he explains indicates that the Triune God created the entire "world machine" by virtue of a three-fold causality.³²⁸ Bonaventure adapts this triad to his own purposes, arguing that all creatures are "constituted in being by the efficient cause. . . patterned after the exemplary cause, and. . . ordained to the final cause."³²⁹ Constituted

Cosmographia of Bernardus Sylvestris (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973), 53–55.

³²⁶ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219).

³²⁷ Cf. the conclusions to DMT III, a. 1 (V 70–72) and VIII (V 114–115) where Bonaventure takes up the question of God's simplicity and primacy, respectively.

³²⁸ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219): "*Per hoc autem, quod additur in certo pondere, numero et mensura, ostenditur, quod creatura est effectus Trinitatis creantis sub triplici genere causalitatis: efficientis... exemplaris... finalis...*" Bonaventure also treats these three causes in *De mysterio Trinitatis* 1.2 concl. (V 54). On these three causes in thirteenth century understandings of the doctrine of creation, cf. Zachary Hayes, O.F.M., *The General Doctrine of Creation in the Thirteenth Century* (München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1964), 22, 26, and 32.

³²⁹ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219): "*Omnis enim creatura constituitur in esse ab efficiente, conformatur ad exemplar et ordinatur ad finem.*" Bonaventure receives measure, number, and weight from Wisdom 11:21 — "Thou hast ordered all things in measure, number, and weight" — from Augustine's *De genesi ad litteram* 4.3.7. Cf. Hugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis* 1.2.22; Peter Lombard, 1 Sent. 3, 1, dub. 1; and Alexander of Hales,

in this way, all creatures bear this three-fold causality in themselves,³³⁰ in their measure, number, and weight,³³¹ as a trace (*vestigium*) of the Creator.³³² As we saw in the previous chapter, the genesis of this use of Wis. 11:21 appears to be the fourth book of *De genesi ad litteram*. Insofar as Bonaventure refers to Augustine's understanding of the Hexaëmeron in part two, we must first review Augustine's understanding of this triad, to which Bonaventure also refers, before continuing with our analysis of *Brev.* II.1–2.

Measure, Number, and Weight in Augustine's Thought and *Brev.* II.

Summa Fratris 2.1.1.1.2.1 (II.1 38–39). Cf. Meldon C. Wass, O.F.M., *The Infinite God and the Summa Fratris Alexandri* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1964), 21–22.

³³⁰ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219): “*triplicis causae...omnem creaturam secundum hanc triplicem habitudinem comparari ad causam primam.*”

³³¹ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219): “*Per hoc autem quod additur in certo pondere, numero et mensura.*” Bonaventure had previously discussed this three-fold constitution of creatures in *In I Sent.* 3.2.dub. 3 (I 78–79) and *In 2 Sent.* 35.2.1 (II 828–30). Cf. Augustine, *De genesi* 3.16.25, and 4.3.7. Augustine described the world structure in terms of a three-fold causal resemblance to God's perfection. According to Augustine, all creatures are constituted according to a divine order—measure, number, and weight—that they receive from their Creator, and through which divine order is available to the mind. “All creatures, as long as they exist, have their own measure, number and order. Rightly considered, they are all praiseworthy, and all the changes that occur in them, even when one passes into another, are governed by a hidden plan that rules the beauty of the world and regulates each according to its kind” (3.16.25). Likewise, cf. *Summa Fratris* II.1.1.1.2 (II.1 44).

³³² *Brev.* II.1 (V 219): “*quidem reperiuntur in omnibus creaturis tanquam vestigium Creatoris.*”

According to Augustine, these words of Wisdom mean “Thou hast ordered all things in Thyself.”³³³ For Augustine, the triad of measure, number, and weight functioned in two discrete but interlocking ways. God, Augustine says, is the “Measure without measure. . . the Number without number. . . the Weight without weight.”³³⁴ God imparts to creation a universal order that analogically reflects his own divine nature in the three characteristics of finite nature. As *measured*, the limited creature is both structured in its composition and drawn in its activities “to the beauty of wisdom.”³³⁵ As *numbered*, the creature receives both material form and the inclination

³³³ *De genesi* 4.3.7: “secundum id uero, quod mensura omni rei modum praefigit et numerus omni rei speciem praebet et pondus omnem rem ad quietem ac stabilitatem trahit, ille primitus et ueraciter et singulariter ista est, qui terminat omnia et format omnia et ordinat omnia, nihil que aliud dictum intellegitur, quomodo per cor et linguam humanam potuit: omnia in mensura et numero et pondere disposuisti, nisi: omnia in te disposuisti?” Earlier instances include *De genesi aduersus Manicheos* 1.16.26 and *De Natura Boni* 3. Cf. Roche, “Measure, Number, and Weight in St. Augustine,” 350-76; Bourke, *St. Augustine’s View of Reality*, 18-23; Du Roy, *L’Intelligence de la Foi*, 267; O’Connell, *Art and the Christian Intelligence in St. Augustine*; Harrison, *Beauty and Revelation in the Thought of Saint Augustine*, 107-10; Williams, ““Good for Nothing’?: Augustine on Creation,” 9-24; Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 61-62; and Samantha Thompson, “What Goodness Is: Order as Imitation of Unity in Augustine,” *The Review of Metaphysics* 65 (2012): 525-53.

³³⁴ *De genesi* 4.3.8.

³³⁵ Lewis Ayres, “Measure, Number, and Weight,” in *Augustine through the Ages*, ed. Roland J. Teske (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 551. Cf. *De genesi* 4.3.7 and 4.4.8.

toward growth (in life and virtue).³³⁶ And having *weight*, for Augustine, entails a tendency on the part of the creature toward place, both in space and time, and more importantly to God himself—“weight is drawn by another Weight.”³³⁷

In addition to explaining the analogical reflection of the Creator in creation through this triad, Augustine uses measure, number, and weight to distinguish the divine essence. Reflecting again on Wis. 11:21, he argues that any order by which God creates and disposes his creatures toward perfection must come from him, for it cannot precede him, nor can it be subsequent to him if it is to truly lead to perfection. Rather, God’s own essential perfection is the source, such that he is “the measure without measure. . . the Number without number. . . the Weight without weight.”³³⁸ These three are “those qualities by which he is made visible in the particular beauty and form of His Creation, and by which, conversely, Creation becomes an image and sign which reveals Him.”³³⁹

³³⁶ Lewis Ayres observes that number, by which form is given, makes the invisible visible. “Number or form is also, and inseparably, that by which God made the visible: originally through creation in the Word, and now also in the Incarnation” (Ayres, “*Measure, Number, and Weight*,” 551). Cf. *De genesi* 4.4.8

³³⁷ *De genesi* 4.4.8. Cf. *Confessions* XIII.9.10: “My weight is my love.”

³³⁸ Augustine, *De genesi* 4.3.8.

³³⁹ Harrison, *Beauty and Revelation in the Thought of Saint Augustine*, 110. According to Ayres, *pace* Olivier Du Roy, Augustine gives no indication that he equates

Augustine's triad of measure, number, and order is the first and primary pattern Bonaventure invokes for understanding creation in *Brev.* II. While he agrees with Augustine that the triad of measure, number, and weight reveals the fact that creatures are vestiges, whereby one can see the Creator in the creation, he offers a modified account of the terms themselves. Specifically, he ties measure, number, and weight to his own understanding of a "three-fold causality."³⁴⁰ In this account, measure still entails limit, but now also entails the creature's "constitution by the *efficient source*."³⁴¹ Number signifies form and, like Augustine, reflects the exemplary Wisdom through which the world was created; but, now, in Bonaventure's thought, exemplary causation replaces formal causation. Weight still indicates a good order, but Bonaventure accentuates this order in terms of final causality, such that the creature not only tends toward its place, whether in creation or God's plan, but also toward God himself *qua* the final cause, which he describes using Augustine's language of "perfect order and repose in things."³⁴²

measure, number, and weight with the Trinitarian persons respectively (Ayres, "Measure, Number, and Weight," 551–552).

³⁴⁰ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219).

³⁴¹ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219; emphasis mine).

³⁴² *Brev.* II.1 (V 219). Cf. *De genesi* 4.3.7 and 4.9.17.

Although Bonaventure maintains that creatures reflect the three-fold cause whereby they were made (and in so doing reflect the perfection of the Creator), he also demands that the process requires creatures to be ontologically distinct from their Creator. The First Principle, Bonaventure argues, must be perfect, and therefore distinct, in order to lead creatures to their “completion.”³⁴³ Because the Creator is perfect, however, it follows that creation cannot be made from the substance of this Creator. Such a derivation of creation from the substance of the Creator would entail a composite diversity in the Creator that is antithetical to the simplicity of divine perfection. Rather, insofar as the creation is not made from pre-existing material, it must have been made from nothing. Bonaventure puts it thusly: “Creation from nothing implies on the part of the creature, a state of being subsequent to non-being. . . .”³⁴⁴ His articulation of *creatio ex nihilo* emphasizes the distinction between Creator and creation; creation is not eternal, but rather temporal and limited, whereas God is eternal and

³⁴³ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219): “omnia reducuntur ad unum principium, quod quidem sit primum, ut det ceteris statum; et perfectissimum, ut det ceteris omnibus complementum.” Monti translates *complementum* as “perfect” in order to accentuate the emanation of God’s perfection to creation. Bonaventure’s use of *complementum* in this passage, however, foreshadows his use of the same term in *Brev.* IV wherein Christ’s perfection bring about the *complementum* of fallen creation through the Incarnation (part IV), grace (part V), and the sacraments (part VI).

³⁴⁴ *Brev.* II.1 (V 219).

limitless.³⁴⁵ “Thus, it follows necessarily that the creation of the world must have been accomplished in time [*ex tempore*] by this same limitless power, acting by itself and without any intermediary.”³⁴⁶

Brev. II.2—The Hexaëmeron, Seminal Reasons, and Divine Perfections

Having thus developed, in concert with Church teaching and Augustine’s triad of measure, number and weight, that creation reflects the perfect attributes of its creator, Bonaventure then turns to the Hexaëmeron in chapter two. In this chapter, he goes beyond rejecting the possibility of the eternity of the world in favor of an absolute beginning. He also describes the production of the world in terms of the seven days of Genesis 1-2:4a. He says,

We must hold specifically that physical nature was brought into existence over the course of six days in the following manner. In the beginning, before any day,

³⁴⁵ Bonaventure’s point here develops an argument first developed in the Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity, question 5 (V 89–90), wherein he asserts that no creature can have the attribute of eternity, insofar as eternity is an attribute that in Bonaventure’s thought only applies to God.

³⁴⁶ *Brev. II.1* (V 219). On *creatio ex tempore*, see P. van Veldhuijsen, “The Question of the Possibility of an Eternally Created World: Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas,” in *The Eternity of the World in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas and His Contemporaries* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 26–28. Van Veldhuijsen takes *ex nihilo*, *in principio*, and *ex tempore* to all convey an “absolute first instance” in creation. Richard Dales reports that John Pecham employs the term similarly in his *Utrum mundus potuit fieri ab aeterno*. Cf. Dales, *Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 124–126. Cf. also Edward Grant, *God and Reason in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 238–42.

God created heaven and earth. Then on the first day, the light was formed; on the second, the firmament was established in the midst of the waters; on the third, the waters were separated from the land and gathered together in one place; on the fourth, the heavens were adorned with lights; on the fifth, the air and the waters were filled with birds and fishes; on the sixth, the land was furnished with animals and human beings. On the seventh day, God rested, not from activity and work, since he continues to work this very hour, but from the production of any new species. For God made all things then—either in their prototypes, as in the case with those that propagate themselves, or in a *seminal reason*. . . .³⁴⁷

Bonaventure's appeal to the seminal reasons in conjunction with the temporal process of the seven days in this passage provides another way to see divine order in creation.

In the broadest sense, he uses the notion of the seminal reasons, as formulated at least by Augustine and Peter Lombard, to specify the way that order is innate to the cosmos.³⁴⁸ For Bonaventure the days of creation themselves reflect the divine order,

³⁴⁷ *Brev.* II.2 (V 219–220): “*Natura vero corporea nobis consideranda est quantum ad fieri quantum ad esse et quantum ad operari. De natura vero corporea quantum ad fieri haec specialiter tenenda sunt quod sex diebus sit in esse producta ita quod in principio ante omnem diem creavit deus caelum et terram. Prima vero die formata est lux. Secunda firmamentum factum est in medio aquarum. Tertia die separatae sunt aquae a terra et congregatae in locum unum. Quarta vero die caelum ornatum est luminaribus quinta aer et aqua volatilibus et piscibus sexta die terra animalibus et hominibus. Septima die requievit deus non a labore nec ab opere cum usque nunc operetur sed a novarum specierum conditione quia omnia fecerat vel in simili sicut illa quae propagantur vel in **seminali ratione** sicut illa quae aliis modis introducuntur in esse*” (emphasis mine).

³⁴⁸ *De genesi* 3.12.18–20; Peter Lombard, *ad Hebraeos* 7.4 (PL 192:451.34); 2 *Sent.* 18.5.1, 18.5.3, 30.4.2–3; *Summa Fratris* 1.1.1.4.3.2.2 (I 235). Cf. Jules M. Brady, “St. Augustine's Theory of Seminal Reasons,” *The New Scholasticism* 38 (1964): 141–58. Hugh of St. Victor, whose work on creation may be an inspiration for Bonaventure, does not appeal to the theory of seminal reasons anywhere in his writing. While Hugh thought that the Word could be contemplated through the world, he did not appeal to the

which itself is a reflection of the divine perfections.³⁴⁹ In this respect, the theory of the seminal reasons signifies both a natural power of reproduction as well as the influence of God over those natural processes, both in their creation and their governance:

“Because all things flow from the first and most perfect Principle, who is omnipotent, all-wise, and all-beneficent, it was most fitting that they should come into being in such a way that their very production might reflect these same three attributes (*triplex nobilitas*) or perfections.”³⁵⁰

seminal reasons to do so (*De tribus* 1.1). He alludes to growth from a seed in *De sacramentis* 1.6.7 to discuss the way the human race comes from Adam and Eve. Cf. Peter Spotswood Dillard, “Removing the Mote in the Knower's Eye: Education and Epistemology in Hugh of St. Victor's *Didascalicon*,” *Heythrop Journal* (2014): 203; and Grover A. Zinn, Jr., “Bonaventure,” in *Augustine through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan Fitzgerald and John Cavadini (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999), 109.

³⁴⁹ On the relationship of this tradition to Bonaventure, cf. Hayes, *The General Doctrine of Creation in the Thirteenth Century*, 23–26. Gregory LaNave sees Bonaventure's use of the seminal reasons as part of his larger methodology of “*reductio*” (LaNave, “Bonaventure's Theological Method,” 114–15). Cf. Miller, “Cosmic Semiosis: Contuiting the Divine,” 323–25.

³⁵⁰ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): “*Quia enim res manant a primo principio et perfectissimo tale autem est omnipotentissimum sapientissimum et benevolentissimum ideo oportuit quod sic producerentur in esse ut in earum productione reluceret triplex nobilitas praedicta et excellentia.*” Monti translates “*nobilitas*” as “attributes,” although Bonaventure's term in part one is “*essentialia*,” also translated as attribute (*Brev.* I.6 [V 214]). Note here Bonaventure's use of *benevolentia* and not *bonum*, highlighting the action of the divine will.

Divine Perfections in the thought of Hugh of St. Victor and *Brev.* II.2

The divine appropriations are an important theological doctrine for Bonaventure.³⁵¹ Together with the divine attributes, they animate not only the first part of the *Breviloquium*, but also the overall procedure of the text, insofar as Bonaventure always bases an argument in one of the three attributes or appropriations, what we might call a divine perfection or nobility. A likely source for the three-fold nobility of God is Hugh of St. Victor, who in *De sacramentis* uses the triad of *potentia-sapientia-bonitas/benignitas* rather than the seminal reasons to discuss the reflection of divine order in creatures.³⁵² These three attributes, better known as appropriations, are held in

³⁵¹ Bonaventure explains that attributes are held in common of the divine essence ("equally and without distinction to all the Persons"), whereas appropriations (such as oneness, truth, goodness) denote not a property of the person but that by which the mind is led to the knowledge of the Trinity. Cf. *In 1 Sent.* 34.1.3, DMT q. 1, a. 1, concl. (V 50–51), *Brev.* I.6 (V 215); John Francis Quinn, *The Historical Constitution of St. Bonaventure's Philosophy* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1973), 498–500; Christopher M. Cullen, *Bonaventure* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 127; Gilles Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Francesca Aran Murphy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 319–320. Cf. also the next chapter of this dissertation.

³⁵² *De sacramentis* 1.2.6, 1.3.26. Cf. Lombard's use in *1 Sent.* 34.3–4 (I.2 251–253). On the general provenance of this triad, cf. John Whittaker, "Goodness Power Wisdom: a Middle Platonic Triad," in *Sofiēs maiētores "Chercheurs de sagesse": hommage à Jean Pépin*, ed. Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Goulven Madec, and Denis O'Brien (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1992), 179–93. Regarding Hugh's reception and use, cf. the explanation in Dominique Poirel, *Livre de la nature et débat trinitaire au XIIe siècle, Le De tribus de Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 368–82; Matthias Perkams, "The Origins of the Trinitarian Attributes: potentia, sapientia, benignitas," *Archivum Verbi* 1

common in the divine substance, and as such are reflective of divine perfection. Yet, these three attributes are also “assigned” or “appropriated” to specific persons of the Trinity in order to accommodate human reasoning.³⁵³ In distinguishing the attributes, or perfections, in this way, Hugh explains, the human mind is led to see that the cooperative operation of these three makes creation perfect.³⁵⁴ Such divine work is particularly evident in time, Hugh suggests, where the mind encounters the divine perfections not at once but in succession. “Goodness presents itself *first* to our consideration, because through it God willed; *then* wisdom, because through it He

(2004): 25–41; Coolman, *The Theology of Hugh of St. Victor: an Interpretation*, 86–87, and Boyd Taylor Coolman, “General Introduction,” in *Trinity and Creation*, ed. Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 56–58. Coolman is critical of Perkams proposal that Hugh adopted the triad from Abelard. Gilles Emery disputes the Augustinian origin of this triad (Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Thomas Aquinas*, 318). Paul Rorem argues, however, that this condensed summary of *De tribus diebus* is thoroughly Augustinian (Rorem, *Hugh of Saint Victor*, 73). On Bonaventure’s relationship to the Hugh, and Victorine Trinitarian theology, cf. Grover A. Zinn, Jr., “Book and Word: The Victorine Background of Bonaventure’s Use of Symbols,” in *San Bonaventura 1274-1974* (Grottaferrata: Collegio San Bonaventura, 1973), 143–69; and Dale M. Coulter, “The Victorine Sub-structure of Bonaventure’s Thought,” *Franciscan Studies* 70 (2012): 399–400.

³⁵³ Cf. *Summa Fratris* I.73 (I: 114). I thank Justin Shawn Coyle for bring the matter of the trinitarian character of causality in the *Summa Fratris* to my attention in his unpublished paper, “Appropriating Apocalypse: Rereading Bonaventure’s *Breviloquium*” (Boston: Boston College, 2016), 5.

³⁵⁴ *De sacramentis* 1.2.6–1.2.8.

disposed; *lastly* power, because through it He made. For there seems to be an order; and the will seems to have been first; after it, disposition, and lastly operation seems to have followed.”³⁵⁵ Hugh is aware that this risks introducing the "abominable" possibility of time into the life of God, the consequence of which would be to impose a diversity upon the simplicity of God. He combats this possible outcome, however, by explaining that the activities of will, wisdom, and power—appearing to rational creatures as discrete events from the perspective of creation—are in fact unified and simultaneous in the eternal procession of the Godhead.³⁵⁶ Outside of the Godhead, however, the three attributes are manifest in both rational and corporeal creation as signs of the Trinity. They “are the three things which perfect every rational being. . . .”³⁵⁷

Hugh’s understanding of power, wisdom, and goodness as that which draws the creature to imitation of and ultimately perfection in the Creator and perfection in the Creator is perhaps influenced by Augustine, who had argued in *De genesi ad litteram* that creaturely perfection subsists in the imitation of the Word who is the exemplary source of life, wisdom, and happiness for all creatures. For the Word, “living is the same thing

³⁵⁵ *De sacramentis* 1.2.9.

³⁵⁶ *De sacramentis* 1.2.11.

³⁵⁷ *De sacramentis* 1.3.28.

as living wisely and happily,” whereas for creatures, “living is not the same as possessing a life of wisdom and happiness.”³⁵⁸ For Augustine, the light of the first day represents the simultaneous call to existence and perfection, which is also a call to the fuller imitation of God’s power, wisdom, and happiness in the creature. Thus, the *ratio* of creation, founded on God’s wisdom, is already present in the first creative action, the utterance of the light.

Hexaëmeral Operations: Creation, Distinction, Adornment

Whether Hugh received the triad from Augustine or not, Bonaventure evidently adapts his “*omnipotentissimum, sapientissimum et benevolentissimum*” from Hugh’s *potentia-sapientia-bonitas/benignitas*.³⁵⁹ Bonaventure relates these three to another trio of terms with no small amount of significance for his interpretation of the first week of Genesis. He says, “The divine operation that fashioned the world machine was three-fold: *creation* [*creatio*], particularly reflecting omnipotence; *distinction* [*distinctio*], reflecting wisdom; and *adornment* [*ornatus*], reflecting unbounded goodness.”³⁶⁰ In this

³⁵⁸ Augustine, *De genesi* 1.5.10. Cf. *De Trinitate* 7.1–3.

³⁵⁹ Bonaventure’s choice of *benevolentia*, especially his explanation of the perfect attributes of God in part I, will be treated in the next chapter.

³⁶⁰ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): “*Et ideo triformis fuit operatio divina ad mundanam machinam producendam scilicet creatio quae appropriate respondet omnipotentiae distinctio quae respondet sapientiae et ornatus qui respondet bonitati largissimae*” (emphasis mine). Monti translates “*ornatus*” as “embellishment.” For the sake of consistency, I have translated “*ornatus*” as

division, Bonaventure marshals his understanding of divine order (*Brev.* II.1), and the divine attributes (II.2) to explain the temporal act of creating, distinguishing, and adorning the world in six days.

The first operation, which reflects God's omnipotence, is the creation of heaven and earth "from nothing," which takes place "before any day. . . [It is] the foundation of all times and beings."³⁶¹ Whereas Augustine (and Philo) had described the whole work of creation as simultaneous and prior to time, Bonaventure attempts to reconcile Augustine's understanding of *creatio ex nihilo* with a temporal understanding of what follows by distinguishing the operation of *creatio ex nihilo* from the process of world formation described in Genesis 1:3–31, a process which Bonaventure sees as three-fold. While Augustine sees creation as singular, Bonaventure sees *creatio ex nihilo* as the first of three operations (he calls this operation "creation") that provides the innate order of what is yet to come under the auspices of "heaven and earth."

"adornment" as Roy Deferrari does in his translation of Hugh's *De sacramentis*. This is the same three-fold division that originated with Bede, but is popularized by Hugh. Cf. chapter two of this study.

³⁶¹ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): "*Et quoniam creatio est de nihilo ideo fuit in principio ante omnem diem tanquam omnium rerum et temporum fundamentum.*" On this stage, cf. *In 2 Sent.* 12.2.2 (II 304–305), and 1.1 dub. 2 and 4 (II 36–36).

He names the remaining two operations of the Hexaëmeron “distinction” and “adornment.” In contrast to the singular operation of “creation,” both of these stages are themselves “three-fold.”³⁶² The second operation occupies the first three days, and the third operation occupies the second three days. In terms of the divine operations, Bonaventure says that the first three days reflect God’s wisdom, while the second three days reflect God’s goodness.³⁶³

Following the foundation of the heavens and earth, “the work of distinction was fittingly accomplished in the space of three days.”³⁶⁴ Bonaventure sees a fittingness to the three-day process of distinction insofar as the three days correspond to “a three-fold qualitative distinction,” namely of the three elemental natures: “luminous,” “translucent,” and “opaque.”³⁶⁵ On the first day, the separation of light from dark “distinguishes” the luminous nature, light, from what it is not. On the second day, the separation of the waters above and below by way of the firmament distinguishes the

³⁶² *Brev. II.2 (V 220): “triplicem.”*

³⁶³ *Brev. II.2 (V 220): “sapientiae. . . bonitati largissimae.”*

³⁶⁴ *Brev. II.2 (V 220): “Et quia ornatus correspondet distinctioni ideo similiter tribus diebus debuit consummari.”*

³⁶⁵ *Brev. II.2 (V 220): “Rursus quia distinctio corporum mundi attenditur secundum triplicem modum ideo facta fuit per triduum. Est enim distinctio naturae luminosae a perspicua et opaca et haec facta est in prima die in divisione lucis a tenebris.” Cf. Quinn, *The Historical Constitution of St. Bonaventure’s Philosophy*, 235–36; and Cullen, *Bonaventure*, 130–31.*

translucent nature from the luminous nature. And the appearance of dry land in the midst of the waters on the third day distinguishes the opaque nature, or corporeal matter in the colloquial sense, from the translucent nature.³⁶⁶

God “adorns” or “ornaments” the three natures over the second three days. The three activities of the second three days parallel and correspond to the activity of the first three days.³⁶⁷ Hence, on the fourth day, the sun, moon, and stars adorn the luminous nature. The fishes and birds adorn the translucent nature on the fifth day. And beasts, reptiles, and human beings adorn the opaque nature on the sixth day.³⁶⁸ The discussion of the parallel development in the work of distinction during the first three days and the work of adornment during the second three days reinforces their correspondence.³⁶⁹ Each nature is adorned in the order in which it was initially distinguished: the work of the fourth day parallels the first day, the fifth parallels the second, and the sixth parallels the third.

³⁶⁶ See the next chapter of this study for a discussion of *Brev.* II.3–4.

³⁶⁷ Bonaventure performs this interpretation in the two subsequent chapters (*Brev.* II.3–4).

³⁶⁸ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): “ideo similiter tribus diebus debuit consummari.”

³⁶⁹ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220). The verb Bonaventure uses to describe this “fittingness” is “correspondet.”

In addition to the parallel correspondence of three couplets, Bonaventure sees an overall progression in this internal coherence: the works of distinction progress toward dry land (the opaque nature), the works of adornment progress toward the embellishment of the opaque nature, and the six days overall progress toward mankind. “On the sixth day the beasts and reptiles were made, and finally, as the *consummation* of all things, human beings.”³⁷⁰

The Theological Relevance of the Hexaëmeron

Bonaventure returns to the language of “consummation” in *Brev.* IV in order to reveal a similarity between, or perhaps even a correspondence of, adornment (of creation in mankind) and cosmic completion (of the universe in the Incarnation).³⁷¹ He

³⁷⁰ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): “*Est et ornatus naturae opacae scilicet terrae et hic factus est sexta die in qua factae sunt bestiae facta sunt et reptilia facta est etiam ad consummationem omnium natura humana*” (emphasis mine). This is a general theme of Origen’s homily; it is stated explicitly by Philo (*De opif.* §78), Basil (*Hexaëmeron* 9.6), Ambrose, (*Exameron* 9.8), Bede (*In genesim* 14–15) and Hugh (*De sacramentis* 1.1.25).

³⁷¹ Other instances of “consummation” in the *Breviloquium* include prol. init. (V 203): “*sacram Scripturam consummando veritatis notitiam dilatarent*”; II.12 (V 230); III.8 (V 236); IV.10 (V 252); V.5 (V 257); V.6 (258); V.7 (V 260); V.8–9 (V 262); VI.4 (V 268); VI.11 (V 276); VI.12 (V 278); VI.13 (V 279); VII.1 (V 281); VII.3 (V 283); VII.4 (V 285); VII.5 (V 286); VII.7 (V 290). Bonaventure also uses “consummation” interchangeably with the idea of “completion” and “end,” as in *Brev.* prol. 6 (V 208). Hayes stresses that consummation is one of the three constitutive elements of Bonaventure’s metaphysics; cf. Hayes, *The General Doctrine of Creation*, 26. Cf. chapter four of this study (below) on the correspondence of the hexaëmeral operation of adornment and the divine operation of redemption, and particularly on Christ as consummation.

begins to unpack the general theological and trinitarian significance of the *Hexaëmeron* already in *Brev.* II.2.

In Bonaventure's mind, the progressive three-fold model of "the succession of times" gives a "clear and distinct" demonstration of God's "power, wisdom, and goodness."³⁷² Here, again, he is not simply proposing that the progression itself reflects the divine attributes or appropriations. Rather, the parallel correspondence of distinction and adornment, and the progression through that correspondence toward the adornment of the opaque nature in the creation of humankind, the consummate ornament of all creation, reflects the relationship of wisdom and goodness in the divine life.³⁷³

³⁷² *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): "*per successionem temporum tum propter distinctam et claram repraesentationem potentiae sapientiae et bonitatis. . .*" Bonaventure uses the same work for "clear" here as he does for "lucid" in the prologue.

³⁷³ Cf. the sketch of the divine appropriations beginning in *Brev.* I.6 (V 213). Bonaventure describes the Father as *unitas*, the Son as *veritas*, and the Spirit as *bonitas*. Of the four ways of ascribing appropriations, one deals with causality: efficient causality is appropriated to the Father; exemplary causality to the Son; and final causality to the Spirit. Cf. *Brev.* I.6 (V 214). Although these appropriations are "common" to the whole godhead, Bonaventure says, when distinguished, "they lead to a better understanding of and knowledge of what is proper," which is to say, what is appropriated to the "three persons." On three-fold causality in the doctrine of creation, cf. Hayes, *The General Doctrine of Creation in the Thirteenth Century*, 19–32.

Seeing the integration of his theory of the divine appropriations in his discourse on the creation of the world in six days, one begins to observe the resemblance of his description of the days of creation to his description of the stages of theology from the prologue. Particularly, the use of the word “*claram*” in *Brev.* II.2 to describe the way that the days of creation manifest God’s power, wisdom, and goodness recalls the description in the prologue of how the seven parts of the *Breviloquium* manifest the truth of Scripture “*clarius*.”³⁷⁴ In both of these instances, God’s attributes are the unifying and common factor.³⁷⁵ Likewise, God’s attributes determine what is “fitting” in creation. Bonaventure explains, “there was a fitting correspondence between these operations [creation, distinction, adornment] and having various ‘days’ or times.”³⁷⁶ By “fitting,” Bonaventure implies an aesthetic quality to the already logical process whereby God bestows measure, number, and weight upon the cosmos through His power, wisdom, and goodness.³⁷⁷ In short, similar to the way a work of art fittingly reflects the style of

³⁷⁴ *Brev.* prol. 6 (V 208).

³⁷⁵ See the previous chapter of this study on this section of the prologue.

³⁷⁶ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): “*tum propter convenientem correspondentiam dierum sive temporum et operationum. . .*”

³⁷⁷ Cf. Harrison, *Beauty and Revelation in the Thought of Saint Augustine*, 110.

the artist who made it, so too the work of creation fittingly reflects the attributes of the Creator.³⁷⁸

This application of fittingness to the process of creation seems to be influenced by Hugh, who proposes that providence guides all things fittingly in their creation, distinction, and adornment. Such guidance results in a harmony between the elements and their adorning features.³⁷⁹ Likewise, Scripture follows the same principle of fittingness when it describes the creation before the fall, and both of these before it describes restoration.³⁸⁰ “For it could not fittingly have shown how man was restored, unless it first explained how he had fallen; nor, indeed, could it fittingly have show his fall unless it first explained in what condition he was constituted by God.”³⁸¹ While it may seem that what Hugh calls “fitting” is nothing else than logical progression, his claim goes beyond the causal sequence of creation, fall, redemption. He writes: “To show the first condition of man, it was necessary to describe the foundation and creation of the whole work, because the world was made for the sake of man; the soul,

³⁷⁸ Bonaventure’s comparison of the way Scripture relates Salvation History to an “artfully composed melody” (*Brev. prol. 2* [V 204]), reinforces this aesthetic metaphor.

³⁷⁹ *De sacramentis* 1.1.9–11.

³⁸⁰ *De sacramentis* 1, prol. 3.

³⁸¹ *De sacramentis* 1, prol. 3.

indeed, for the sake of God; the body, for the sake of the soul; the world, for the sake of the body of man, that the soul might be subject to God, the body to the soul, and the world to the body.”³⁸² For Hugh, the work of restoration responds to the way that sin corrupts the original fittingness of creation. Thus, according to Hugh, the principle of fittingness is simply an expression of the way in which Wisdom providentially guides all things, whether creation, recreation, or the way in which Scripture narrates these. Fittingness, we see, pinpoints not simply an aesthetic harmony, but rather, for Hugh, the harmony of providence. Accordingly, the division of the days in creation-distinction-adornment reflects in no small measure divine order. In this respect, Hugh is giving a deeper expression to a regnant theme in the hexaëmeral literature. But this observation is also relevant to our study of Bonaventure insofar as he adopts not only the threefold division of the days from commentators like Hugh, but also the language of fittingness and applies it both to the Hexaëmeron and in a similar manner as Hugh.

Conclusion

If Bonaventure borrowed these foregoing elements pertaining to the seminal reasons, measure–number–weight, and the division of the days into creation–distinction–adornment from Augustine and Hugh, he combines them in the second part

³⁸² *De sacramentis* 1, prol. 5–6.

of the *Breviloquium*. First and foremost, he applies the principles of measure, number, and weight, and of the seminal reasons to the unfolding of time in the stages of distinction and adornment. God's work of creation, distinction, and adornment of the world in six days, he says, "contains the seeds of all things that would later be accomplished, as a prefiguration of future ages; thus, these seven days would contain seminally, as it were, the division of all times to come, as we have already explained above through the succession of the seven ages of history."³⁸³ In other words, the work of creation, entailed in the narrative of the six days and God's rest on the seventh day, provide the archetypes and powers for the unfolding of the seven ages. Bonaventure is, however, positing something more than a mere record of events. According to him, the days contain an order which is reflective of the divine attributes. This order will dictate not only events, but the very procedure by which God brings about the work of restoration; while creation and rest happen over the seven days of Genesis 1-2:4a, God's creation, recreation, and perfection of the universe happen over seven ages. "That is why," he says, "to the six days of work was added a seventh day of rest: a day to which

³⁸³ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): "ut sicut in prima mundi conditione fieri debebant seminaria operum fiendorum sic fierent et praefigurationes temporum futurorum. Unde in illis septem diebus quasi seminaliter praecessit distinctio omnium temporum quae explicantur per decursum septem aetatum."

no dusk is ascribed—not that this day was not followed by night, but because it was to prefigure the repose of souls that shall have no end.”³⁸⁴

In this respect, Bonaventure believes the Hexaëmeron to be crucial for “*novi theologi*” to understand, especially the fact of creation from nothing and that which is subsequent to the first operation: continued existence, formation, and the operation of the cosmos. These six days clearly correspond to God’s perfections in the three stages of creation (omnipotence), distinction (wisdom), and adornment (goodness).³⁸⁵

³⁸⁴ *Brev. II.2 (V 220): “Et hinc est quod sex diebus operum additur septimus quietis qui dies non scribitur habere vesperam non quia non habuerit dies illa noctem succedentem sed ad praefigurandam animarum quietem quae nunquam habebit finem.”*

³⁸⁵ Bonaventure does not attempt in this chapter (*Brev. II.2*) to establish a deeper relationship within the final two stages between God’s attributes and the days themselves. However, one could see how he could do so, with the luminous nature and its adornment corresponding to God’s power, the translucent nature and its adornment corresponding to God’s wisdom, and the opaque nature and its adornment corresponding to God’s goodness. This is an especially likely possibility considering his belief that creation in time fittingly reflects the divine perfections, that the two final stages fittingly parallel each other, and his understanding, received from Robert Grosseteste that light is the most basic substance, from which more complex substances arise. Cf. Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 1.8.2 (78); and James R. Ginther, *Master of the Sacred Page: a Study of the Theology of Robert Grosseteste* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 91–95. For Bonaventure, God’s nature is such that the first and most simple expression of the godhead is oneness and power. Hence, Bonaventure ascribes efficient causality to power. He describes God’s will, by contrast, in terms of goodness, and ascribes to it finality. Divine will, therefore, is last in the “logical order” in that it “presupposes” knowledge (wisdom, the exemplary cause) and power. Thus, even though he does not state it explicitly in *Brev. II.2*, there is an implied correlation of each of the three-day clusters to the three divine perfections.

It may be objected here that the days of creation, while perhaps corresponding to the ages of history and stages of life, do not correspond to the topical structure of the *Breviloquium*—not every seven-fold structure, after all, is hexaëmeral. However, it is Bonaventure's claim in part two that the world machine is described on the intelligible cross of Scripture that gives the license to look at creation, and particularly the first week of Genesis 1–2:4a. Just as Bonaventure argues that the days of creation elucidate God's perfections, his exposition of the Hexaëmeron in part two can help elucidate the theological program of the *Breviloquium*, as the next chapter will propose. While he receives inspiration from a variety of sources, the most notable of which are Augustine and Hugh, Bonaventure's contribution can be seen most clearly in the synthesis and reconciliation of these sources, and his tireless insistence that time itself (particularly the time of creation) is a vestige of the Trinity's power, wisdom, and goodness.

Bonaventure's use of the division of creation, distinction, and adornment (from Bede and Hugh) is crucial for his effort to synthesis Augustine's understanding of the reflection of divine perfection in creation with Augustine's (and the later tradition's) emphasis on time as a record of God's deed. God's power, wisdom, and goodness are reflected not only in the days of creation, but insofar as the events of salvation history are contained seminally in those days, then all of history in some sense also reflects God's perfections.

The next chapter will argue that Bonaventure's use of the hexaëmeral genre, and his seminal understanding of the Hexaëmeron, combined with his own description of God as *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum* in part one, justifies an hexaëmeral reading of the body of the *Breviloquium*. Indeed, Bonaventure describes his theology as a doctrine according to piety which leads to emphasizing the Trinity as not only *summum bonum*, but *benevolentia*, such that the Trinity disposes all things well.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HEXAËMERAL STRUCTURE OF THE *BREVILOQUIUM*

The previous chapter showed that Bonaventure posits a correspondence between the days of creation and the ages of history that he describes as *seminal*. He says,

[T]he primal production of the world ought to contain the seeds of all things that later would be accomplished as a prefiguration of future ages; thus, *these seven days would contain seminally, as it were, the division of all times to come*, as we have already explained above through the secession of the seven ages of history. That is why, to the six days of work was added a seventh day of rest: a day to which no dusk is ascribed in Scripture—not that this day was not followed by night, but because it was to prefigure the repose of souls that shall have no end.³⁸⁶

The literal sense of Genesis 1–2:4a, when read spiritually, prefigures salvation history.

For Bonaventure, this hexaëmeral correspondence is rooted in the divine perfections of power, wisdom, and goodness, which, as we saw in the last chapter, are reflected in the three primary operations of creation, distinction, and adornment, followed by the seventh day of rest. And thus, for Bonaventure, the significance of the Hexaëmeron lies in its *seminality* with regard to cosmic and temporal order. Moreover, this significance is

³⁸⁶ *Brev.* II.2 (V 220): “*ut sicut in prima mundi conditione fieri debebant seminaria operum fiendorum sic fierent et praefigurationes temporum futurorum. Unde in illis septem diebus quasi seminaliter praecessit distinctio omnium temporum quae explicantur per decursum septem aetatum. Et hinc est quod sex diebus operum additur septimus quietis qui dies non scribitur habere vesperam non quia non habuerit dies illa noctem succedentem sed ad praefigurandam animarum quietem quae nunquam habebit finem.*”

bound up in the triad of creation, distinction, and adornment, and that triad's reflection of the divine perfections.

This chapter argues that the structure of the *Breviloquium* also corresponds to a spiritual reading of the Hexaëmeron, the literal sense of which, according to Bonaventure, is explained in *Brev.* II.1–5. This correspondence becomes clearer in the light of his descriptive triad of God as the *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum*. He explains at the outset of part one that God is known in Scripture not only as the source (*principium et exemplar*) of creation, but also as the source of redemption and perfection. “Now God is not only the principle and effective exemplar of all things in creation, but also their restorative principle in redemption and their perfecting principle in remuneration.”³⁸⁷ Bonaventure himself describes the relationship of God's triple principiality and exemplarity as fundamental to the topics of the *Breviloquium*. As we will see, he argues that theology must address not only God and God's work of making a world, but also sin, restoration, grace, sacraments, and the final judgment, and does so in the body of the *Breviloquium*.³⁸⁸

³⁸⁷ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210): “*et deus non tantum sit rerum principium et exemplar effectivum in creatione sed etiam reffectivum in redemptione et perfectivum in retributione.*”

³⁸⁸ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210). See below on this passage.

How does God's three-fold identity as the creative, redemptive, and perfecting principle and exemplar relate to the seven-fold structure of the *Breviloquium*?

Bonaventure, as we will see, is animated by a similar question: how does God's triadic identity relate the pattern of creation, distinction, and adornment, and to the patterns of salvation history? To begin addressing these questions with Bonaventure, we must first examine the way he understands Scripture's presentation of God and God's three acts of creation, redemption, and perfection, insofar as these three operations bear some relation to the three operations of creation, distinction, and adornment, addressed in the last chapter. However, this chapter proposes that this relationship is not a simple one-to-one correspondence of the three divine acts (creating, redeeming, perfecting) and the three operations of the Hexaëmeron. Rather, Bonaventure's division of topics in the body of the *Breviloquium*, and the relations internal to that division, correspond better with the second and third operations: distinction and adornment. Hence, we see the foundational work of the *principium et exemplar effectivum* in parts one through three of *Brev.* as a work of spiritual distinction like God's literal action of distinction. Similarly, the restorative work of the *principium et exemplar reffectivum* in *Brev.* IV–VI is a work of spiritual adornment like God's literal act of adornment in creation. Finally, the eschatology presented in *Brev.* VII functions in an analogous fashion to the work of

perfection on the seventh day.³⁸⁹ In this way, Bonaventure synthesizes Hugh's divisions of the operations of Genesis 1–2:4a (in *Brev.* II) and the division of theological doctrine (in *Brev.* prol. 6 and *Brev.* I.1).

Moreover, Scripture itself can be incorporated into this synthesis: it is the source from which the doctrines emanate, and is the principle and exemplar of truth. It is therefore like the operation of *creation*, the day before the days. From Scripture, Bonaventure then *distinguishes* certain core theological concepts that pertain to the operation of creation: God as Trinity; creation as the reflection of that Trinity; and the fall of the rational creature. The theological concepts that follow (Incarnation, grace, sacraments, and eschatology) proceed from, rely on, and adorn these first three fundamental topics. *Brev.* I, II, and III, then, taken together function similar to the three-day operation of *distinction*. Likewise, *Brev.* IV, V, and VI function like the three-day work of *adornment*. We will see that Bonaventure compares the adornment of the cosmos in the creation of mankind to the completion of the cosmos in the restoration effected by Christ's Incarnation, death, and resurrection. He thereby makes the link

³⁸⁹ Although Bonaventure claims an explicit correspondence between the six days leading to a seventh day of rest, and the six ages leading to a seventh age of repose, he does not here attempt to divide the ages according to the three works of creation, distinction, and adornment.

between adornment and Christology highly plausible.³⁹⁰ The incarnate Christ is the source of the re-creation and grace that restores the image of God in humanity and the medicinal work of the sacraments, leading to perfection.

Perhaps the most compelling reason to see a link between the operations of the Hexaëmeron and the structure of the body of the *Breviloquium*, is that parts IV, V, and VI parallel or respond to the topics parts I, II, and III, much in the same way that the operations of distinction and adornment parallel each other. In fact, as the previous chapter observed, this parallel is one of the obvious structural features of the Hexaëmeron as Bonaventure inherits it from at least Bede and Hugh. Let us grant for the moment that his description of God, creation, and sin in parts I, II, and III function as “distinctions” of fundamental theological loci. Seeing the first three parts in this way allows us to then see textual parallels in parts IV, V, and VI. For instance, just as the sun on the fourth day is a new light of sorts, Christ is, in *Brev.* IV, a new beginning, who, as the *principium et exemplar refectionis*, stands in parallel with part I. Just as the fish and fowl adorn the waters on the fifth day, so too grace in part V adorns the virtues, instills spiritual gifts, and raises the soul, the epitome of creation described in part II, to beatitude. And just as man is the highest adornment of the cosmos on day six, the

³⁹⁰ Cf. *Brev.* IV.4 (V 244-245).

sacraments, of part VI, are a new height of material and spiritual existence and signification. Moreover, in the same way that the beasts and mankind are the adornment of dry land (distinguished on the third day), so too the sacraments respond to *Brev.* III, in which sin is introduced. Bonaventure emphasizes this connection to *Brev.* III by consistently calling the sacraments a medicinal remedy for sin. Accordingly, it seems that the order of parts four, five, and six corresponds to the distinctions of parts one, two, and three: Christ is a new beginning; grace re-creates the rational soul; the sacraments heal the damage done by sin to the soul. Parts one, two, and three distinguish core theological doctrines. Parts four, five, and six, which describe the work of re-creation, respond to and adorn those initial concepts. And in this way, this chapter argues, the first six parts of the *Breviloquium* correspond to the hexaëmeral operations of distinction and adornment.

Finally, Bonaventure addresses the work of perfection with his treatment of the Last Judgment in part seven. There, he shows that in judgment, the world is purged and perfected; humanity is not only restored to the image, but also and consequently perfected in God's likeness. Such a return entails first restoring humanity to its the original capacity and role which it inhabited in the Garden of Eden. But it also includes re-creating the human in light of the Incarnate Christ, the *principium et exemplar refectivum*. In this way, the work of restoration prefigures the work of perfection, as the

treatments of Christ's perfections in the Incarnation, the grace of the Holy Spirit, and the sacraments show. Accordingly, we will see in this chapter that Bonaventure already begins to discuss perfection before he gets to the treatise on the Last Judgment.

Thus, the seven parts of the *Breviloquium*, as this chapter will argue, correspond to God's triple identity of *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum*. These are, however, prefigured by the operations of Genesis 1–2:4a, when read spiritually.

The Work of Distinction: Part One—the Trinity

Bonaventure begins the first part of the *Breviloquium* by outlining the seven topics that comprise the body of the *Breviloquium*. "First, the Trinity of God; second, the creation of the world; third, the corruption of sin; fourth, the Incarnation of the Word; fifth, the grace of the Holy Spirit; sixth, the healing of the sacraments; and seventh, the repose of final judgment."³⁹¹ These seven topics, he explains, arise when one considers the origins and intention of Scripture, which he defines as a "science that imparts to us

³⁹¹ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210): "*primo de trinitate dei secundo de creatura mundi tertio de corruptela peccati quarto de incarnatione verbi quinto de gratia spiritus sancti sexto de medicina sacramentali et septimo de statu finalis iudicii.*" Bonaventure had already outlined these seven once before in prologue 6.4 (V 208). On these seven topics as treated in the prologue, cf. chapter two of this study.

wayfarers as much as knowledge of the First Principle as we need to be saved."³⁹²

Bonaventure's description of theology as a science recalls the "breadth, length, height, and depth" of Scripture described in the prologue and the intelligible cross that helps us understand the world machine.³⁹³ He thus plants the seeds for an hexaëmeral reading of the text in the first part of the *Breviloquium*; he even introduces his treatment of God as *principium et exemplar effectivum-refectivum-perfectivum* by glossing the three terms as creation, redemption, and remuneration in his description of theology. He says,

Now God is not only the principle and effective exemplar of all things in creation, but also their restorative principle in redemption and their perfecting principle in remuneration. Therefore, theology does not deal simply with God the Creator, but also with the process of creation and creatures themselves. Furthermore, the rational creature, which is in a certain sense the end of all the others did not stand firm, but fell and hence needed to be restored. It therefore follows that theology must deal with the corruption of sin, with the physician, with health and its medicine, and finally with that perfect recovery which will be in glory, when the wicked have been cast into punishment. Thus theology is the only perfect science, for it begins at the very beginning which is the First Principle, and continues to the very end, which is the everlasting reward; it

³⁹² *Brev.* I.1 (V 210): "*sacra scriptura sive theologia sit scientia dans sufficientem notitiam de primo principio secundum statum viae secundum quod est necessarium ad salutem. . .*"

³⁹³ Bonaventure treats the procedure of theology, in contradistinction to the mode of science, in *In I Sent.*, prooem., q. 2 (I, 10–11). Early Franciscans like Bonaventure took the comparison of the articles of faith and the first principles of science from William of Auxerre. Cf. LaNave, "Bonaventure's Theological Method," 93; Chenu, *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle*, 34–37; and Henry Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence de la foi: au XIIIe siècle* (Paris: Parole et Silence, 2006), 19–48. For William, cf. Magistri Guillelmi Altissiodorensis, *Summa Aurea*, ed. J. Ribailier, vol. 1 (Paris and Grottaferrata: 1980).

proceeds from the summit, which is God Most High, the Creator of all things, and reaches even to the abyss, which is the torment of hell.³⁹⁴

Note that Bonaventure introduces this triad (*effectivum-refectivum-perfectivum*) and its gloss (creation-redemption-perfection) before describing theology as a science. If one reads this passage too quickly, one might not notice that Bonaventure subtly alludes to the Hexaëmeron, or rather what is a central tenet of the hexaëmeral genre—that mankind is the creature for whom all others were created—in his remark that the rational creature is “the end” of other creatures. What is more important, Bonaventure mentions the seven topics corresponding to the seven parts of the *Breviloquium*. Here he explicitly relates the three perfections of God that we addressed last chapter (i.e. power, wisdom, goodness) to creation, considered as an act of God and as the terminus of God’s act. He implies, even more subtly perhaps, that we might see the seeds of God’s salvific acts in creation itself. For this reason, the saving knowledge of Scripture (or theology) is no mere philosophy, but a teaching in accord with Christian piety:

³⁹⁴ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210): “et deus non tantum sit rerum principium et exemplar effectivum in creatione sed etiam refectivum in redemptione et perfectivum in retributione ideo non tantum agit de deo creatore sed etiam de creatione et creatura. Et quia creatura rationalis quae est quodam modo finis omnium non stetit sed suo casu indiguit reparari ideo agit de corruptela peccati medico sanitate et medicina et tandem de curatione perfecta quae erit in gloria impiis proiectis in poenam. Et ideo ipsa sola est scientia perfecta quia incipit a primo quod est primum principium et pervenit ad ultimum quod est praemium aeternum. Incipit a summo quod est deus altissimus creator omnium et pervenit ad infimum quod est infernale supplicium.” Cf. *Reductione* 4 (V 321): “Deum in quantum principium, finis et exemplar.”

Since faith is the source of worship of God and the foundation of that doctrine which is according to piety, it dictates that we should conceive of God in the most elevated and most loving manner. Now our thought would not be the most elevated if we did not believe that God could communicate himself in the most complete way, and it would not be most loving if, believe him so able, we thought him unwilling to do so.³⁹⁵

The next chapter will briefly address the importance of this passage in light of Bonaventure's notion of theology as an affective science. If, however, we view it in light of Bonaventure's understanding of the Hexaëmeron (as we saw in the previous chapter), we might note that this most elevated and loving conception of God is rooted in God's all-surpassing kindness (*summa benignitate*).³⁹⁶ Bonaventure's reference to God's *summa benignitate* in redemption and perfection is important because it signals an emphasis on God's active compassion and love, and not merely God as the "highest good" (*summum bonum*).³⁹⁷ Bonaventure's use of *benevolentia* and *benignitate* draws our

³⁹⁵ *Brev. I.2 (V 211): "quia fides cum sit principium cultus dei et fundamentum eius quae secundum pietatem est doctrinae dictat de deo esse sentiendum altissime et piissime. Non autem sentiret altissime si non crederet quod deus posset se summe communicare non sentiret piissime si crederet quod posset et nollet."*

³⁹⁶ *Brev. I.2 (V 211): "per quod etiam carnem factum pro summa benignitate hominem redemit pretiosissimo eius sanguine redemptum que cibavit. . . ."*

³⁹⁷ Bonaventure describes God as *summum bonum* when he wants to emphasize the distinct and transcendent Good of God's essence, especially in contrast to the human soul as it comes into conformity with God's perfection. Cf. e.g. Anselm, *Proslogion* 1.5: "*Quod ergo bonum de est summo bono, per quod est omne bonum?*" Bonaventure refers to God as "*summum bonum*" throughout the *Breviloquium* (I.6, II.7–II.8, III.1, IV.7, V.1–2, V.4, V.7–10, and VII.7). On Bonaventure's use of *bonum*, *bonitas*,

attention to God's friendship and mercy. The benevolent God pours out a great bounty of love, friendship, and mercy upon his creation both in the creative act, and in restoring creation and bringing it to perfection.³⁹⁸ In fact, the Trinity does all things—creation, redemption, and perfection—out of supreme kindness. This, indeed, might be the guiding thread of the *Breviloquium* and its seven-fold theology. We can see, therefore, *Brev. I* functions both to distinguish the doctrine of the Trinity from other doctrines, and as the pre-eminent distinction, insofar as God's triadic identity and God's three perfections help ground further distinctions.

The Work of Distinction: Part Two—Creation

Whereas *Brev. I* distinguishes the doctrine of the Trinity, *Brev. II* distinguishes the effects of God's creating activities, the most important of which is humanity. We see this in one of the clearest statements of God's role as *principium et exemplar effectivum*, and its relationship to the operations of creation, restoration, and perfection, which comes in *Brev. II.4*.

benignitas, and *benevolentia*, cf. Théodore A. Koehler, "The Language of St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas: A Study of their Vocabulary on Mercy," *Marian Library Studies* 29 (2015), 11–24. Cf. also Todd D. Vasquez, "The Art of Trinitarian Articulation: A Case Study on Richard of St. Victor's *de Trinitate*" (Ph.D. diss., Loyola University Chicago, 2009), 185, fn. 382; and Mary K. Bolin, "Grace: a Contrastive Analysis of a Biblical Semantic Field," *Faculty Publications, UNC Libraries* (2005), 199–205.

³⁹⁸ In addition to *Brev. I.6*, cf. *II.2*, *II.8–10*, *IV.1*, and *V.1*.

It is therefore undoubtedly true that we are the goal of everything that exists, and that all corporeal beings were made to serve humankind, so that through these things humanity might ascend to loving and praising the Creator of the universe whose providence disposes of all. Therefore this physical machine of corporeal beings is like a dwelling fashioned by the supreme architect to serve human beings until such time as they arrive at that dwelling, not made with hands, in heaven. And so, just as the soul, by reason of the body and its deserved state, is now on earth, so one day the body, by reason of the soul and its deserved reward, will be in heaven.³⁹⁹

This “physical machine” was designed to serve humans in their ascent to God, both spiritually and corporeally. In fact, everything corporeal in this physical world was made to serve the end of the ascent of the human being, in body and soul, to the heavenly vocation of “loving and praising,” a phrase which itself recalls the description of theology as a task of piety.⁴⁰⁰ In the above quote, we see Bonaventure marshaling the cosmology that he develops in part two to offer a vision of the entire world which culminates not in man as such, but in man’s praise of God and eventual dwelling in the

³⁹⁹ *Brev. II.4 (V 222): “Et propterea indubitanter verum est quod sumus finis omnium eorum quae sunt. Et omnia corporalia facta sunt ad humanum obsequium ut ex illis omnibus accendatur homo ad amandum et laudandum factorem universorum cuius providentia cuncta disponuntur. Haec igitur sensibilis corporalium machina est tanquam quaedam domus a summo opifice homini fabricata donec ad domum veniat non manufactam in caelis ut sicut anima modo ratione corporis et status meriti nunc est in terris sic aliquando corpus ratione animae et status praemii sit in caelis.”*

⁴⁰⁰ Bonaventure’s liturgical vision of the human vocation in the eschaton recalls Ambrose’s equally liturgical description of the human body in *Exameron* 9.9. On this, cf. chapter two for more on Ambrose’s treatment of the sixth day.

heavenly realm. As he explains, “through the soul—which is a form having existence, life, feeling, and intelligence—every nature may be led back [*reducatur*], as if in an intelligible circle, to its beginning, in which it is perfected and beatified.”⁴⁰¹ This cosmic structure, which gives rise to the soul in creation as the agent by which all things are led back to God, illuminates the structure of the *Breviloquium*.

As the above paragraph already suggests, although mankind was created in a state of original justice, the corruption of sin unseats humans as the *medium* between creation and God. Sin will be discussed more thoroughly below. For now, however, it is important to see that sin is conceived of as a disruption to God’s providential design, which we might call the distinction of *Brev. II*. Accordingly, as Bonaventure indicates in *Brev. I.1*, insofar as God does not abandon that design, God is also known to his creatures as the source of restoration and perfection. This three-fold understanding of God’s relationship to his creatures, which is worked out extensively in the *Breviloquium*, is reflected and with regard to the later parts of the text, prefigured in part two.

One way that Bonaventure prefigures the work of restoration and perfection in his discussion of creation is by proposing that the theologian might understand creation-distinction-adornment according to God’s perfections of power, wisdom, and

⁴⁰¹ *Brev. II.4* (V 221): “*per eam quae est forma ens vivens sentiens et intelligens quasi ad modum circuli intelligibilis reducatur ad suum principium in quo perficiatur et beatificetur.*”

goodness/benevolence. He uses these three perfections to indicate the ways that the six days of creation reflect the Trinity, not by allocating an even number of days to each of the perfections, but by showing how each operation reflects all three of the perfections. The first operation, which is the work of *creatio ex nihilo*, provides the paradigm for future manifestations of divine order in creation. In this way, insofar as all things are contained seminally in this creation (according to *Brev. II.2*),⁴⁰² Bonaventure implies that the seeds for restoration and perfection are sown in creation as well, even before any day, when one reads Genesis 1-2:4a spiritually.⁴⁰³

Creation prefigures restoration: *Brev. II.5 & 12*

Hence, part of Bonaventure's understanding of the importance of Genesis 1 is that it contains, seminally perhaps, not only cosmological knowledge but also truth about salvation. In this way, Scripture offers a two-fold knowledge; it is simultaneously

⁴⁰² Cf. chapter three (above) on this passage.

⁴⁰³ *Brev. II.5 (V 222): "ideo sacra scriptura licet principaliter agat de operibus reparationis agere nihilominus debet de opere conditionis in quantum tamen ducit in cognitionem primi principii efficientis et reficientis. . . ."* God's providence and good will are manifest in the dual manner that Scripture describes creation and redemption, which he calls "sublime" and "salutary" knowledge, respectively. Although Scripture is primarily concerned with the works of restoration—in that its goal is to give the knowledge that is necessary for salvation—in order to fulfill this goal, it "must necessarily also deal with the works of creation insofar as they lead to the knowledge of the first effective and recreating Principle." Indeed, "The restorative Principle cannot be known unless the effective Principle is known also."

sublime and saving: “sublime because it is knowledge of the effective principle, which is God the Creator; saving, because it is knowledge of the restorative Principle, which is Christ our Savior and Mediator.”⁴⁰⁴

In one respect, this is simply Hugh’s distinction of the works of foundation and the works of restoration, from *De sacramentis*, book 1. Hugh himself affirms that the works of foundation are prolegomena to the account of restoration. In another respect, however, this is an extension of Hugh’s distinction. Bonaventure suggests that contained within the account of Genesis 1, Scripture reveals *saving* truth.

Accordingly, while he has already examined the Hexaëmeron once in *Brev.* II.2–4, he provides a second analysis in *Brev.* II.5 under the auspices of “saving knowledge,” because the “sublime” knowledge of creation prefigures restoration, perhaps in a manner similar to that of the prefiguration of adornment in the days of distinction. The interrelatedness of sublime and saving knowledge is one of the first signs outside of the prologue that Bonaventure’s treatment of creation might have a broader application beyond the doctrine of creation itself. In terms of the thesis being argued here, Bonaventure emphasis on the interrelatedness of creation and salvation, under the

⁴⁰⁴ *Brev.* II.5 (V 222): “et ideo ipsa est cognitio sublimis et salutaris sublimis quia de principio effectivo quod est deus creator salutaris quia de principio reparativo quod est Christus salvator et mediator.”

auspices of a discussion of the Hexaëmeron, gives additional license for exploring the association of the Hexaëmeron and his division of theological loci.

Bonaventure explores this association in *Brev.* II.5, again with reference to the divine perfections. Genesis 1:1 reveals to the Christian that God's power, wisdom, and kindness (*bonitatis*) are first revealed in the operation of *creatio ex nihilo*.⁴⁰⁵ God does not create in chaos, but already in the day before the days God instills his perfections in creation through prototypes or seminal reasons.⁴⁰⁶ He says, "The word 'heaven,' implies the luminous nature; the word 'earth,' implies the opaque nature; and the word 'waters,' the transparent or translucent nature."⁴⁰⁷ Although these natures are not yet distinguished or adorned, they are already created. Quoting Sirach 18:1, he says, "It is in this sense that we must understand this passage, 'He who lives forever created all

⁴⁰⁵ *Brev.* II.5 (V 222): "*habet in se ordinem naturae in existendo ordinem sapientiae in disponendo ordinem bonitatis. . . .*" In this passage on the divine attributes and their reflection in the created world, Bonaventure substitutes "nature" for "power." Monti translates *bonitatis* as the general "goodness." I have chosen kindness to reflect Bonaventure's choice of "*bonitatis*."

⁴⁰⁶ *Brev.* II.5 (V 222): "*in principio ante temporis. . . .*"

⁴⁰⁷ *Brev.* II.5 (V 222): "*Ubi nomine caeli insinuatur natura luminosa nomine terrae opaca nomine aquae pervia sive perspicua sive contrarietati subiecta sive supra contrarietatem elevata.*"

things together.”⁴⁰⁸ God instills the reflection of his perfections at once and at the beginning, but reveals them through a two-fold sequence of three days to distinguish the three natures, and three days to to “provide. . . a three-fold embellishment.”⁴⁰⁹

These perfections help shape the providential order of creation, insofar as they establish a hierarchy among creatures, a hierarchy which then dictates, after a fashion, the context and order of restoration. Bonaventure explains that the Father’s creative power instills the three natures that are established “before any time” so that “the highest in dignity would be on high, the middle, in the middle position, and the lowest, at the bottom.”⁴¹⁰ The hierarchy is important for his anthropology; humans who hold a mediating position in the cosmos on account of their composition.⁴¹¹

It is similarly important, as he alludes at the end of part two, for understanding the way in which the work of restoration and perfection unfold from Scripture, which, as the source of both sublime and saving knowledge, performs a crucial function for the

⁴⁰⁸ *Brev.* II.5 (V 222): “*Et sic intelligendum est illud quod dicitur qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul.*”

⁴⁰⁹ *Brev.* II.5 (V 222). This is particularly striking considering that he uses in this passage the term “*natura*” instead of “*potentia*.”

⁴¹⁰ *Brev.* II.5 (V 223): “*triplicem naturam summam in summo mediam in medio et infimam in infimo. . .*”

⁴¹¹ *Brev.* II.10 (V 228).

science and wisdom of theology. Scripture reveals that God instills a triple nature in the day before days, which is reflected in the days and above all in the human soul. God's perfections of power, wisdom, and goodness are instilled in the day before the days, and then reflected in the days as they unfold. Indeed, the very duration and progression of creation reflects these attributes; while the triple nature is instilled as an act of God's *power* before the days, it unfolds over the six days as an act of his *wisdom*.⁴¹² As he explains in *Brev.* II.2 and reiterates in II.5, Scripture divides the six days into two sets of three days according to the distinction and adornment of elements, such that each of these three day sequences reflect the triple nature, and as "durations," as opposed to simultaneous acts, they reflect divine Wisdom. Similarly, the hierarchical influence of the higher natures on the lower, represented in the parallel progression of the days reflects divine goodness itself. The natures that are distinguished in the first three days proceed from luminous to the translucent and then to the opaque. This procession reveals, in Bonaventure's mind, a structure of influence such that the lower orders depend on the superior natures.⁴¹³ This hierarchical influence at the level of nature is a

⁴¹² *Brev.* II.5 (V 223): "God used a triple measure of duration, that is a triplet of days, to make a threefold distinction in the triple created nature; and he used another triple of days to provide this triply distinct nature with a threefold embellishment."

⁴¹³ Cf. Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 1.8.2, and James McEvoy, *Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 91.

vestige of divine influence, which emanates from the day before the days, extends from above, through the highest created natures to the lowest. Hence, every creaturely activity “receives its law, origin, and energy from the celestial nature.”⁴¹⁴ In its *sublime* knowledge, therefore, Scripture reveals God and the three-fold order that proceeds from God in the six days.

Just as the days are in some sense prefigured by the “day before the day,” so too saving knowledge is prefigured by sublime knowledge. However, this is only available according to a spiritual interpretation of the text. In Scripture the unity of creation and salvation is reflected in the relationship of literal and spiritual interpretation; the literal sense of Genesis 1 is the work of creation, distinction, adornment, and the Sabbath day of God’s rest. Contained within this literal sense, Genesis 1 teaches saving truth, as Bonaventure explains: “Scripture does not speak of the work of creation except with reference to the work of redemption.”⁴¹⁵

As an example of the dual knowledge of Scripture, Bonaventure observes that the whole process of the seven days refers spiritually to salvation and the Church. “The

⁴¹⁴ *Brev. II.5 (V 223): “Quia enim omnis actio corporalis in rebus inferioribus regulam, originem et vigorem sumit a natura caelesti...”*

⁴¹⁵ *Brev. II.5 (V 223): “ideo non determinat de opere conditionis nisi propter opus reparationis.”*

‘seven days’ stands for the seven states of the Church through the succession of the seven ages [as well as] the seven illuminations through which the angels rise from the creature to God.”⁴¹⁶ These days are capable of representing much more than angelic illumination, however. In Bonaventure’s analysis, the seminal prefiguring of salvation is already evident in the “threefold” nature that is instilled in *creatio ex nihilo*, and manifest in the works of distinction, adornment, and, ultimately, perfection.

Adornment is Prefigured in Distinction

Having described the correspondence between sublime and saving knowledge in *Brev.* II.5, we are now positioned to see that this correspondence turns on the operation of adornment, in which the attribute of kindness is showcased. In *Brev.* II. 12

⁴¹⁶ *Brev.* II.5 (V 223–224): “*per septenarium dierum intelligitur septiformis ecclesiae status secundum decursum septem aetatum. Per eundem etiam septenarium intelligitur septiformis angelorum conversio a creatura ad deum.*” Although Augustine maintains that his angelic interpretation actually renders a more literal interpretation of the days than a temporal account, Bonaventure holds that it is spiritual insofar as the steps of angelic illumination are symbolically represented, in his opinion, by the days: “understood in a spiritual sense, in the three natures which were first produced, we see the angelic hierarchy under the term heaven.” Cf. Augustine, *De genesi* 4.28.45: “And please let nobody assume that what I have said about spiritual light and about the day being constituted in the spiritual and angelic creation, and about what it contemplates in the Word of God, and about the knowledge by which the creature is known in itself and is being referred to the praise of unchangeable truth, where first the idea was seen of the thing to be made, which once made was known to itself: that none of this can be said strictly and properly, but that it all belongs to a kind of figurative and allegorical understanding of day and evening and morning.”

Bonaventure says that the whole world was meant to be read spiritually by humans in order to both learn about themselves and their Creator. That is, prior to the fall, the image of God was placed within creation as the adornment and culmination of the whole cosmos. This special adornment was given so that there might be a creature who could perceive the world as God's "footprint" (*vestigium*) and mirror (*speculum*) image,⁴¹⁷ and in the process to become the likeness of God. Humans, Bonaventure says, possess an ability unique to them alone to read the two books of creation: — "one written within. . . and the other written without."⁴¹⁸ The book written without is the vestige, God's footprint in the corporeal cosmos. The book written within is the image of God in the rational creature. Whereas angels have "an internal sense" to read the book within, and beasts have the senses to see the book written without, only humanity possesses "the double range of senses" to read both.⁴¹⁹ Only the rational and corporeal

⁴¹⁷ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230). Vestiges are the traces of God in all creatures, whether animate or inanimate, rational or irrational. The image of the Trinity is found only rational creatures. The likeness of the Trinity is found "only in those spirits that are God-conformed."

⁴¹⁸ *Brev.* II.11 (V 229)

⁴¹⁹ *Brev.* II.11 (V 229): "*duplex sensus.*" The movement from the exterior book to the interior book parallels the movement from exterior to interior that is characteristic of the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*. The language of *intus* and *foris* depends on Bonaventure's Christology, as he explains here in chapter 11, and is drawn from Hugh of St. Victor (see below), and Gregory the Great, who used the "*intus... foris*" paradigm to depict the Incarnation. Cf. Gregory the Great, *Commentary on Ezekiel*, II.ii.15 (219.428).

creature is able to see the perceptible world as a manifestation of the power, wisdom, and goodness of the “supreme Principle” (*summum principium*). Indeed, only the human can see the world as “a kind of book reflecting, representing, and describing its Maker, the Trinity, at three different levels of expression: as a vestige, as an image, and as a likeness.”⁴²⁰ Bonaventure argues that the wholeness of the universe depended on there being a rational creature who, so endowed by grace and nature, could by nature read both books.⁴²¹

Bonaventure receives this literary metaphor from Hugh of St. Victor. In *De tribus*, Hugh says,

For this whole sensible world is a kind of book written by the finger of God, that is, created by divine power, and each creature is a kind of figure, not invented by human determination, but established by the divine will to manifest and in some way signify the invisible wisdom of God. However, just as when an unlettered

For commentary on Gregory’s use of *intus* and *foris*, see G. R. Evans, *The Thought of Gregory the Great* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 52-53. Jean Plagnieux, however, argues that the primary influence is Augustine (Jean Plagnieux, “Aux sources de la doctrine bonaventurienne sur l’état originel de l’homme: Influence de saint Augustin ou de saint Irénée,” in *S. Bonaventura, 1274–1974 IV*, 313–15).

⁴²⁰ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230): “*colligi potest quod creatura mundi est quasi quidam liber in quo relucet repraesentatur et legitur trinitas fabricatrix secundum triplicem gradum expressionis scilicet per modum vestigii imaginis et similitudinis. . . .*” Bonaventure describes this knowledge as a kind of ascent: “the human intellect is designed to ascend gradually to the supreme Principle.” This is ostensibly the methodology of the *Itinerarium*. Cf. *Itin.* 1.2.

⁴²¹ *Brev.* II.11 (V 229).

person sees an open book and notices the shapes but does not recognize the letters, so the stupid and carnal people, who are not aware of the things of God, see on the outside the beauty in these visible creatures, but they do not understand its meaning. On the other hand, a spiritual person can discern all things. When he considers externally the beauty of the work, he understands internally how wondrous is the wisdom of the Creator.⁴²²

Bonaventure not only adopts Hugh's book metaphor; he also adopts the movement from exterior to interior (see above). To these elements, Bonaventure adds the language of virtue; the human, having been made *like* God, possesses "the three-fold dowry of faith, hope, and love" ("*quin configuretur ei per fidem spem et caritatem*").⁴²³

In this way, Bonaventure describes the human being as the *medium*:

Thus, the rational spirit stands midway between the first and the last [likeness] of these, so that the first [the vestige] is below it, the second [the image] within, and the third [the likeness] above it. And so, in the state of innocence, when the image was not yet spoiled but rendered God-like through grace, the book of creation sufficed to enable human beings to perceive the light of divine Wisdom. They were then so wise that when they saw all things in themselves, they also perceived them in their proper genus and with reference to God's creating art.⁴²⁴

⁴²² Hugh, *De Tribus Diebus* 4 (PL 176:814), trans. Coolman and Coulter, in *Trinity and Creation*, 63–64. Cf. Coolman and Coulter, *Trinity and Creation*, 96 n. 18: Coolman notes the influence of Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 26.2.12, ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont (Leiden: Brepols, 2013), 161.10–21.

⁴²³ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230): "*quin configuretur ei per fidem spem et caritatem.*"

⁴²⁴ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230): "*Est igitur spiritus rationalis medius inter primam et ultimam ita quod primam habet inferius secundam interius tertiam superius. Et ideo in statu innocentiae cum imago non erat vitiata sed deiformis effecta per gratiam sufficebat liber creaturae in quo se ipsum exerceret homo ad contuendum lumen divinae sapientiae ut sic sapiens esset cum universas res videret in se videret in proprio genere videret etiam in arte.*"

The originally just human being occupied an important middle space between God and creation, and was, therefore, both *medium* between nature and the supernatural, as well as the epitome of the natural.⁴²⁵ Innocent and empowered with grace to be God-like, humans saw creation as a reflection of the Eternal Art. In this graced state, there was communion with God, mediated to nature through the human being. Similarly, human beings also reflected the three-fold causality in a three-fold vision: “the eye of flesh, the eye of reason, and the eye of contemplation.”⁴²⁶ With the eye of the flesh, they perceived what is remote from God: the world, created in unity, wisdom, and goodness. With the eye of reason they perceived what is proximate to God: their soul, which holds the power of memory, understanding, and will. And with the eye of contemplation, they perceived God’s likeness in the world through the theological virtues of faith, hope, and love. “Thus with the eye of flesh, human beings see those things which are outside them; by the eye of reason, those things what are within them; by the eye of

⁴²⁵ Cf. *Brev.* II.4 on humanity as completing the intelligible circle of creation, and II.11 on humanity as the creature intended to read book the interior and the exterior books. Cf. also Alexander Schaefer, “The Position and Function of Man in the Created World According to Saint Bonaventure,” *Franciscan Studies* 20 (1960): 279; and Paula Jean Miller, *Marriage: the Sacrament of Divine–Human Communion*, 46–48.

⁴²⁶ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230): “*triplicem visionem... carnis, rationis et contemplationis...*” Bonaventure receives the language of the third eye from Hugh of St. Victor, *De Sacramentis* 1.6.14.

contemplation, the things that are above them."⁴²⁷ Ascending from the external creation, to the interior self, and then to God, human perception mirrored the hierarchical cosmology, which itself manifests God's power, wisdom, and goodness, and in this manner human contemplation participated in the human mediation of the corporeal cosmos and the divine hierarchy.⁴²⁸

Thus, Bonaventure presents creation as the second of three distinctions, in this case first distinguishing creation as such from the Creator. Thereafter, he notes that creation is marked by a hierarchy which reflects triad of identity of God, the first distinction. The hierarchy of creatures finds humans on top, insofar as they are comprised by a union of both kinds of created matter—spiritual and corporeal matter—and endowed with an ability to sense both kinds of created matter. In this way, humans are the first mediators. But moreover, Bonaventure sees in the process of creation itself a prefiguration of salvation, such that Genesis 1 contains both knowledge of the universe as it presents itself to the senses, as well as saving knowledge. Thus, from part two, we see that Bonaventure both explains salvation, as well as continues to set up building

⁴²⁷ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230): "*oculo carnis videret homo ea quae sunt extra se oculo rationis ea quae sunt intra se et oculo contemplationis ea quae sunt supra se.*"

⁴²⁸ On the vision without, within, and above, cf. Augustine, *De genesi* 4.29.46–4.31.48.

blocks for explaining restoration and perfection. Indeed, the Hexaëmeron seems to be not only an important doctrine within Bonaventure's system, but is perhaps one of the most important models for reflecting on the theology of the *Breviloquium*.

The Work of Distinction: Part Three—Sin

For Bonaventure, sin, which is the topic of part three, is a corruption of the created order. In this respect, it is difficult to describe sin as a distinction within the pattern of creation-distinction-adornment in the same way that we have done with the doctrines of the Trinity and creation. Bonaventure's descriptions of God and creation work together in their emphases on the positive attributes of each and the dependence of creation on God to exist. As far as this goes, these are simply elements of the doctrine of creation as Bonaventure had received it. From another perspective, however, it is precisely the relationship of sin to creation: true, sin depends on creation for its scope and influence, as Bonaventure will explain in part three. However, whereas creation exists as a reflection of the perfections of the creator, sin does not exist, but rather corrupts existence, turning creation into a parody of what it should be. In this respect, Bonaventure incorporates sin in the framework of creation-distinction-adornment, even if he does so by distinguishing sin from God and creation as a negation or corruption.

Bonaventure presents sin in terms of its effects on the human vocation, which is fitting insofar as sin originates in a failure on the part of humans to act according to that

vocation. Unsurprisingly then, Bonaventure introduces sin in *Brev.* II.12 during his discussion of human contemplation. Humans lost the ability and special grace to read the interior book, however, and consequently further impeded their ability to read the exterior book by introducing death and decay into the world through sin. "For fallen human beings cannot attain these things [the three-fold vision] unless they first recognize their own insufficiency and blindness, and this they cannot do unless they consider and attend to the ruin of human nature."⁴²⁹ Indeed, "the eye of contemplation does not function perfectly except through glory, which human beings have lost through sin, although they may recover this through grace and faith and the understanding of the Scriptures. By these means the soul is cleansed, enlightened, and perfected for the contemplation of heavenly things."⁴³⁰

⁴²⁹ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230): "*lapsus homo pervenire non potest nisi prius defectus et tenebras proprias recognoscat quod non facit nisi consideret et attendat ruinam humanae naturae.*"

⁴³⁰ *Brev.* II.12 (V 230): "*Qui quidem oculus contemplationis actum suum non habet perfectum nisi per gloriam quam amittit per culpam recuperat autem per gratiam et fidem et scripturarum intelligentiam quibus mens humana purgatur illuminatur et perficitur ad caelestia contemplanda.*"

For Bonaventure, sin is “not efficient, but deficient.”⁴³¹ It is the corruption of “measure, kind, and order,”⁴³² and, as Zachary Hayes observes, therefore “involves both a moral and cosmic dimension; for sin is not only an act of the will against the moral order, but—precisely as such—it is a disruption in the order of being.”⁴³³ For Hayes, presumably, “moral” denotes the spiritual capacity of humanity as much as it does ethics as such. Regardless, for Bonaventure, sinful corruption results in the creature’s inability to properly reflect the Creator in their own being, as well as his inability to refer the rest of creation to the Creator through the activity of contemplation. Humanity has turned away from the height of contemplation, choosing to focus on the lesser and lower good of the flesh, “to cling to what is changeable,” instead of “the highest good” (*summe bonum*) and “first Principle and perfect being” (*primum principium ut summe ens*).⁴³⁴ In this way, we might characterize the fall of humanity in two ways;

⁴³¹ *Brev.* III.1 (V 231): “*quia defectus est, non habet causam efficientem, sed deficientem.*”

⁴³² *Brev.* III.1 (V 231): “*hoc est peccatum quod est modi speciei et ordinis corruptivum.*” Bonaventure uses *modus* as a synonym for *mensura* from Wis. 11:21. See chapter two of this study for Augustine on Wis. 11:21, and chapter three for Bonaventure’s use of *mensura* in *Brev.* II.

⁴³³ Hayes, Zachary Hayes, *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure* (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 2000), 167.

⁴³⁴ *Brev.* III.1 (V 231): “*commutabili inhaerescit.*” Cf. Augustine, *De natura boni* 34 and 36. Hayes argues that, for Bonaventure, sin is a rejection of the *summum bonum*, and therefore a rejection of God. It is, more precisely, “a failure in human beings to

first, with regard to the original creation, sin stands as a distinction of loci. Sin is precisely no-thing, but rather a corruption. Accordingly, as a theological concept, needs to be distinguished from creation as well as God. In this way, however, it also assists in distinguishing God from creation insofar as creation alone is mutable. Moreover, sin helps distinguish the divine operation of creation (*principium effectivum*) from re-creation (*principium reffectivum*). Second, with regard to the Hexaëmeron, sin corrupts the epitome of the work of the six days, mankind. In this respect, Bonaventure presents sin as a corruption of the original adornment of creation.

Moreover, sin, which originates in the primal vice, pride,⁴³⁵ entails the human usurping the principality of God, placing themselves and other lesser goods in God's place. "One cannot withdraw from the First Principle without contempt for it. . . Now contempt for the First Principle is pride."⁴³⁶ Such a contemptuous withdrawal, which then gives rise to the other six vices, corrupts the right order and justice of both the

personalize the law of all created reality as the law of their personal existence. It is in essence always a sin against the Son who became incarnate in Jesus. Sin always has a Christological dimension" (*The Hidden Center*, 167). The "Christological dimension" of sin in the *Breviloquium* does not become so clear until Bonaventure treats the Incarnation in the following part.

⁴³⁵ *Brev.* III.9 (V 238). Bonaventure cites Sirach 10.13 on the primacy of pride.

⁴³⁶ *Brev.* III.9 (V 238). Cf. Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 166.

human being as well as the entire cosmos. “Every sin distorts the image of the Trinity and defiles the soul in its three powers: the native appetite, rationality, and the positive appetite.”⁴³⁷ This quote shows the two-fold relationship of sin to creation—sketched above: sin functions as both a distorting distinction and a corruption to adornment.

Ultimately, Bonaventure concludes, this corruption, and the ensuing loss of the eye of contemplation, results not only in the ruin of human nature, which pertains to distinction, but also humanity’s utter failure in succeeding in their role as the *medium* of the hierarchy established by God as *principium effectivum*, which pertains to adornment. Accordingly, as we will see, the destruction of humanity’s mediation requires both a renewal of the distinction of creation (re-creation) and a renewal of the adornment of creation, which is humanity’s lost mediation.

Bonaventure’s understanding of sin as corrosive of distinction and a corrosion of adornment are not limited to part III. His analysis of and reaction to human sin appear in every section of the *Breviloquium*, from the discussion of the fall of human contemplation at the end of *Brev.* II, to the discussion of Christ’s obedience as the “contrary” to the disobedience of Adam’s sin in IV.3, the work of the virtues as opposing the work of the vices in V, the seven sacraments as the medicine that combats

⁴³⁷ *Brev.* III.11 (V 240). On the penalty of sin, cf. also III.10 (V 238–239), and VII.2 (V 282–283), and Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 164.

the seven sins in VI, and, finally, the divine judgment that purges the world of sin in VII. Sin, far from being confined to one section of the text, impacts the whole structure of the *Breviloquium*. Accordingly, our analysis of his teaching on sin is similarly integrated in the discussions of those sections in this study.

The brief summary of parts I, II, and III (above) helps us see how these parts might be conceived of in terms of the hexaëmeral operation of “distinction.” Moreover, we see, per our discussion of part I, that the triad of hexaëmeral operation is tied to the triad of God as *principium et exemplar effectivum, refectivum, et perfectivum* and the triad of power-wisdom-benevolence. And finally, just as we saw in chapter three of this dissertation and above in the current chapter that the days of the operations of distinction and adornment parallel each other, so too, we can now see how Bonaventure is already prefiguring a similar parallel with parts IV, V, and VI. In fact, the crucial text for understanding the work of restoration that begins with the Incarnation is his statement in part two that everything is contained seminally in the testimony of the six days of creation, distinction, and adornment and the seventh day of rest. Of course, Bonaventure does not think that the unaided reader can simply look at creation and discern the Incarnation. Rather, in a spiritual reading of the Hexaëmeron, one can see the *principium et exemplar refectivum*, the Eternal Art who is already sowing the seeds of restoration.

The Work of Adornment: Part Four—the Incarnation

Insofar as part three is meant to present sin as a distinction—as we have dubbed the first two parts with reference to the Hexaëmeral operation of distinction—albeit as a negating, parodic, and corrupting one, then we can see that part four only doubles down on the hexaëmeral character of the structure of Bonaventure’s text. As the fourth part, Bonaventure’s treatise on the Incarnation corresponds to the fourth day, the beginning of the work of adornment by framing the Incarnation as a new beginning and a spiritual adornment. In this way, part four performs a work similar to that of the fourth day in that it parallels the first part just as the fourth day paralleled the first day. Bonaventure accomplishes this parallel, as we will see below, in two ways. First, he creates a parallel between part one and part four by describing Christ as both the *principium et exemplar reffectivum*, thereby paralleling the *principium et exemplar effectivum* of part one. Second, he draws on the parallel between adornment and distinction by describing Christ as a *complementum* of the cosmos, a term that evokes the work of adornment, thereby paralleling the First Principle’s power to distinguish the elements.

Bonaventure also presents Christ as the new man, the second Adam who is born in the sixth age, and the new *medium*, the one who bridges the distance between creation and God in himself. Christ is the divine response to the ruin of sin, in whom “eternal Wisdom and its work coincide in the same person. . . the book written within

and without for the restoration of the world.”⁴³⁸ In this description, we see that Christ recapitulates the original human vocation of moving from exterior to interior. In this way, Christ restores humanity’s intimacy with God, as well as humanity’s original role as *medium*.

This helps us make sense of the placement of the Incarnation in *Brev.* IV.

Bonaventure helps us address concerns regarding the centrality of Christ in Bonaventure’s thought and the structure of the *Breviloquium*; if Christ corresponds to mankind as a second Adam, and the structure of the *Breviloquium* is indeed Hexaëmeral, then why has Bonaventure treated Christ in part four and not part six? Here, we need to attend to the fact that he grounds his treatment of restoration in two parallels: first, the Incarnation is both a work of the Trinity and a new beginning, as we alluded to briefly above. Second, the Incarnation recapitulates the first Adam as the *medium* between creation and humanity. This latter parallel is part of his presentation of Christ as the beginning of spiritual adornment. It is fitting that Bonaventure reflects on this new beginning and new mediation of the Incarnation by placing it at the beginning of the works of restoration. Echoing Hugh of St. Victor, he says, “The First creative Principle [*principium effectivum*] could not have been anything less than God. Nor it is surely no

⁴³⁸ *Brev.* II.11 (V 229): “*Et quia in Christo simul concurrit aeterna sapientia et eius opus in una persona ideo dicitur liber scriptus intus et foris ad reparationem mundi.*”

less important to restore [*reparare*] created things as to give them existence, for the well-being of things is no less significant than for them simply to be. And so it was most fitting that the restorative [*reparativum*] principle of all things should be God Most High.”⁴³⁹ Thus, we know Christ not only as the effective (*effectivum*) principle but also the restorative (*refectivum*) principle.⁴⁴⁰ “The Incarnation is the work of the First Principle, not only insofar as it is an effective principle in producing, but also insofar as it is a restorative principle in healing, atoning, and reconciling.”⁴⁴¹ In reiterating the two-fold identity (creation and restoration) of the First Principle here, he is identifying the Incarnation as a work of the creating Trinity, and, more specifically, locating the motive

⁴³⁹ *Brev.* IV.1 (V 241): “*principium effectivum rerum non potuerit nec decuerit esse nisi deum et non minus sit res conditas reparare quam in esse producere sicut non minus est bene esse quam simpliciter esse decentissimum fuit rerum principium reparativum esse deum summum.*” For Bonaventure’s sources, cf. Hugh, *De sacramentis* 1, prol. 2: “For the works of restoration are of much greater dignity than the works of foundation, because the latter were made for servitude, that they might be subject to man standing; the former, for salvation, that they might raise man fallen. Therefore, the works of foundation, as if of little importance, were accomplished in six days, but the works of restoration can not be completed except in six ages. Yet six are placed over against six that the Restorer may be proven to be the same Creator”; and Augustine, *Sermon* 176, 5.5 (PL 38:952): “Nobody can recreate except the one who creates” (cited in Monti, *Breviloquium*, 131, n. 2).

⁴⁴⁰ *Brev.* I.1 (V 209).

⁴⁴¹ *Brev.* IV.2 (V 242).

for the Incarnation in the divine nature.⁴⁴² This turn to the First Principle should be unsurprising, however, considering that in his description of the order of creation he never fails to demonstrate the Trinitarian source of the order of creation and redemption. Likewise, his mirroring of creation and redemption in the opening paragraphs of part four corresponds to the relation of sublime and saving knowledge as explained in part two, wherein he sets up a fitting and necessary relationship of the knowledge of creation and salvation.

More importantly, Bonaventure sees this parallel of the works of creation and the works of redemption as analogous to the parallel of distinction and adornment. Indeed, he describes Christ according to this analogy: just as man was made for the “adornment [*ornamentum*] of the whole universe,” so too Christ, “the second man,” for “the fulfillment [*completionem*] of the whole in its redemption, in whom the First Principle was joined with the last, ‘God with clay.’”⁴⁴³ Christ not only corresponds to mankind,

⁴⁴² Monti agrees: “Bonaventure thus locates the primary reason for the Incarnation in the divine nature itself.” Cf. Alexander of Hales, *Summa Fratris* III.2.13

⁴⁴³ *Brev.* IV.4 (V 244–245): “*sicut primus homo, qui erat totius mundi sensibilis ornamentum, ultimo fuerat conditus, scilicet sexto die, ad totius mundi completionem: sic secundus homo, totius mundi reparati complementum, in quo primum principium coniugitur cum ultimo, scilicet « Deus cum limo », lieret in fine temporum, hoc est in sexte aetate...*” Citing Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo 3 in vigilia Nativia. Domini* 8 (PL 183:98C). Monti translates *ornamentum* “perfection.” Bonaventure is consistent in thinking the cure according to both the patient and the physician. Insofar as wisdom is the appropriation of the second person of the Trinity, and the hypostatic union is the union of human and

the adornment of the universe; in Christ, the First Principle is united to the last creature. By placing him in the middle part of the seven parts of the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure accentuates this mediating role.

Moreover, by placing Christ squarely at the beginning of the works of restoration, Bonaventure both reinforces the unity of divine operation in creation and redemption, and demonstrates that re-creation is an important aspect of the work of *principium et exemplar refectionis*. In so doing, he solidifies the parallel of that restorative work and the operation of adornment: Christ, as God and man, begins a spiritual adornment in the work of restoration.⁴⁴⁴

divine nature under one divine person, it is fitting and most loving that Wisdom should enter into his creation to save it in that age which corresponds to the creature he would assume and the day which reflects his appropriation. Bonaventure develops this theme at length and with regard to the six wings of the seraph in both the structure of the *Itinerarium* and the *Hexaëmeron* (16.29). Cf. Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 271.

⁴⁴⁴ Compare with Ilia Delio, O.S.F., "Revisiting the Franciscan Doctrine of Christ," *Theology Studies* 64 (2003): 9–10. Delio argues that "while in his the *Breviloquium* (1255) he clearly adopts the Anselmian position with regard to the Incarnation, his later thought shifts toward Christ as the noble perfection of the universe in his *De reductione artium ad theologiam* (1257). Even in his "Sermon on the Nativity," composed after the *De reductione artium*, one finds no mention of satisfaction but rather an emphasis on the Incarnation as the perfection of the created order and an act of cosmic completion." This study, by contrast, has proposed that Bonaventure distinguished completion from perfection, thereby suggesting that the *Breviloquium*, rather than straightforwardly adopting the Anselmian position of satisfaction, eschewing a notion of perfection (as Delio seems to think Anselm does), instead figures the Incarnation in terms of the divine operations of creation, redemption, and perfection, and in the process

We see Bonaventure offer another perspective on the spiritual gloss of the work of distinction and adornment. In part two, he explains that all of the operations of creation, distinction, and adornment reflect power, wisdom, and goodness/kindness. Within this general reflection of the divine attributes, the first operation of creation and the category of nature have a special relationship to power, the subsequent operations of distinction and adornment relate to wisdom, and the unfolding of duration and direction toward the end relate to goodness or kindness. In *Brev.* IV, he describes a similar application of the divine attributes to the work of restoration. He explains,

It was fitting that God should so restore all things as to display that same power [*potentiam*], wisdom [*sapientiam*], and benevolence [*benevolentiam*]. Now what is more powerful than to combine within a single person two natures so widely disparate? What is wiser and more fitting than to bring the entire universe to full perfection by uniting the first and last, that is the Word of God, which is the origin of all things, and human nature, which was the last of all creatures? What is more benevolent than for the master to redeem the slave by taking the form of a servant? Certainly this is a deed of such unfathomable goodness that no greater proof of mercy, kindness, and friendship can be conceived. Assuredly, then, this was the most appropriate way for God the Redeemer to demonstrate the divine power, wisdom, and benevolence."⁴⁴⁵

synthesizes his understanding of redemption with the hexaëmeral operation of adornment, which leads to the perfection of the seventh day/seventh age. Indeed, it is Christ's recapitulation of Adam, as the medium between creation and the Creator, which leads, in some sense, to perfection.

⁴⁴⁵ *Brev.* IV.1 (V 241): "*optime seu benevolenter decuit ut sic repararet quod suam potentiam sapientiam et benevolentiam ostenderet. Quid autem potentius quam coniungere extrema summe distantia in unam personam. Quid sapientius et congruentius quam quod ad perfectionem totius universi fieret coniunctio primi et ultimi verbi scilicet dei quod est omnium principium et humanae naturae quae fuit ultima omnium creaturarum. Quid benevolentius*

Bonaventure's turn to benevolence early in the *Breviloquium* now pays off as he shows that the good will (*benevolentia*) and kindness (*benignitas*) extended by the First Principle in the creation of the world finds its fullest expression in the Incarnation. He describes this expression with reference to the distinction and adornment of natures in the six days. The new gift given in the servant and crucified Christ resembles in a sense the gifts of existence, wisdom, and goodness given to mankind in his originally just state. Mankind, who was able to behold glory when aided by grace, adorned the original creation. Similarly, God's salvific act of joining the two natures (divine and human), the first and the last, and taking the form of a slave and servant to fallen mankind, constitute an unparalleled and perfect demonstration of the same power, wisdom, and benevolence that is was shown in the creation, distinction, and adornment of the world. The Incarnation repairs the damage done by sin to the original creation, particularly to mankind. As we observed above, sin is the last distinction in Bonaventure's system, and unlike the first two (Trinity and creation) is a negative or destructive distinction. Particularly, sin is corrosive not only to mankind as such, but

quam quod dominus propter servi salutem accipiat formam servi. Immo hoc tantae benignitatis est ut nihil clementius nihil benignius nihil amabilius cogitari possit. Convenientissimus ergo erat hic modus deo reparatori propter commendandam divinam potentiam sapientiam et benevolentiam."

mankind as the medium and adornment of creation. Sin disrupts the structure of creation-distinction-adornment in that the world proceeds toward perfection through the stages of distinction and adornment, the last of which is epitomized in humanity. Insofar as sin curtails humanity's ascent to completion and perfection (in the seventh age), sin also disrupts this original order

The Incarnation enters into creation through humanity, participating thereby in humanity's adornment of the world. However, more importantly, in Bonaventure's view, the Incarnation is an even greater demonstration of the divine perfections than any creative act of adornment was. Indeed, for Bonaventure, the Incarnation is the supreme adornment of God's creation. Thus, part four inaugurates not an extended discussion of the distinction of creation (part two); neither is the Incarnation simply a reaction or response to sin (part three). Rather, part four begins a different stage of Bonaventure's theological system, that of the spiritual adornment of restoration.

Inasmuch as the *principle* of creation and redemption is also the *principle* of perfection, Bonaventure declares that it was fitting that God should become incarnate as human, for in so doing he not only restores humanity's innocence, but also helps humans to recover "their proper excellence,"⁴⁴⁶ and friendship with God. Christ does

⁴⁴⁶ *Brev.* IV.1 (V 241): "*suam excellentiam.*"

this by both mediating between God and mankind, and drawing humanity toward himself as their end and fulfillment. In this description of the Incarnation, however, Bonaventure exposes a potential contradiction in the structure and Christology of the *Breviloquium*. To position Christ as both Mediator and *medium* in *Brev.* IV ought to preclude his also being the fulfillment of humanity, who is created on the sixth day, or the Second Adam who arrives only in the sixth age.⁴⁴⁷ Yet, this is no contradiction when one considers that the original role of humanity was to be the *medium* of both corporeal and spiritual creation, as well as the *medium* between God and creation. Consequent to the Fall and corruption of human nature, humanity has lost this mediating role. Bonaventure returns to the anthropology of *Brev.* II to describe how it is that Christ is both *medium* and fulfillment: the one who restores the creation to its original justice and the second Adam.

This raises one of the objections to the thesis of this chapter, however. Why treat the Incarnation in *Brev.* IV when it so clearly corresponds to the sixth day and sixth age? The answer to this question lies not in Bonaventure's commitment to the numbers six or seven, but in his understanding of the Hexaëmeron as a division of two distinct operations (distinction and adornment) which proceed from the foundation of *creatio ex*

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. *Brev.* IV.2.6 on Bonaventure's clarification of mediator and *medium*; and Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 62–63.

nihilo. He introduces Christology in *Brev.* IV because by doing so he is able to describe restoration as a kind of adornment, and because Christ is the *principium* of this spiritual adornment. Christ's dual role as *medium* and fulfillment is encapsulated in his identity as this principal of restoration (*principium et exemplar refectionis*). Restoration, like creation and perfection, is a divine work alone, Bonaventure argues. Had another creature been the mediator and savior, he speculates, "then humanity would have become subject to another creature, and thus would not have regained its state of excellence."⁴⁴⁸ Thus, it was fitting and necessary (from the perspective of humanity) for the *principium effectivum* to begin a new work. This work of re-creation, which spans from parts four to six, corresponds to the operation of adornment of days four through six.

"Christian faith requires that we hold. . . that the Incarnation is a work of the Trinity, through which took place the assumption of flesh by the Godhead and the

⁴⁴⁸ *Brev.* IV.1 (V 241): "*homo esset illi merae creaturae subiectus et sic non recuperaret statum excellentiae.*" Bonaventure alludes to a prophetic or angelic mediator who while mediating revelation, could not mediate and restore humanity's original dignity and excellence, which, as God's grace and glory, only God could restore. Likewise, any other mediator than God would not have been able to restore friendship with God. "Nor could humanity have recovered its friendship with God except by means of a suitable mediator, who could touch God with one hand and humanity with the other, who could be the likeness and friend of both: God-like in his divinity, and like us in his humanity" (*Brev.* IV.1 [V 241–242]).

union of the Godhead with the flesh. . . [and] also of a rational spirit.”⁴⁴⁹ Bonaventure proposes that the unique mode of conception entailed in the Incarnation demonstrates how the Incarnation participates in the adornment of the cosmos. Just as the luminaries on the fourth day constitute a new mode of being in the luminous nature, Christ’s conception and life constitute a new, or recreated way of being for humanity. Christ is conceived not from neither man or woman (Adam), or from man alone (Eve), or in a union of concupiscence (all offspring from Adam and Eve), but from a woman alone. “And so, for the completeness of the universe, it was fitting that a fourth way be introduced: out of woman without the seed of a man, through the power of a Supreme Maker.”⁴⁵⁰

This observation, however, expands the terms of adornment to include the *completissimum* of Incarnation; in a sense, the Incarnation was necessary for the full adornment of the universe. It is fitting that this should be treated in part four, and not part six, because it is this *completissimum* that will give rise to all other adornments that

⁴⁴⁹ *Brev.* IV.2 (V 242). Cf. *Brev.* II.9.5 on these three powers.

⁴⁵⁰ *Brev.* IV.3 (V 243). Bonaventure explains that Joseph does not recapitulate Adam’s role in conceiving offspring, because Christ’s birth actualizes a new mode of producing a human. Cf. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo* 2.8 (PL 158:406).

flow from the *principium reffectivum*. Christ is the beginning of the completion of the world through restoration.

He is not only the source of completion and adornment, but also a new restorative *medium*. “For it is a mediator’s proper role to be the *medium* between humanity and God in order to lead humankind back to the knowledge of God, to the likeness of God, and to be children of God.”⁴⁵¹ The Son was the most fitting of the three divine hypostases to mediate in this way between humanity and God because the Son is already the *medium* of the Trinitarian relations. Indeed, “Since mediation is proper to the Son of God, incarnation is also.”⁴⁵²

As mediator, the Son draws creation into his relationship of procession from and return to the Father. So too, part four of the *Breviloquium* inaugurates a discussion of restoration and return to the First Principle. Becoming “children of God,” Bonaventure says, happens precisely by becoming conformed to Christ “who is the image of the

⁴⁵¹ *Brev.* IV.2 (V 243): “*Mediatoris namque est esse medium inter hominem et Deum ad reducendum hominem ad divinam cognitionem, ad divinam conformitatem et ad divinam filiationem.*”

⁴⁵² *Brev.* IV.2 (V 242): Cf. *In 3 Sent.* 1.2.3 (III 28–31), and 19.2.2, ad. 1 (III 411). Cf. also *Hex.* 1.10–39 (V 330–35) on seven ways in which Christ is *medium*.

Father.”⁴⁵³ As the new *medium* between God and mankind, what Christ mediates is fulfillment and completion. To make this point, Bonaventure explains not only the mode of conception, but also the temporal aspect of the Incarnation. He says, “the integrity and perfection of the universe require that all things be ordered as to places and times.”⁴⁵⁴ The source of this ordering, he argues, is the Hexaëmeron. The progression through the operations of creation, distinction, and adornment lead ultimately to the perfection of the seventh day. Following this hexaëmeral pattern, Christ comes as the second Adam in the fulfillment of time in order to cure the sin of the first Adam through a “contrary” action of obedience.⁴⁵⁵ However, rather than focus on the introduction of sin through Adam and the opposition to that sin in Christ, he shifts the focus to Adam’s role as the summit of adornment of creation as well as Christ’s corresponding role as the source of restoration. Bonaventure says,

Just as the first man, who was the adornment of the whole sensible world, was created at the end, that is the sixth day, to bring completion to the whole world; indeed, the second man, who is the completion of the whole world in renewing

⁴⁵³ *Brev.* IV.2 (V 243). Bonaventure eloquently expresses this vision later in *Hex.* 21.18 (V 434): “The influence is a true one which comes forth and returns as the Son goes forth from the Father and returns to Him” (cited in Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 193).

⁴⁵⁴ *Brev.* IV.4 (V 244).

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. *Brev.* IV.3 (V 243) and IV.9 (V 249–50).

it, in which the first Principle was joined with the last, that is 'God with mud,' came at the end of time, that is in the sixth age.⁴⁵⁶

The first and most obvious parallel is between Christ, who comes in the sixth age, and man, who is the creation of the sixth day. Yet, the stronger link is actually between adornment and redemption, as Bonaventure's other parallel shows (between the First Principle, which is part one of the *Breviloquium*, and Christ, which is part four). It is God's agency as the First Principle that is being accentuated here, both in the Incarnation and the union with the last creature.

In this three-part emphasis, Bonaventure is able to show that Christ as the source of re-creation is related to *Brev.* IV, V, and VI in their entirety. Indeed, although the Incarnation is treated in *Brev.* IV and not VI, the association of the Incarnation and the

⁴⁵⁶ *Brev.* IV.4 (V 244-245): "sicut primus homo, qui erat totius mundi sensibilis ornamentum, ultimo fuerat conditus, scilicet sexto die, ad totius mundi completionem: sic secundus homo, totius mundi reparati complementum, in quo primum principium coniugitur cum ultimo, scilicet « Deus cum limo », lieret in fine temporum, hoc est in sexte aetate. . ." (translation mine). Citing Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo 3 in vigilia Nativia. Domini* 8 (PL 183:98C). Monti translates *ornamentum* "perfection." Bonaventure is consistent in thinking the cure according to both the patient and the physician. Insofar as wisdom is the appropriation of the second person of the Trinity, and the hypostatic union is the union of human and divine nature under one divine person, it is fitting and most loving that Wisdom should enter into his creation to save it in that age which corresponds to the creature he would assume and the day which reflects his appropriation. Bonaventure develops this theme at length and with regard to the six wings of the seraph in both the structure of the *Itinerarium* and the *Hexaëmeron* (16.29). Cf. Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 271.

work of the six days drives home the point that the Incarnation is a work of completion, and therefore a kind of adornment. Six, as many of the hexaëmeral authors agreed, is the number of completion. Developing this association, Bonaventure refers to the creature of the sixth day, mankind, as the “adornment of the whole universe.” In the same way, the sixth age fulfills, or adorns the work of the *principium et exemplar refectivum*, which is prefigured in the hexaëmeral work of adornment.⁴⁵⁷ God’s work as *principium et exemplar refectivum* is like the work of adornment in that it brings to completion God’s work as *principium effectivum*. The transition from the works of creation to re-creation, therefore, hinges on the Incarnation, the source of the completion of the cosmos.

Emphasizing the completeness and fullness of the Incarnation, Bonaventure explains that Christ came at a time fitting for the “proper for the exercise of wisdom, the curbing of concupiscence, and the passage from turmoil to peace. All of these things pertain to the sixth age of the world’s course because of the Incarnation of the Son of God.”⁴⁵⁸ The Incarnation fulfills the law, the promise of mercy, and history. It is history,

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. *Brev.* II.2 (V 220) and below.

⁴⁵⁸ *Brev.* IV.4 (V 245). On this passage, cf. Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, 109–110. Ratzinger takes the concept of fullness to be equivalent to center for Bonaventure, and therefore reads this passage as pertaining to Christ’s identity as *medium*.

however, more than the other two (law and prophecy), that most demonstrates the manner in which the Incarnation is a fullness.

Each of these circumstances indicates a fullness: the law of grace fulfills the written law; the giving of what was promised fulfills the promise; and the sixth age—the number six symbolizing perfection—is itself a sign of fullness. That is why the coming of the Son of God is said to be in the fulness of time: not because it brought time to an end, but because in it the mysteries of the ages were fulfilled.⁴⁵⁹

Again, Bonaventure does not treat the Incarnation in part six but part four in order to show that the completion that is brought about by re-creation is a process that corresponds to, or works analogous to adornment. Yet, he emphasizes that Christ, as the *principium refectionis*, is both the *medium* and the source of fulfillment. It is fitting that Bonaventure places this treatment in *Brev. IV*, then, which as the fourth of the seven parts of the *Breviloquium* is both the middle of the text and the inaugural part of the works of re-creation.

Furthermore, by treating Christ in part four, Bonaventure re-creates the parallel relationships that marked his interpretation of the operations of distinction and adornment in part two. *Brev. IV* works in parallel to *Brev. I*, insofar as Christ is both

⁴⁵⁹ *Brev. IV.4* (V 245). Cf. Augustine, *De genesi* 4.7.14: “We must say that God perfected his works in six days because six is a perfect number. Hence, even if these works did not exist, this number would be perfect; and if it had not been perfect, these works would not have been perfected according to it.” Cf. also *De trinitate* 4.4.7–8, and 4.6.10.

principium effectivum et refectivum. From this point, Bonaventure begins to establish corresponding pairs between *Brev.* II and V, and III and VI. Not only do grace and the sacraments participate in the adorning work of the Incarnation; they directly correspond to creation and sin. Grace (*Brev.* V), elevates and in a sense adorns created human nature (*Brev.* II). Likewise, the sacraments (*Brev.* VI) adorn in a loose sense by remediating human nature, ill and weakened by sin (*Brev.* III). Bonaventure maintains that Christ is the source of this correspondence, in that his grace—particularly the perfection of his affections, wisdom, and merit—completes and elevates human nature through his gifts of the Spirit and the beatitudes.⁴⁶⁰ Similarly, the Incarnation combats sin, and thereby enables the reformation and repurposing of material nature in the sacraments. The correlation of *Brev.* III to *Brev.* VI is particularly strong in terms of the materiality of sin and the sacraments. “As sensible objects had been the occasion of the fall of the soul, they might also become the occasion of its rising.”⁴⁶¹

The Work of Adornment: Part Five—Grace

Bonaventure relates grace to creation in his hexaëmeral structure by returning to the original purpose of humanity, which, while introduced near the end of part two, has

⁴⁶⁰ *Brev.* IV.5 (V 245).

⁴⁶¹ *Brev.* VI.1 (V 265).

been a topic of central concern for parts three and four. Humans were created in such a way that they could perceive God both in the world around them as well as within them. Made thus, humans were destined for eternal happiness.

The First Principle, out of its own supreme benevolence, made the rational soul capable of enjoying eternal happiness. . . Now, eternal happiness consists in possessing the supreme good, which is God—a good immeasurably surpassing anything human service could merit.⁴⁶²

God's grace was already present in creation in that he made the soul, the adornment of the whole world, capable of enjoying divine benevolence in the form of eternal happiness. No human action could possibly merit beatitude or restore that capacity because beatitude, the enjoyment of God, is only granted by God. "No person is in any way worthy to attain this supreme good, which totally exceeds the limits of human nature, unless elevated above self through the condescending action of God."⁴⁶³

⁴⁶² *Brev. V.1 (V 252): "haec est quia cum primum principium productivum pro sua summa benevolentia fecerit spiritum rationalem capacem beatitudinis aeternae et reparativum principium capacitatem illam infirmatam per peccatum reparavit ad salutem et beatitudo aeterna consistit in habendo summum bonum et hoc est deus et bonum excellens impropotionaliter omnem humani obsequii dignitatem."*

⁴⁶³ *Brev. V.1 (V 252): "nullus omnino ad illud summum bonum dignus est pervenire cum sit omnino supra omnes limites naturae nisi deo condescendente sibi elevetur ipse supra se."*

Even without the stain of sin, Bonaventure argues, beatitude is a good that can not be merited but only bestowed by God.⁴⁶⁴

Moreover, it is a gift that leads the creation to its Creator. “This influence that renders the soul dei-form comes from God, confirms us to God, and leads to God as our end.”⁴⁶⁵ Grace conforms the mind “to likeness with the blessed Trinity.”⁴⁶⁶ In the process, the person is brought into the presence of God in a new way, for “the one who enjoys God possesses God”⁴⁶⁷ Bonaventure thereby equates not only being in the likeness of God with conformity with God; but he also further equates both with being led back to God (“*ad Deum reducitur, sicut immediate ei conformatur*”).⁴⁶⁸ And this “reduction to God” is described then as a kind of re-creation, solidifying the link between part two and part five. Indeed, the image perfectly remade in the likeness of

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. *Brev.* II.12 on the necessity of grace for the eternal happiness and *Brev.* III.5 on sin’s contamination.

⁴⁶⁵ *Brev.* V.1 (V 252): “*Haec autem influentia deiformis, quia est a Deo et secundum Deum et propter Deum.*” Cf. *Itin.* 1.14.

⁴⁶⁶ *Brev.* V.1 (V 252): “*reddit imaginem nostrae mentis conformem beatissimae Trinitati.*”

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. *Brev.* V.1 (V 253): “the one who enjoys God possesses God.”

⁴⁶⁸ *Brev.* V.1 (V 252).

the Trinity is “the image of the new creation.”⁴⁶⁹ Christ’s grace restores both the original capacity and role of humanity. As such, grace is re-creative and therefore accomplishes the work of spiritual adornment.

Bonaventure also connects his treatise on creation to the treatise on grace by invoking the ontological indigence of the creature who is made from nothing.

“Speaking very generally, ‘grace’ refers to the assistance generously and freely granted by God to a creature for any of its activities whatsoever. Without this support, we could do nothing; in fact, we could not even continue to exist.”⁴⁷⁰ Grace is a necessary condition for the continued existence of all creatures who are subject to God’s providential provision. Indeed, “by the very fact that the rational spirit was brought into being from non-being, it is deficient in itself.”⁴⁷¹ In its original constitution, the rational spirit required God’s grace to turn to something other than itself. “In its

⁴⁶⁹ *Brev. V.1 (V 253): “divinae imaginis perfectio deiformis, et ideo dicitur imago recreationis.” Cf. 2 Sent. 26.3.4.1, and I Sent. 14.2.2.*

⁴⁷⁰ *Brev. V.2 (V 253): “gratia dicatur generaliter specialiter et proprie generaliter dicitur adiutorium divinum creaturae liberaliter et gratis impensum et indifferenter ad quemcumque actum et sine huiusmodi adiutorio gratiae nec possumus aliquid efficere nec durare in esse.”*

⁴⁷¹ *Brev. V.2 (V 253): “Cum ergo spiritus rationalis hoc ipso quod de nihilo sit in se defectivus.”*

deficiency, it always stands in need of God's presence, clemency, and influence to maintain its existence."⁴⁷²

Yet, grace is also required for "good moral acts," which Bonaventure considers to be preparatory for perfection. He calls the grace that instills virtue "another, 'gratuitously given' grace"⁴⁷³; grace calls the human soul away from "self-centered" intention, to acting "for the sake of the highest good."⁴⁷⁴ Thus, this gratuitously-given grace works to elevate human nature insofar as it assists humans in fulfilling the tasks for which they were created, namely to act for the highest good, as Bonaventure described in *Brev.* II.11–12.⁴⁷⁵

Grace is also necessary as the remedy for sin. Free will has been so corrupted by sin that grace is required to liberate the soul. The soul "cannot rise from sin in any way without the assistance of the divine grace that is called 'the grace that makes

⁴⁷² *Brev.* V.2 (V 254): "*sit defectivus indiget semper adiutorio divinae praesentiae manutenentiae et influentiae per quam manuteneatur in esse.*"

⁴⁷³ *Brev.* V.2 (V 254): "*dono alterius gratiae gratis datae.*" Cf. *Brev.* III.2–3 on the turn to the inferior and away from God, the superior.

⁴⁷⁴ *Brev.* V.2 (V 254): "*propter summum bonum.*"

⁴⁷⁵ Cf. *Brev.* II.9 and II.12 on the goal of human existence as right action and contemplation.

pleasing."⁴⁷⁶ Even here, Bonaventure describes the restorative power of grace as re-creative, for grace perfects and does not destroy nature. "This grace, even though it is a sufficient remedy for sin, is not poured into the soul of an adult without the consent of that person's free choice. . . For it is the role of 'grace given gratuitously' to turn a person's free will away from evil and prompt it toward good, and it is the role of free will to consent to this grace or to reject it."⁴⁷⁷ When free will receives this freely-given grace, "it cooperates with grace so that it might arrive at salvation."⁴⁷⁸ Thus, as the structural correspondence between *Brev.* II and V suggests, grace perfects nature.

Bonaventure's description of the virtues, the gifts of the Spirit, and the beatitudes reinforces this structural relationship. Through the virtues, the human creature is properly adorned through accruing merit. Indeed, the virtues reorder the soul to

⁴⁷⁶ *Brev.* V.3 (V 255): "*nullatenus potest resurgere sine adiutorio divinae gratiae quae dicitur gratum faciens.*" Cf. *Brev.* III.1, 8, and 10 on the corruption of free will.

⁴⁷⁷ *Brev.* V.3 (V 255): "*Illa autem gratia licet sit sufficiens **remedium** contra peccatum non tamen infunditur adulto nisi adsit liberi arbitrii consensus. . . Nam gratiae gratis datae est liberum arbitrium revocare a malo et excitare ad bonum et liberi arbitrii est consentire vel dissentire et consentientis.*" Grace sufficiently re-mediate the damage done by sin, thereby re-creating the human in the image of the Son, the *medium*. See Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 63.

⁴⁷⁸ *Brev.* V.3 (V 255): "*cooperari eidem ut tandem perveniat ad salutem.*"

rectitude, recreating the soul and assisting it in turning toward the *summum bonum*.⁴⁷⁹

Referring back to the triune constitution of the person developed in *Brev.* II.9–12, Bonaventure says that the theological virtues (faith, hope, and charity) propel the soul towards its end insofar as they reform the soul in the image of God. He says, “In this way, just as the image of creation consists in a trinity of powers with a unity of essence, so the image of re-creation consists in a trinity of habits with a unity of grace.”⁴⁸⁰ Likewise, the cardinal virtues pertain to the powers and operations of the soul. “Prudence rectifies the rational power, fortitude the negative appetite, temperance the positive appetite, while justice directs all of these powers in relationship to others.”⁴⁸¹ God’s justice orders

⁴⁷⁹ *Brev.* V.4 (V 256). Bonaventure observes two aspects, or faces, of the soul’s movement toward God. The first he calls the superior or upward face, which “is concerned with its end as such.” The second is the inferior or lower face, which is concerned “with the means that lead to [that end].” Grace must address both aspects of the soul in order to restore virtue in the return to God. Cf. Kent Emery, Jr., “Reading the World Rightly and Squarely: Bonaventure’s Doctrine of the Cardinal Virtues,” *Traditio* 39 (1983): 209-10.

⁴⁸⁰ *Brev.* V.4 (V 256): “*sicut imago creationis consistit in trinitate potentiarum cum inutate essentiae, sic imago recreationis in trinitate habituum cum unitate gratiae, per quos anima fertur recte in summam Trinitatem secundum tria appropriata tribus personis.*” Cf. *Brev.* II.11 (V 229).

⁴⁸¹ *Brev.* V.4 (V 256): “*prudencia rectificat rationalem, fortitudo irascibilem, temperantia concupiscibilem, iustitia vero rectificat omnes has vires in comparatione ad alterum.*” Cf. Emery, “Reading the World Rightly and Squarely,” 97: “As the seminal reasons of material things, which first diversify into the four elements, are implanted in prime

not only human relationships to other humans and creatures, but also the relationships that comprise the interior life of the soul.

The description of the gifts of the Spirit also support the link between parts two and five. Primarily, the gifts of the Spirit assist the person in resisting the “hindrances of [the vices] after-effects,”⁴⁸² and in that way cooperate with the virtues to “facilitate both action and contemplation.”⁴⁸³ Hence, the gifts of the Spirit are required to restore man to his original capacity as the reader of both the inner and outer books.⁴⁸⁴ Whereas the virtues primarily prepare the person for action, Bonaventure suggests that the spiritual gifts primarily prepare one for contemplation. The gifts also prepare the person to receive the beatitudes.⁴⁸⁵

matter by the Father of lights, so the four cardinal virtues are 'impressed ' in the soul by the exemplary light descending from above.”

⁴⁸² *Brev.* V.5 (V 257): “*impedimenta symptomatum.*” The Holy Spirit gives this assistance through the seven gifts which correspond to the seven ways in which the soul requires assistance: “For making progress against the deviation of the vices, both in its natural powers and in its superadded virtues, in suffering, in acting, in contemplating, and in the last ways combined.” On the origin of the vices, cf. *Brev.* III.9.

⁴⁸³ *Brev.* V.5 (V 258): “*ad expeditionem in actione et contemplatione...*”

⁴⁸⁴ *Brev.* V.6 (V 259). Since action and contemplation require different aids respective to their orientations and ends, “there must be a combination of gifts,” enabling both “advancement” and “understanding.”

⁴⁸⁵ *Brev.* V.6 (V 259). The gifts of the Spirit dispose the person to each of the beatitudes. Fear prepares one for poverty, piety for meekness, knowledge for mourning, fortitude for zeal for justice, counsel for mercy, understanding for cleanness of heart,

Finally, the habits of the beatitudes *perfect* action and contemplation.⁴⁸⁶ The one who acts and contemplates through the assistance of Christ's gifts of beatitude arrives at a peace and consummation which he describes as an "ecstatic"⁴⁸⁷ union with "the

and wisdom for peace. Bonaventure claims, poverty is the essence of perfection because it is the beatitude that first compels one to imitate Christ. Bonaventure says, "Those who wish to attain the height of perfection should first strive to establish foundation," by which he means the fear of the Lord and humility which lead to poverty, which is perfection of the spirit, and wisdom, which "prepares us for peace." In this way, the beatitudes perfect a person in both action and rest. "Wisdom unites us to the highest truth and good, in which all the desires of our soul find their end and their repose."

⁴⁸⁶ *Brev.* V.6 (V 260): "It is apparent that the main task of the habits of the virtues is to prepare us for the labors of the active life; that of the habits of the gifts, for the repose of contemplation; and that of the habits of the beatitudes, for the perfection of both." Bonaventure likely receives his distribution of virtues, gifts, and beatitudes in terms of the *via activa* and the *via contemplativa* from Gregory the Great, *In Ezechiel*, Hom. 7.11. Bernard of Clairvaux's *De Consideratione*, V.13.32 and *Serm. in Catic.* 62.4 are other possible sources. McGinn traces Bonaventure's distinct synthesis of the active and contemplative to Thomas Gallus' reception of Dionysian hierarchy (Bernard McGinn, *The Flowering of Mysticism: Men and Women in the New Mysticism 1200-1350* (New York: Crossroad, 1998), 94). On the influences, cf. also Robert Javelet, "Réflexions sur l'Exemplarisme bonaventurien," in *S. Bonaventura (1274-1974)* (Grotteferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventura, 1974), 362-4 and Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 42-43.

⁴⁸⁷ In language that is reminiscent of the *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, the *Breviloquium* commends the fruits of the spirit as the means by which one falls into a "most ardent love," thereby exiting the world "through ecstasy and rapture to the Father" (*Brev.* V.6 [V 259]. Compare with *Itin.* 7.6: "Christ sets light to the fervor of his strongest passion, which only He truly perceives, and of which he says: My soul has chosen suspension and my bones have chosen death. Whoever loves this death can see God, because it is true beyond doubt. No-one can look on God and live. So let us die and enter into the darkness, let us impose silence upon our cares, our desires and our illusions. Let us pass over with the crucified Christ, from this world to the Father."

highest truth and good, in which all the desires of our soul find their end and their repose.”⁴⁸⁸ The status of ecstasy helps clarify that the gifts of beatitude in this life do not themselves perfectly identify with the eternal union that is part of the order of the *principium et exemplar perfectivum*. It is rather a foretaste of that union and order. Thus, while God as *principium perfectivum* is operative in parts four, five, and six, it is a topic fittingly “appropriated” to part seven. God restores in a “supremely perfect” manner, and as such the seeds for perfection are present in the works of restoration, just as the seeds of restoration were present in the works of creation.

Bonaventure’s description of the beatitudes, therefore reveals the overlap in his theology between restoration and perfection, alluded to throughout this chapter. He maintains, however, that this this overlap reveals a seminal relationship between restoration and perfection. “The restoring principle is supremely perfect, perfectly achieving restoration and reformation through the gift of grace. Therefore, the gift of [saving] grace flowing out from that [restorative] principle must branch out lavishly and abundantly into the habits of perfections that so closely related to their final end that they are rightly called beatitudes.”⁴⁸⁹ While grace can be understood in general

⁴⁸⁸ *Brev.* V.6 (V 260).

⁴⁸⁹ *Brev.* V.6 (V 260): “*reparativum principium sit perfectissimum et perfectissime reparativum et reformativum per donum gratuitum ideo gratiae donum ab ipso manans*

terms as pertaining to existence, or specific terms as pertaining to restoration of the soul corrupted in sin, it also pertains to the work of perfection. Grace occupies a middle space between the remediation of sin and the perfection of eternal union, as the discussion of perfect prayer shows. It reaches its apex in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, petitions that address sin, virtue, the gifts of the Spirit, the sacraments, and even the endowment of glory given to the saints in resurrection.⁴⁹⁰ What Bonaventure identifies in part five, which he encapsulates in his discussion of the Lord's Prayer, is the fact that grace, because it is both a restoring and perfecting gift from God, works in sevens not only to combat the seven sins, but also to conform the person, in soul and body, and through the sevenfold endowment of glory, thereby preparing the person for eternal perfection in union with God in the seventh age.⁴⁹¹

Rather than destroying nature, therefore, grace cooperates with nature to perfect it. Accordingly, that perfection, which is entailed in the heavenly state, is prefigured in the earthly sojourn, as Bonaventure's treatise on grace demonstrates. The overlap of

liberaliter et abunde ramificari debet usque ad habitus perfectionum qui cum fini approximent recto vocabulo nuncupantur ex nomine beatitudinum."

⁴⁹⁰ *Brev.* V.10 (V 264).

⁴⁹¹ Insofar as grace also, and first, enables existence, the sevenfold character of grace (virtues, gifts, beatitudes, petitions) can be seen as a subtle allusion to not only the seven vices but also the seven days.

restoration and perfection does not contradict the hexaëmeral division offered here; rather, Bonaventure offers a synthesis of sorts under the concept of spiritual adornment. The function of grace to spiritually adorn nature only reinforces the hexaëmeral character of the *Breviloquium's* structure.

The Work of Adornment: Part Six—Sacraments

Whereas grace is the gift of the Holy Spirit to restore, conform, and draw human nature toward perfection, the sacraments are presented primarily as “divinely instituted remedies” for the corruption of sin.⁴⁹² They “confer grace” by curing the soul of “the weakness of its vices. They are principally ordained to this as their final end; but as subordinate ends, they are also a means of humiliation, instruction, and exercise.”⁴⁹³ Thus, Bonaventure’s treatment of the sacraments accords with his thematic arrangement under the *principium refectivum* that began in part four. The Incarnation, grace, and the sacraments work to combat sin and thereby bring the whole world to completion and adornment.⁴⁹⁴ Moreover, the sacraments relate specifically to corruption of sin, and therefore corresponds to *Brev.* III.

⁴⁹² *Brev.* VI.1 (V 265): “divinitus instituta tanquam medicamenta.”

⁴⁹³ *Brev.* VI.1 (V 265).

⁴⁹⁴ Recalling his analogy of adornment and completion in *Brev.* IV.4 (V 244-245).

The principle of our restoration, which is Christ crucified, the Incarnate Word, disposes all things most wisely, being God, and heals them most mercifully, being divinity incarnate. Therefore, *he ought to restore and heal the diseased human race in a manner suitable to the patient, the disease, the cause of the illness, and the cure.* Now the physician is the Incarnate Word himself, the invisible God in a visible nature. The patient, humankind, is neither pure spirit nor flesh alone, but spirit in mortal flesh. The disease, original sin, infects the mind through ignorance and the flesh through concupiscence. The origin of this sin, though due principally to the consent of reason, took its occasion from the bodily senses.⁴⁹⁵

The sacraments reflect Christ's role in completion by mediating the new covenant and the law of grace to his people. "Christ instituted the seven sacraments of the law of grace in virtue of his role as mediator of a new covenant and as principal author of a law through which he called humankind to promised eternal goods, gave directing precepts, and instituted sanctifying sacraments."⁴⁹⁶ These three operations,

⁴⁹⁵ *Brev. VI.1 (V 265): "principium reparativum quod est Christus crucifixus verbum scilicet incarnatum quod sapientissime dispensat omnia quia divinum et clementissime curat quia divinitus incarnatum sic debet reparare et sanare genus humanum aegrotum secundum quod competit ipsi aegrotanti aegritudini et occasionem aegrotandi et ipsius aegritudinis curationi. Ipse autem medicus est verbum incarnatum deus scilicet invisibilis in natura visibili. Homo aegrotans est non tantum spiritus nec tantum caro sed spiritus in carne mortali. Morbus autem est originalis culpa quae per ignorantiam inficit mentem et per concupiscentiam inficit carnem. Origo autem huius culpae licet principaliter fuerit ex consensu rationis occasionem tamen sumsit a sensibus carnis."*

⁴⁹⁶ *Brev. VI.4 (V 268): "De institutione autem sacramentorum hoc tenendum est quod septem sacramenta legis gratiae Christus instituit tanquam novi testamenti mediator et praecipuus lator legis in qua vocavit ad promissa aeterna dedit praecepta dirigentia et instituit sacramenta sanctificantia."*

Bonaventure explains, originate in Christ's role is as *principium reffectivum* and, moreover, correspond to divine power, truth, and kindness.⁴⁹⁷

This point is significant in order for him to advance his claim that the sacraments are the final element of the work of restoration. Christ acts in perfect accordance with "supreme power, truth, and kindness, and as such possesses supreme authority."⁴⁹⁸

Christ's absolute authority extends to creation, restoration, and perfection.

"Consequently, it was proper for him to inaugurate a New Testament and to provide a complete and sufficient law in accordance with his supreme power, truth, and kindness."⁴⁹⁹

Bonaventure is careful to relate each of the individual sacraments to a corresponding sin. This is important, because "a perfect cure requires the perfect and complete expulsion of sickness. Now in this case there is a sevenfold disease,

⁴⁹⁷ *Brev. VI.4 (V 268): "summae virtutis, summae veritatis et summae bonitatis."*
 Bonaventure also draws attention to Christ's triune identity here: "*principium reparativum nostrum est Christus crucifixus verbum scilicet incarnatum quod quia verbum est patri coaequale et consubstantiale.*"

⁴⁹⁸ *Brev. VI.4 (V 268): "summae virtutis summae veritatis et summae bonitatis ac per hoc et summae auctoritatis."*

⁴⁹⁹ *Brev. VI.4 (V 268): "ideo ipsius est proprie novum testamentum introducere ipsius etiam est legem dare integram et sufficientem secundum exigentiam summae virtutis et veritatis ac bonitatis suae."*

comprising three forms of sin—original, mortal, and venial—and four forms of penalty—ignorance, malice, weakness, and concupiscence.”⁵⁰⁰ Insofar as the corruption was comprehensive, so too the cure must be comprehensive. Hence, since there are seven sins, it is fitting that there would be a corresponding seven-fold cure.

It is appropriate that a combination of seven remedies are needed to drive out completely this sevenfold disease: against original sin, Baptism; against mortal sin, Penance; against venial sin, Extreme Unction; against ignorance, Orders; against malice, the Eucharist; against weakness, Confirmation; against concupiscence, Matrimony, which both tempers and excuses it.⁵⁰¹

He treats baptism first, calling it the foundation of all the other sacraments, especially those that confer an indelible “character,” such as confirmation or Orders.⁵⁰² As the foundation, Bonaventure says, baptism bestows “a grace. . . that regenerates, rectifies, and cleanses from all sins.”⁵⁰³ Indeed, because baptism combats the stain of original sin, it must work in a complete fashion, doing so in accordance with “his

⁵⁰⁰ *Brev.* VI.3 (V 267). Cf. *Brev.* III.5 on these vices. Cf. also Christopher Cullen, *Bonaventure*, 104 and 167 on the vices and their cure in the sacraments.

⁵⁰¹ *Brev.* VI.3 (V 267): “*est quod oportuit adhiberi contra haec septenarium medicamentorum ad hunc septiformem morbum plenius expellendum scilicet contra originale baptismum contra mortalem poenitentiam contra venialem unctionem extremam contra ignorantiam ordinem contra malitiam eucharistiam contra infirmitatem confirmationem et contra concupiscentiam matrimonium quod eam temperat et excusat.*”

⁵⁰² *Brev.* VI.6 (V 271).

⁵⁰³ *Brev.* VI.7 (V 271).

power. . . our salvation. . . and our disease.”⁵⁰⁴ The sacrament of Confirmation, the vocal proclamation of faith in Christ, accompanied by the sign of the cross in the name of the Trinity, combats weakness, which is a penalty of sin.⁵⁰⁵ The Eucharist is given to nourish the spiritual life born and strengthened in Baptism and Confirmation. Eucharist remediates against the sin of malice by increasing our love. “It is from him that a stream of mutual love flows into us by means of the all-pervading, unifying, and transforming power that his love possesses.”⁵⁰⁶ Penance heals the corruption of mortal sin through “contrition. . . confession. . . and satisfaction in deed.”⁵⁰⁷ Extreme unction “has the power of taking away venial sins and of restoring bodily health if this is for the sick person’s good.”⁵⁰⁸ Holy Orders, which is one sacrament, but which contains all the degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, heals spiritual ignorance, and confers a character upon one to minister to others.⁵⁰⁹ Finally, in a manner similar to how Holy Orders both heals from sin and expands the ranks of the ordained in the Church, so too Matrimony

⁵⁰⁴ *Brev.* VI.7 (V 271). On original sin, cf. *Brev.* III.5.

⁵⁰⁵ *Brev.* VI.8 (V 272–273).

⁵⁰⁶ *Brev.* VI.9 (V 274).

⁵⁰⁷ *Brev.* VI.10 (V 275).

⁵⁰⁸ *Brev.* VI.11 (V 276).

⁵⁰⁹ *Brev.* VI.12 (V 278).

heals from the sin of concupiscence and expands the ranks of the Church by populating them.⁵¹⁰ Therefore, each sacrament corresponds to a specific sin, thereby further reinforcing the parallel to part three.

More than simply capitalizing on the coincidence of sevens (sins, sacraments, days of creation), Bonaventure's approach to the relationship of the sins to the sacraments reinforces the parallel correspondence of creation and re-creation, and the textual pairs that this correspondence creates. Here, he shows that parts three (sin) and six (sacraments) are inversely related not only in terms of their content, that is, they not only correspond to each other in term of their referent in the same way that the beasts of the sixth day are the adornment of the dry land of the third day; rather, they are also tied together under the banner of spiritual adornment, which is mediated by part four.⁵¹¹ The sacraments are Christ's sacraments. As we see, they extend his work of remediating sin precisely as a medicine, that is simultaneously material and spiritual, provided by Christ, the physician. Accordingly, the parallel of part three and part six depends on both the work done in part four by the *principium et exemplar reffectivum* and

⁵¹⁰ *Brev.* VI.13 (V 279). Cf. *Brev.* III.7 on concupiscence.

⁵¹¹ Cf. Benson, "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*," 255. Benson treats the sacraments and grace together as the *progressus* that emanates from Christ, the new *ortus*.

the dual spiritual and material nature of the affliction. Thus, we can reasonably argue that Bonaventure's treatment of the sacraments in the *Breviloquium* is hexaëmeral, but that it also presses this hexaëmeral relationship to its limits insofar as Christ is not simply the beginning (*principium*) of redemption, grace, and sacraments, but also the *exemplar* and *medium*. Christ informs the process of spiritual adornment in a way that the work of the fourth day certainly does not inform the works of the fifth and sixth days.

The Work of Perfection: Part Seven—The Last Judgment

Bonaventure concludes the *Breviloquium* in part seven with a description of the eschaton in terms of the perfection of the rational creature who has departed from original justice, and has therefore corrupted not only itself but the propensity toward perfection in creation. Mankind's fall, affecting not only the human itself but in some sense all of creation, is now succeeded by mankind's return, which includes the elevation of Adam's race as well as the return of non-spiritual creatures. While the works of the *principium et exemplar reffectivum*—originating in the Incarnation, and proceeding through grace and the sacraments—reforms the image of God in the creature, the rational creature nevertheless stands in need of judgment. Only after judgment is humanity finally granted glory, the eternal happiness that is its supernatural end, offered gratuitously in grace, and which constitutes the life of the

Trinity. *Brev.* VII, in this way, is presented as the culmination of the Trinity's work of foundation and restoration.

Part seven is also analogous, *via* a spiritual interpretation, to the seventh day. The seventh day is the perfection of the works of creation, distinction, and adornment. God rests after creation, and blesses and sanctifies those creatures that he has made. In a similar manner, part seven treats the perfection of the operations of the *principium*. The rational creature, who is made in the image of the Trinity, is corrupted by sin. Although Christ, as exemplar, extends his perfect merit, wisdom, and beatitude to humans, they can only enjoy them partially and *in via* while on the earthly sojourn. In order to enjoy perfect beatitude, they must first be cleansed of whatever sin remains from their mortal lives.

Hence, while the *principium et exemplar perfectivum* was operative in the works of restoration, it is not until the Last Judgment that this work is consummated insofar as history finally conforms to the exemplary order which gives birth to the temporal.⁵¹² On the other hand, even part seven continues to treat the works of re-creation as an ongoing process, at least in the opening chapters. Purgatory, for instance, completes the work of the restoration of the image, therefore, leaving the person completely ready for,

⁵¹² Cf. Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, 110–118.

but not yet completed by, the work of perfection in the likeness, to which it transports them immediately, in Bonaventure's view. "Nor would it benefit the divine mercy or justice further to delay glory once God finds the vessel to be suitable, for it would be a great punishment to delay a reward, and a purified soul ought not to be penalized further."⁵¹³

Once the human being is purified, so too the material creation is purified and freed to perform its original function. "God fashioned the material world or macrocosm for the sake of the microcosm, that is, humankind, which is placed in the middle between God and these inferior things."⁵¹⁴ Humanity's fall was destructive not only to humanity but to the corporeal cosmos as well, having lost the connection to God which had been mediated by mankind. "This world should be disordered because human being were disordered; thus, as it had stood upright when they stood, it fell, in a sense, when they fell."⁵¹⁵ By the same principle, when humans are punished in judgment, so

⁵¹³ *Brev. VII.2 (V 283): "Nec enim decet divinam misericordiam seu iustitiam ut amplius differat gloriam cum inveniatur receptaculum idoneum et magna sit poena in dilatione praemiorum nec amplius puniri debeat spiritus iam purgatus."*

⁵¹⁴ *Brev. VII.4 (V 284): "Quoniam ergo deus secundum sapientiam suam ordinatissimam cunctum mundum istum sensibilem et maiorem fecit propter mundum minorem videlicet hominem qui inter deum et res istas inferiores in medio."*

⁵¹⁵ *Brev. VII.4 (V 285): "Primo ergo quoniam mundus iste perturbari debet homine perturbato sicut stetit cum stante et quodam modo cecidit cum labente."* On this metaphor of

too the world is punished. "And so it is fitting that all creation should submit to divine zeal, conforming both to the Maker of the world and to the human beings who dwell in it."⁵¹⁶

Purification, therefore, leads to the restoration of the original, harmonious created order. "This world ought to be cleansed as humanity is to be cleansed. . . Furthermore, this world ought to be renewed once humankind is renewed. . . Finally, this world ought to be consummated once humanity is consummated."⁵¹⁷ Bonaventure is clear that the repose of the material cosmos depends on the cleansing, resurrection, and eternal repose of humanity. "For since all these creatures were ordained toward the more noble form, the rational soul, once souls have achieved their final state of rest, all other things must also come to completion (*complementum*)."⁵¹⁸

standing in relation to sin as a description of the disorder relationship of humanity to God, cf. *Brev.* III.6.

⁵¹⁶ *Brev.* VII.4 (V 285): "*omnis creatura divinum accipiat zelum et conformetur auctori conformetur etiam habitatori.*" Cf. R. Silic, *Christus und die Kirche: Ihr Verhältnis nach der Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura* (Breslau, 1938), 41; and Schaefer, "The Position and Function of Man in the Created World According to Saint Bonaventure," 278.

⁵¹⁷ *Brev.* VII.4 (V 285): "*mundus iste purgari debet cum homine expurgando. . . mundus iste innovari debet cum homine innovato. . . mundus iste debet consummari homine consummato.*"

⁵¹⁸ *Brev.* VII.4 (V 285): "*enim omnia ista ordinentur ad formam nobilissimam quae quidem est anima rationalis posito statu in animabus necesse est statum et complementum poni*

While it appears that Bonaventure has thus linked part seven with part two, eschatological harmony and justice with the original harmony and justice of the first humans, it is in fact the resurrected body of the incarnate Christ that proves to be the paradigm for eschatological glory.⁵¹⁹ Christ's resurrection corresponds to the perfection of grace, and thereby mediates grace to nature, thereby leading to the general resurrection. "Perfect grace conforms us to Christ our Head, in whom there was no physical imperfection."⁵²⁰ He then explains that the perfection of glory entails that the three divine perfections of the First Principle be reflected in the visible world. "Now these invisible attributes of God should be manifest in visible works. As the First Principle of the visible universe, God produces it, governs it, restores it, rewards it, and brings it perfection. Thus, its production should reveal God's supreme power; its government, God's supreme wisdom; its restoration, God's supreme mercy and its

in ceteris praecedentibus." Bonaventure here returns to the language of completion that he had likened to adornment in *Brev.* IV.

⁵¹⁹ *Brev.* VII.5 (V 286): "*resurrectio debet esse secundum exigentiam perfectionis naturae et natura spiritus rationalis exigit quod vivificet corpus proprium quia proprius actus in propria materia habet fieri necesse est quod idem corpus numero resurgat alioquin non esset resurrectio vera.*"

⁵²⁰ *Brev.* VII.5 (V 286): "*resurrectio debet esse secundum exigentiam consummationis gratiae et perfecta gratia facit nos conformes Christo capiti nostro in quo nullus fuit defectus membrorum.*"

rewarding, God's supreme justice."⁵²¹ In this way, Bonaventure argues that the glory of the eschaton is indeed a return to the First Principle, mediated through Christ in his resurrected and glorified state. For glorified humans are not simply the restored image of God, but are in fact now fully re-created in God's likeness, which is most perfectly imaged in the incarnate and resurrected Christ. "Thus, [they] will rise with an unimpaired body, in the prime of life, and well-proportioned, so that all the saints will come together into a perfect man, into the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ."⁵²²

The seventh part of the *Breviloquium* culminates in a seven-fold perfection of the body and soul in glory. The blessed enjoy a "reward of charity [that] consists in a sevenfold endowment—triple to the soul and fourfold to the body—containing the consummation, the integrity, and the fulness of all goods related to the completion of glory"⁵²³ In the endowment of glory, the soul receives "vision, enjoyment, and

⁵²¹ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 289): "*Quoniam autem haec invisibilia dei manifestari decet per opera ideo Deus mundum istum sensibilibus principians sic produxit, sic gubernat, sic reparat, sic remunerat et consummat, quod in productione manifestatur summa potentia, in gubernatione sapientia, in preparatione clementia et in retributione iustitia consummata.*"

⁵²² *Brev.* VII.5 (V 286).

⁵²³ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 290): "*praemium caritatis, quod consistit in septiformi dote, triplici animae et quadruplici corporis, in quibus clauditur consummatio, integritas et plenitudo omnium bonorum spectantium ad gloriae complementum.*"

possession of the one highest good, namely, God.”⁵²⁴ The body, likewise, is perfected through the reunion with the soul in resurrection; the resurrected body becomes luminous, subtle, impassable, and agile.⁵²⁵

The glorified human, Bonaventure explains, reflects God’s “unity, truth, and goodness,” which “imply, in turn. . . supreme power, wisdom, mercy, and justice.”⁵²⁶ The reunited soul and body, joined by God, reflects 1) God’s power. The orderly relationship of the higher soul and the lower body, ruled “indirectly [by God] through human free will,” reflects 2) perfect wisdom. The condescension of Christ in the Incarnation, suffering the punishment for humanity’s wretchedness, reflects 3) divine mercy. The judgment of damnation and eternal repose reflects 4) God’s justice. These four require together that the body and soul be reunited, and consequently the human be restored to its original capacity and role as the culmination and *medium* of the cosmos.

More importantly, however, glory, which is manifest first in the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ, goes beyond the restoration of the original creation to also

⁵²⁴ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 288): “*visione, fruitione et tentione unius summi boni, scilicet Dei. . .*”

⁵²⁵ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 290): “*claritas... subtilitatem... impassibilitas.... agilitas.*”

⁵²⁶ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 289): “*summam unitatem veritatem et bonitatem hoc ipso est ponere in eo summam potentiam sapientiam clementiam et iustitiam.*”

include union with God, which is consummation. Bonaventure maintains that insofar as the rational human is created in the image of God, it can only be satisfied by and with God. It is significant that he describes this union in terms of the soul as well as the body. Perfection of the soul entails the vision, love, and retention (memory) of God forever. In the body, glory entails a reunion with the soul that perfects the body, which in turn becomes luminous, subtle, impassible, and agile.⁵²⁷ The glorified state of the body is, in essence, a perfect harmony with the soul that is analogous to the soul's conformity to God. The perfections of the soul stand below, or derive from, the "delight. . . [and] bliss [that] flow from God *the Head, down upon the skirt of the garment, the human body.*"⁵²⁸ In eternity, the soul is made perfect in conformity to God, and the body is made perfect in conformity with the soul.

Following this anthropo-christocentric understanding of the eschaton, Bonaventure returns to the opening focus of the *Breviloquium*. Recall that the book begins with Ephesians 3:14–19, in which Paul commends being rooted and grounded in the love of Christ so that one can come to know "with all the saints, what is the breadth,

⁵²⁷ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 290): "*Quia tentione aeternitatis factus. . .*"

⁵²⁸ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 290), quoting 1 Cor. 12:4-11.

length, height, and depth.”⁵²⁹ As we will see in the next chapter, Bonaventure understands theology as an affective science and wisdom. The goal of his affective theology is the formation of the affections. Specifically, as he indicates in the prologue, theology should draw one into fervent love for Christ. Bonaventure performs the theological task in accord with his prescription in the prologue in an affective and somewhat self-effacing manner by ending the *Breviloquium* with the prayer of another, that of St. Anselm of Canterbury.⁵³⁰ In this prayer, Anselm meditates on the state of the blessed, drawing attention to the love and the joy that is received in beatitude. The good of reunion with the First Principle, he argues, is unlike any created good; it is an exemplary good, the source of goodness and life. “This is not a joy such as we have experienced in created things, but as different from this and the Creator is from the creature. For if life that is created is good, how good is the Life that creates?”⁵³¹ For the one who would desire such a reunion, Anselm recommends that one “love the one

⁵²⁹ *Brev. prol. init.* (V 201).

⁵³⁰ *Brev. VII.7* (V 290–91); quoting from *Proslogion* 24–26 (PL 158:239C–242C). Monti notes that Bonaventure ends his *Soliloquium* and *De perfectione vitae ad sorores* with this same passage.

⁵³¹ *Brev. VII.7* (V 291): “*non qualem in creatis rebus sumus experti, sed tanto differentem, quanto differt Creator a creatura. Si enim bona est vita creata, quam bona est vita creatrix?*”

Good in which all good things exist... Desire the simple Good which itself is every good."⁵³²

Glory, understood thus, entails a conformity to God that is most intimate. For it is knowing God in such a way that the love of Christ consumes all love. Anselm explains that this love surpasses any other fleshly or intellectual desire that humans could have; divine love is the fulfillment of glory. Moreover, it is the concluding subject of the *Breviloquium*. In this way, Bonaventure returns to the opening of the text, and closes the intelligible circle of the soul to which he referred in part two. For it is in the consummation of the soul in love, that for which all other things are created, that fulfills the affective science and wisdom of theology. As Bonaventure says in the prologue and part two, the goal of Scripture is the salvation and perfection of the soul in the love of Christ.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that the structure of the *Breviloquium* is hexaëmeral. This argument sought not to draw direct correlations between each of the days and the parts of the text, but rather to show that Bonaventure's division of the days, a division which he receives from Bede and Hugh, into creation-distinction-adornment, helps us to better

⁵³² *Brev.* VII.7 (V 291): "*Ama unum bonum, in quo sunt omnia bona, et sufficit. Desidera simplex bonum, quod est omne bonum, et satis est.*"

understand the relationship of the parts, which Bonaventure himself divides according to the divine operations of the *principium et exemplar effectivum, refectionum, et perfectivum*.

While these three operations are unified in the perfect Trinity, they are manifest in creation and history through progressions. Bonaventure attends to this in part two, particularly his argument that the work of God in the ages of history is contained seminally in the days of creation. In the same way that the operations of the distinction and adornment and perfection of the triple nature are contained seminally in *creatio ex nihilo*, that day before the days, so too the operations of the *principium et exemplar effectivum, refectionum et perfectivum* are contained seminally in the revelation of the First Principle. Furthermore, just as the operation of distinction and adornment parallel one another, so too the parts of the *Breviloquium* which correspond to creation and restoration parallel one another. And finally, just as the seventh day of rest represents a supernatural perfection that exceeds the completion of the operation of adornment, so too the seventh part of the *Breviloquium* represents the supernatural consummation and perfection of eternity. Even though perfection is consistently alluded to throughout the text, the perfection of eternity entails the excessive delight and intimate love that comprises the divine life.

Read through the triad of creation-distinction-adornment, the Hexaëmeron provides the structural paradigm for the progress of the *Breviloquium*. The Hexaëmeron,

as a structure, is not merely a progression of six leading to a seventh (day, age, or stage).

Rather, as Bonaventure has adopted it from Bede and Hugh, the Hexaëmeron is a specific way of ordering the six days to each other and to the seventh day according to the operations of creation, distinction, and adornment, followed by a perfection that is already prefigured in some sense in the foundation of that order. It is this hexaëmeral order, correlated to the divine operations of creation, redemption and perfection, that helps to better understand the order and internal relationships of the parts of the *Breviloquium*.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Summary of the Argument

This dissertation has argued that the structure of the *Breviloquium* is hexaëmeral. My conclusion rests on what we saw to be Bonaventure's own use and analysis of the first week of Genesis in the prologue and part two (respectively) in light of trends native to the genre of hexaëmeral commentary. This conclusion is bolstered by observing the role that Bonaventure ascribes to the divine attributes in both his hexaëmeral treatise in part two and in the *Breviloquium* as a whole. Pairing omnipotence with creation, wisdom with distinction, and goodness with adornment allows us to propose a plausible parallel relation of three elements of the *Breviloquium*: first, the hexaëmeral operations of creation, distinction, and adornment; second, the triadic identity of God as *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum*; and third, the seven parts of the *Breviloquium*.

In the *Breviloquium*, the grammar of theology begins with the distinction between creation and re-creation—or foundation and restoration to borrow from Hugh's lexicon. Chapter one of this study, however, established that several of the interpretive models advanced in the previous century for reading the structure of the *Breviloquium* obscure

this grammar in their attempts to appreciate the distinctive features of this unique work. Chapter two, in an attempt to rectify the lacuna left by these previous studies, begins by unpacking the way that the prologue frames the Hexaëmeron—by which we mean the Scriptural narrative of the six days of creation and seventh day of rest as revealed in Genesis 1–2:4a. The prologue, as we saw, functions as a commendation of Scripture: Scripture offers the Christian a comprehensive and universal kind of knowledge, within which is contained all truth, even the truth of history, under what Bonaventure calls the length of Scripture. Here, he employs the Hexaëmeron to describe the form and order of history, all of which is the narrative of divine action in the cosmos. The first week of Genesis provides the structure for understanding what God has done, is doing, and will do in creation and especially amongst humanity in order to bring all things back to Himself.

That the Hexaëmeron should function in such a way—to reveal the divinely-sourced order of history—gives license, as chapter two argues, to examine the way in which Bonaventure’s most likely sources might have understood the same. The second chapter, in its most basic function, demonstrates a diversity of interpretations of the Hexaëmeron. Amidst, and perhaps despite, this diversity, the interpretations examined in that chapter are unanimous in their assessment that the Genesis narrative of the days of the Hexaëmeron reveals divine perfection in created order. How different

hexaëmeral authors have interpreted that structure varies, however. Particular attention is given to later readers, such as Bede and Hugh of St. Victor, who argue for the structure of creation, distinction, and adornment as a way to see how that divine perfection is reflected. Hugh's rendition of this structure places the operation of creation from nothing before the days, and subsequently divides the six days evenly between the operations of distinction and adornment. Hugh suggests a parallel between these two operations, and seems to hold, though he does not explicitly indicate this, that the form and order of these two operations originate in the first operation. It is this understanding, albeit clarified and synthesized to a greater degree with Augustine's theology of creation, that theologians like Peter Lombard and Alexander of Hales carry from the twelfth to the thirteenth century, an understanding ultimately inherited and further developed by Bonaventure.

Chapter three demonstrates that it is indeed this Hugonian, triadic structure which Bonaventure finally adopts. We saw that part two of the *Breviloquium* is distinct from the prologue not simply in the fact that it employs a different structure for interpreting the Hexaëmeron; rather, while the prologue simply references the linear structure of the six days leading to the Sabbath day as a way to understand history and the stages of life, part two offers the reader a full-fledged exposition on the Hexaëmeron. In part two, Bonaventure explores Church teaching about the creation of

the world, proposes a rudimentary understanding of elemental physics, discusses the influence of heavenly bodies on the corporeal cosmos, places the creation and fall of angels within the framework of Genesis 1, and finally reiterates the classic hexaëmeral trope that humankind is the epitome of creation, that for which all other creatures were made. The momentum of part two, like many of the hexaëmeral commentaries surveyed in chapter two, is toward humanity, which Bonaventure treats summarily in *Brev.* II.4, and then at length beginning in *Brev.* II.9 and forward. That the anthropocentric thrust of part two supplies material for the structure of the *Breviloquium* becomes clearer in the next chapter. In chapter three of this dissertation, however, we saw that Bonaventure works to weave elements from other parts into his exposition of the hexaëmeron. It is significant to note, for instance, that he uses the divine perfections of power, wisdom, and goodness not only to give a Trinitarian account of the work of the days of creation, but to give greater depth to the Hugonian division of the operations of creation, distinction, and adornment. In fact, we saw that in *Brev.* II.2 he explains that the three attributes—omnipotence, wisdom, lavish goodness—correspond to the three operations of creation, distinction, adornment. From this, we surmised that three operations of the Hexaëmeron might have some deeper and fuller application to Bonaventure's theology than simply his exposition of Genesis 1.

Chapter four provides a 'hexaemeral' reading of the *Breviloquium* justified by the interconnection between a series of triadic structures and their role in the *Breviloquium*. As we have seen, Bonaventure connects the triad of power wisdom and goodness (the appropriations) to the triad of *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum et perfectivum*.⁵³³ This latter triad, Bonaventure holds, organizes the topical progress of the text. But, this latter triad is also clearly connected to the triad of the hexaemeral operations of creation, distinction and adornment. Therefore, in the fourth chapter of this dissertation, I worked to show that these hexaemeral operations are also at work in the structure of the text and help us better see the meaning of its content. Accordingly, in chapter four, I undertook to apply the clarifications of the hexaëmeral genre (chapter 2) and Bonaventure's own use of the same (chapter 3) to an interpretation of the structure of the text, broadly construed. Chapter four argued that the most compelling reason to see this hexaëmeral application is not some direct correspondence of the days of creation to the discrete parts of the *Breviloquium*. Rather, upon examination we see parallel relationship of parts I-III and parts IV-VI that bear a remarkable resemblance to

⁵³³ Bonaventure claims throughout *Brev.* I that the divine attributes of power, wisdom, and goodness/benevolence map onto the triad of *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum*.

the parallel relationship of the days of distinction and the days of adornment in Bonaventure's account of the Hexaëmeron.

Thus, the body of the *Breviloquium* appears to be hexaëmeral insofar as the organization of the body follows the structural logic of Hugh's and Bonaventure's three-fold understanding of the days. Parts I, II, and III function within the work in a manner analogous to the operation of distinction; that is, Bonaventure's articulation of Trinitarian theology, creation, and sin present these three as the fundamental loci upon which the next three loci, and indeed all Christian dogma, are built. He explains that the first two parts correspond to the work of the *principium et exemplar effectivum*, the First Principle in foundation. Sin, by contrast, is fundamental only insofar as it undermines both the First Principle and the First Principle's work of foundation. Sin is both parody and anti-principle. The next three loci not only build on the gains of the first three parts; they also effect a new kind of operation in Bonaventure's theology, that of the *principium et exemplar reffectivum*. Here, we showed that he offers an analogy between the work of adornment in the creation of mankind and the work of completion brought about by the Incarnation.⁵³⁴ This comparison, drawing explicitly on the language of adornment, gives license for seeing the work of the *principium et exemplar reffectivum*,

⁵³⁴ On this analogy, see *Brev.* IV.4 (V 244–245), and chapter four of this study.

broadly conceived, and the Incarnation specifically, as spiritual, or salvific, adornment. Grace and the sacraments, likewise, participate in this spiritual adornment: grace corresponds to the work of creation insofar as it is recreative; and the sacraments correspond to sin precisely insofar as they are the opposite of sin. In both part four and five, Bonaventure returns to the language of humanity's original mediating capacity, and its subsequent loss in sin, to explain why the Incarnation and grace are crucial to re-creating that capacity in humanity. He recalls the contemplative faculty of humanity when he discusses the virtues, gifts of the Spirit, and beatitudes. Moreover, he describes the work of the Sacraments in part six by recalling the parodical, parasitical, and inverted nature of sin by invoking a medicinal metaphor for the Sacraments. That there are seven sacraments which oppose the seven vices serves to reinforce the parallel relationship of parts three and six, while simultaneously evoking hexaëmeral imagery. The emphasis, thus, is always on the parallel works of creation and re-creation as reflective of the stage of distinction and adornment.

The hexaëmeral character of part seven is plainly evident insofar as nearly every hexaëmeral commentator agrees that the eschaton is proleptically reflected in the Sabbath. Bonaventure adds his own signature to this tradition by showing that the work of re-creation reaches perfection and its end in the purging of the sin which mars creation, and then lifting the rational creature to perfect rest in the *principium et exemplar*

perfectivum. Such perfection, he insists, is the consummation of all things in love, which, as he had already explained in the prologue, is the very goal of Scripture. Scripture is meant to incite the affections with love for Christ. This is the end of theology as an affective science for Bonaventure. The *Breviloquium* ends, therefore, by gesturing toward the end of all things in prayer and love.

Thus, the theology of the *Breviloquium* performs a rich reduction, not only in the fairly obvious fact that the procedure of the text returns in the final part to the First Principle; but also structurally by returning to Scripture.⁵³⁵ And in this way, we see that Scripture itself possesses hexaëmeral significance; in Bonaventure's scheme, Scripture functions like the day before the days, creation from nothing. Scripture provides the form and foundation of Christian dogma just as the prologue provides the form and foundation of the *Breviloquium*. Hence, the whole text of the *Breviloquium*, and not just the body, is hexaëmeral.

Objections to the Thesis

The interpretation of the structure of the *Breviloquium* proposed and argued for by this study is susceptible to several objections. By anticipating and handling some select objections, the benefits of the current thesis can be made clearer. First, one might

⁵³⁵ On the method of reduction, see Falque's description in chapter 1, on page 13.

protest an interpretation that claims to be “hexaëmeral,” but which appeals not to the six days as such, but to the pattern of creation-distinction-adornment. Likewise, one may challenge the synthesis of the triad of *principium et exemplar effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum* and the operations of creation, distinction, and adornment. Moreover, one might attempt to exploit a tension that became apparent in chapter four regarding Bonaventure’s theology of Christ as both *medium* and the second Adam. Why, one might reasonably ask, does Bonaventure treat Christ in part four and not part six of the *Breviloquium* if Christ is the recapitulation of Adam, the creature of the sixth day? Had Bonaventure placed the treatment of Christ on the sixth day, he would have indexed the correspondence of the days and the parts according to the creation of man, as he seems to do in the prologue, thereby making an hexaëmeral structure clear. Indeed, this objection would rightly point to the prologue’s presentation of the Hexaëmeron, six ages of history, and six stages of life, in which Christ comes in the sixth age as a direct parallel to the creation of man on the sixth day and the fulfillment of wisdom in the sixth stage of life. Likewise, such an objection might inquire whether creation, treated in part two, and sin, treated in part three, find analogues in the days of creation? Is not mankind created on the sixth, not the second day? Similarly, sin seems to be an ill-fit in an hexaëmeral scheme in that the distinction of dry land and vegetation on the third day has little to do with the corruption of the will. Put bluntly, if the structure of the

Breviloquium is indeed hexaëmeral, should we expect to find an obvious or explicit correlation between the parts of the text, the days of creation, and the ages of history?

In order to understand how this dissertation responds to these objections, it is important to recall the variety of interpretative schemes in the hexaëmeral genre, summarized above. Take, for instance, Augustine's interpretation according to the perfect number, the aliquot. For Augustine, the days reflect perfection not simply by numbering six, but in their accordance with the arrangement of 1-2-3, by which they mirror that property of the aliquot: the sum of the integers equals that the product of its integers. Augustine's solution is less important to Bonaventure because he is more concerned to apply Hugh's triadic model of creation-distinction-adornment. That Bonaventure is persuaded by Hugh's account seems clear from the evidence in part two. In part two, he emphasizes the parallel operations of distinction and adornment. Such an interpretation, as he understands it, is not based on an extra-Biblical authority, but rather comes from what he takes to be the plain sense of Genesis 1 itself.⁵³⁶ The parallel of three days of distinction and three days of adornment is an expression, and not merely a symbol, of the order that is instilled in *creatio ex nihilo* on the "day" before the days. Thus, the Hexaëmeron, in Bonaventure's reading, manifests a three-fold order

⁵³⁶ See chapter three on Bonaventure's interpretation of Genesis 1–2:4a.

that is founded in the divine perfections; this *hexaëmeral* order leads to perfection on the seventh day.

Consequently, the objection to seeing a 3-3-1 structure as hexaëmeral is reasonable only if “hexaëmeral” is defined narrowly as six days of creation and a seventh day of rest. Such a narrow definition fails to recognize the variety of hexaëmeral interpretations within the genre of commentary on Genesis 1–2:4a as shown in chapter two. Moreover, such a narrow definition also ignores the fact that Bonaventure himself adopted the Hugonian structure in his own analysis of the Hexaëmeron in part two.

As for the next challenge, regarding the connection between the identity of God and the operations of creation-distinction-adornment, Bonaventure himself suggests that the seminal relationship between the days and age of history comes from God’s perfect attributes. As we saw in the third chapter, Bonaventure envisions both the operations of creation and the processes of time as vestiges of God’s power, wisdom, and goodness. It is God’s benevolence in particular that is key to understanding the parallel reflection of creation-distinction and restoration-adornment, as the fourth chapter of this study underscored. God’s good-will, friendship, and love, and not merely God’s supreme goodness, especially as it is manifest in the Incarnation, binds creation and salvation.

Finally, as to the challenge that would highlight the placement of the treatise on the Incarnation (part four and not part six) as but one example of how poorly the days match the parts of the *Breviloquium*, we must look to Christ's primary role in Incarnation as the *principium et exemplar refectivum*. While the Eternal Art is the agent through whom the Father creates all things, it is through the incarnate Word that the Father restores all things. Insofar as Bonaventure sees an analogous relationship between restoration and the hexaëmeral operation of adornment, it is fitting that Bonaventure should place the treatise on the Incarnation in part four. From this central point, Bonaventure launches his treatment of all of the works of restoration, which have Christ as their *principium et exemplar*. In this way, Christ is shown to be both the *principium* and the *medium* of creation, restoration, and perfection. In fact, it is Christ's role as *medium*—both within the Trinitarian relationships and between God and creation—that establishes a clear correspondence with the first Adam, insofar as Adam was not only the highest adornment of the works of distinction, but was also the first *medium* between God and creation.⁵³⁷ As such, the second Adam, as the *principium refectivum*, is both the new beginning and the new *medium*. It is fitting, therefore, that Bonaventure should treat the

⁵³⁷ Cf. Zachary Hayes, *The Hidden Center*, 63: "The concept of the center ("=medium") is the basis for the office of the incarnate Word as Mediator." Cf. also Schaeffer, "The Position and Function of Man in the Created World According to Saint Bonaventure," 313–316.

second Adam at the beginning of the spiritual adornment of restoration. Hence, although sin does not seem to have much to do with the events of the third day in Genesis 1 (the distinction of the dry land from the water), and while Christ's life, death and resurrection do not seem related to the events of the fourth day (the adornment of the heavens with the luminaries), these topics do, however, fit within the scheme of distinction and adornment.⁵³⁸

Therefore, Bonaventure depends on what we saw to be one of the defining features of the Hugonian interpretation of the *Hexaëmeron*—the parallel of the first three days and the second three days—to facilitate the order of topics in the *Breviloquium*. So we can see that *Breviloquium* part I corresponds to part IV, part II corresponds to part V, and part III corresponds to part VI. This deserves further comment.

First, the relationship of part I and IV is characterized by their treatments of the *principium et exemplar*: part I treats the Trinity as *principium*; part IV treats Christ as the restorative principle and exemplar. Second, the relationship of part II and V is that of creation and re-creation: part II treats the emanation of creation from the First Principle; part V treats the re-creation of all things in the return to the First Principle by way of

⁵³⁸ Although recall that in chapter two we saw that Origen calls Christ the Sun and the Church the Moon)

Christ's grace. And, third, the relationship of part III and VI is that of corruption and its cure: part III treats sin as the demise of the image of God in the world; part VI treats the cure of that image through the repurposing of matter in the sacraments, the specific medicine needed to combat the effects of sin.

There is no simplistic correlation of the specific parts of the *Breviloquium* to the specific days of creation. Rather, this dissertation has attempted to show that there is a correlation between the parts of the *Breviloquium* and the days of creation when they are considered according to the Hugonian division of creation, distinction, and adornment. The internal structure and dynamic of the Hexaëmeron identified by Hugh can be seen to supply Bonaventure with an important paradigm for the internal structure and relationship of the parts of the *Breviloquium*. Just as Bonaventure's precursors read Genesis 1–2:4a in light of the triad of creation-distinction-adornment, he employs an analogous pattern to organize the seven loci of Christian doctrine as they emerge from Scripture. Read in light of creation-distinction-adornment, the structure of the *Breviloquium* is as follows: Scripture as analogous to *creatio ex nihilo* (prologue); Distinction (parts I–III), Adornment (parts IV–VI), and Perfection (part VII). This

division is hexaëmeral insofar as it emerges from Bonaventure's adoption of the Bedean and Hugonian division of days of creation.⁵³⁹

Problems in the Interpretation of the *Breviloquium*

Readers of the *Breviloquium* in the twentieth century have attempted to unify the structure and content of Bonaventure's "brief word." These attempts are partial, however, insofar as they proceed without reference to the Hexaëmeron. The most impressive of these solutions, particularly those by Dominic Monti and Joshua Benson, offer to read the text according to its relationship to theological doctrines that are central to Bonaventure's larger project: namely the Trinity's relationship to creation (Monti), and Christology (Benson). Monti's attempt relies on a paradigm of *exitus-reditus*.⁵⁴⁰ However, as we have seen, Bonaventure does not use the language of *exitus-reditus*, although one could argue that the term *reductio* implies the movement of *reditus*, in some sense. Rather, the *Breviloquium* is ordered according to God's activities of creation, redemption, and perfecting. In this way, the *Breviloquium* bears a striking resemblance to the *De sacramentis*, taking into account the differences noted above.

⁵³⁹ This structure also parallels that of Hugh's *De sacramentis*, which employs a similar division, beginning with a prologue on Scripture, then treating Foundation in part I, the Sacraments of the Church in part II, and ending with eschatology.

⁵⁴⁰ Monti, "Introduction," *Breviloquium*, xlviii–xlix.

Monti leaves it to the reader to determine whether and how *exitus–reditus* relates to the triad of creation-redemption-perfection. Benson, by contrast, employs Bonaventure’s own language from the prologue and part four to present Christ as the *medium* of the structure of *ortus-modus/progressus-status/fructus*.⁵⁴¹ These two approaches, while fruitful in many ways, are limited to different degrees in their ability to unify the structure of the *Breviloquium* in two ways: first, although he eschews proposals that would divide the prologue from the body because of distinctions in genre, Monti’s preference for an *exitus/reditus* structure excludes the prologue, the consequence being that Scripture risks being excluded from the broad reading, in addition to the fact that Bonaventure never uses this language to describe his project. Benson’s reading, on the other hand, gets us closer to integrating the prologue with the understanding of the body; I have taken that further by emphasizing it explicitly. Second, neither Monti nor Benson addresses substantially Bonaventure’s claim to treat God as *principium et exemplar effectivum, reactivum, et perfectivum*. While Benson acknowledges Christ as a new *principium* and incorporates such into his structural interpretation, he does not seem to recognize any relationship between the structure of the *principium effectivum, reactivum, et perfectivum* and the hexaëmeral structure of creation, distinction, and adornment. The

⁵⁴¹ Benson, “The Christology of the *Breviloquium*,” 255.

interpretation proposed in this dissertation attempts to integrate Bonaventure's allusions to the Hugonian division in his own *principium effectivum, reffectivum, et perfectivum*, without denying Benson's emphasis on the centrality of Christ.

This hexaëmeral reading also helps to resolve the question of the relationship of the prologue to the body of the *Breviloquium*. The prologue is the overlooked piece of this theological and structural puzzle. Previous models for attending to the structure of the *Breviloquium*, with the exception of Benson's, erected a formal and methodological divide between the prologue and the body. This is understandable considering the tightly woven synthesis of the seven-part body in comparison to what on the surface looks like commendation of Scripture.⁵⁴² Of course, the prologue is hardly generic, as Bonaventure's description of his context, his interweaving of sources, his metaphors (e.g. the intelligible cross), and above all his turn to the Hexaëmeron as a key for understanding Sacred Scripture demonstrates. In fact, previous models of interpreting the *Breviloquium*'s structure are useful in that by isolating the prologue because of its methodology, they acknowledge that the prologue is not merely a preparatory

⁵⁴² Cf. Bordoy-Torrents, "Técnicas divergentes en la redacción del Breviloquio de San Bonaventura," 442-51; Chenu, *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle*, 54; and Monti, "Introduction," xxxix.

statement, any more than the epilogue of *De scientia Christi* is merely an afterword. Yet, exactly what the prologue is in relation to the body remains an area of exploration.

As we saw, for Bonaventure, the affective science of theology must proceed from and through Scripture. Recall his insistence in the prologue that in order to come to understand God's relation to the world, one must proceed through the breadth, length, height, and depth of Scripture. Theology grasps these four dimensions of Scripture by way of seven topics: "one must know about God, the First Principle of all things, about the creation of those things, about their fall, about their redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ, about their reformation through grace, about this healing through the sacraments, and finally, about their remuneration through punishment or everlasting glory."⁵⁴³ Bonaventure sees Scripture as the foundation from which those doctrines which must be understood in order to grasp God's relationship to the world flow.

Read in light of the division of creation-distinction-adornment, we see that the prologue is related to the body of the *Breviloquium* much in the way that the operation of creation is related to the sequence of the six days of division and adornment.

Bonaventure says in *Brev.* II that in the operation of creation God imparts his three-fold order of power, wisdom, and goodness to the nascent and formless world. This divine

⁵⁴³ *Brev.* prol. 6 (V 208).

order directs the operations of distinction and adornment in such a way that their order reflects God's order. Accordingly, these two operations both lead progressively to the perfection of the Sabbath rest. So too, Scripture, which he treats in the prologue, contains the topics which comprise the seven parts of the *Breviloquium*. Scripture, Bonaventure explains, imparts the knowledge that is necessary for salvation, in the same way that *creatio ex nihilo* imparts the order that is necessary for the providential unfolding and formation in the operations of distinction and adornment. Indeed, this correlation of Scripture and *creatio ex nihilo*, and the allusion to illumination therein, shows us how Bonaventure attempts to light a path through the forest of Scripture for the new theologian: the body of the *Breviloquium* makes that path of foundation and restoration clear just as God's work of distinction and adornment express what was contained in God's Eternal Art on the day before the days.

This hexaëmeral reading also gives us a clearer understanding of previous models of the hexaëmeral genre. Bonaventure attempts to reconcile and synthesize what he takes to be Augustine's simultaneous model of creation with his (Bonaventure's) understanding of the three operations of foundation. The outcome of this synthesis accords with Augustine's own understanding of "one day" which instills God's perfections (measure, number, weight), and with the Hugonian division of creation-distinction-adornment. He adopts in the process Augustine's theory of the

seminal reasons (*De genesi* 3.12.19, and *Brev.* II.2), which he then employs in understanding history, as Augustine also had, and the structure of theological discourse.

Bonaventure's Synthesis

The *Breviloquium* occupies an important place in Bonaventure's corpus. In it, he subsumes the scientific and sapiential task of theology to the formation of the human affections. He conceives of the inception of theological knowledge and wisdom in terms of a "lofty" and "loving" thinking of God.⁵⁴⁴ Indeed, as he indicates early in the prologue, Scripture is to be commended because it leads to knowing the breadth, length, height and depth of Christ's love. Thus, as he explains in part two, Scripture offers both sublime and saving knowledge, in that coming to know creation as an expression of divine benevolence leads, albeit partially, to knowing God's fullest expression of benevolence in salvation. Such divine benevolence, Bonaventure maintains throughout the *Breviloquium*, should lead the theologian to loving devotion of God as the source of creation, redemption, and perfection.

⁵⁴⁴ *Brev.* I.2 (V 211).

The theologian's love (*pietatem*) is a created mirror (to borrow a term from *Brev.* II) of the all-surpassing love (*piissime*) of the Trinity.⁵⁴⁵ Bonaventure holds that the Father "produces and governs all things"⁵⁴⁶ through the Word, his "coequal" and "beloved" Son.⁵⁴⁷ Moreover, insofar as it is the Trinity's love that gives rise to the Incarnation, then the Incarnation should be conceived of as the exemplary expression of God's benevolence to mankind. Bonaventure says, "through the blood of the Word made flesh, God in his all-surpassing goodness [*summa benignitate*] redeemed humankind and nourishes it once redeemed."⁵⁴⁸ Through the Word (*dilectum*) and Spirit (*condilectum*), the Father "will liberally pour out his supreme mercy, delivering humankind from every misery, so that through Christ, all the elect might become children of the eternal Father. In him all love will be consummated: God's for us, and

⁵⁴⁵ *Brev.* I.2 (V 211). Bonaventure is here following Richard of St. Victor, *De Trinitate, Textes Philosophiques du Moyen Age VI* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1958), 3.1: "*Nihil enim caritate melius, nihil caritate perfectius. Nullus autem pro privato et proprio sui ipsius amore dicitur proprie caritatem habere.*"

⁵⁴⁶ *Brev.* I.2 (V 211): "*in quo cuncta disposuit per quod cuncta produxit et gubernat. . . .*"

⁵⁴⁷ *Brev.* I.2 (V 211): "*coaequale. . . dilectum.*"

⁵⁴⁸ *Brev.* I.2 (V 211): "*per quod etiam carnem factum pro summa benignitate hominem redemit pretiosissimo eius sanguine redemptum que cibavit. . . .*"

ours for God.”⁵⁴⁹ Through the benevolent work of the Word and Spirit in creating, redeeming, and perfecting, God draws rational creatures into the same love that eternally begets the Word and spirates the Spirit, thereby consummating “all love” (*omnis pietatis consummatio*).⁵⁵⁰ Thus, the loving thought (*pietatem*) of doctrine strives to imitate the highest love (*piissime*) of the lofty (*altissime*) God’s self-communication: just as God’s perfect love begets a perfect image of himself, the knowledge of God’s perfectly complete and volitional self-communication begets loving knowledge in the mind and heart of the Christian.

Such loving knowledge constitutes what Bonaventure calls the perfect knowledge and wisdom of Scripture.⁵⁵¹ It is the task of the “intelligible cross”⁵⁵² of

⁵⁴⁹ *Brev.* I.2 (V 211): “*per quod etiam in fine mundi summam misericordiam impertiendo ab omni miseria liberabit ut per Christum omnes electi sint filii summi patris in quo erit omnis pietatis consummatio et dei ad nos et e converso.*”

⁵⁵⁰ *Brev.* I.2 (V 211).

⁵⁵¹ Bonaventure treats the procedure of theology, in contradistinction to the mode of science in *In I Sent.*, prooem., q. 2 (I, 10–11). Early Franciscans like Bonaventure took the comparison of the articles of faith and the first principles of science from William of Auxerre. Cf. Gregory. LaNave, “Bonaventure’s Theological Method,” 93; M-D. Chenu, *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle*, 34–37; and Henry Donneaud, *Théologie et intelligence de la foi: au XIIIe siècle*, 19–48. For William, see Magistri Guillelmi Altissiodorensis, *Summa Aurea*, ed. J. Ribailier, vol. 1 (Rome: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas: 1980).

⁵⁵² *Brev.* prol. 6 (V 208).

Scripture to lead the rational creature, and thereby all of creation, back to the Father, “as if in an intelligible circle.”⁵⁵³ This circular return, which depends on God’s love and benevolence, is what makes the affective science and wisdom of theology perfect.

Theology goes beyond philosophical knowledge, considering that cause as the remedy for sins; and it leads back to it, considering that cause as the reward of meritorious deeds and the goal of desire. In this knowledge one finds perfect taste, life, and the salvation of souls; that is why all Christians should be aflame with longing to acquire it.⁵⁵⁴

The knowledge and wisdom of theology, thus, informs both the mind and the will and affections (taste), setting the heart aflame with desire for salvation.⁵⁵⁵

⁵⁵³ *Brev.* II.4 (V 221).

⁵⁵⁴ *Brev.* I.1 (V 210): “*Ipsa etiam sola est sapientia perfecta quae incipit a causa summa ut est principium causatorum ubi terminatur cognitio philosophica et transit per eam ut est remedium peccatorum et reducit in eam ut est praemium meritorum et finis desideriorum. Et in hac cognitione est sapor perfectus vita et salus animarum et ideo ad eam addiscendam inflammari debet desiderium omnium christianorum.*”

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. Gregory. LaNave, *Through Holiness to Wisdom: the Nature of Theology According to St. Bonaventure*, 24–27, 41–45, and 62–65. Bonaventure’s understanding of the affective practice of theology is markedly different from Thomas Aquinas’ notion of the speculative science of *sacra doctrina*. Cf. Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 1, q. 1, a. 4–8, and Frederick Christian Bauerschmidt, *Thomas Aquinas: Faith, Reason, and Following Christ* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 59–64. On Scotus’ notion of theology as practical science, cf. Scotus, *Lectura prol.*, pars 4, q. 1, and Allan B. Wolter, O.F.M., *Duns Scotus on the Will and Morality* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1987), 32–35, and 44–46.

Thus, we can see that Bonaventure's notion of theology as an affective science and wisdom is tied to the structure of the *principium et exemplar effectivum-refectivum-perfectivum*, for it is love, specifically, that motivates the human through the science and wisdom of Scripture to God. Considering this orientation of creation and theology toward love and its divine operation, it is fitting that Bonaventure ends not only on a mystagogical note, but in fact with Anselm's prayer from the *Proslogion*.⁵⁵⁶ He thereby returns to and reinforces his understanding of the affectivity of the Scriptural science. Scripture leads, ultimately, to the excessive and indescribable joy that can be found in truth that God knows perfectly, for God is that truth. The Christian, like the human soul of Christ, participates in that knowledge ecstatically.⁵⁵⁷ Indeed, this completes the return of doctrine to Scripture, proposed first in the prologue, by showing the reduction of all saving truth to the perfect First Principle, in which all natures are satisfied.⁵⁵⁸

⁵⁵⁶ *Proslogion*, ch. 24-26 (PL 158:239C-242C). Monti notes that Bonaventure ends his *Soliloquium* and *De perfectione vitae ad sorores* with this same text.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. *De scientia Christi* epilogue (V 43): "This ecstasy is that ultimate and most exalted form of knowledge which is praised by Dionysius in all his books..."

⁵⁵⁸ Moreover, it completes the vision of faith that Bonaventure had expressed in part five as "firm assent... fervent love... total submission... and confident prayer" (*Brev.7.7* [V 260]: "*summe verum et bonum... summe iustum et misericors... firma assnesio... fervens dilectio... universalis subiectio... fiducialis invocatio...*"). The *Breviloquium* ends with the last of these: confident prayer. Cf. Augustine, *De Trinitate* 15.28.51: "May I remember You, understand You, love You." Here, particularly, Bonaventure complicates the false wedge driven between satisfaction and perfection by

Perhaps we can also now further see that Bonaventure's use of the Hugonian division of the days of creation into creation-distinction-adornment, guided by God's benevolence, which leads to the imitation of divine love in human reason and affection, becomes an important tool for understanding the *Breviloquium*. We see God's benevolence manifest in both the days of creation as well as in God's redemptive work. This link of benevolence also helps further explain how Christ can be related spiritually to the fourth day, the beginning of the operation of adornment, as both *medium* and the new beginning of recreation. Christ, the Eternal Art, begins the work of first adornment on the fourth day, which leads to the culmination of the cosmos in mankind. So too, as the Incarnate Word, Christ begins the work of the spiritual adornment and recreation in the fourth part of the *Breviloquium* by descending to flesh and suffering. Through the fullness of his merits, his wisdom, and his passion, Christ mediates God to humanity and creation, thereby beginning the process by which humanity is restored to its lost role as *medium*. In so doing, Christ's work as *refectivum* begins the work of perfecting, albeit in an inchoate and nascent stage, through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit by grace (*Brev.* V). Christ thus restores the original gift of divine indwelling that had been

interpretations like that of Delio. Cf. Ilia Delio, "Revisiting the Franciscan Doctrine of Christ," 9–10.

humanity's, by grace, before the fall.⁵⁵⁹ Through the reforming work of Christ's grace and the remediating work of the sacraments (*Brev.* VI), the human capacity to contemplate the book of creation as a sign of God's presence is restored, so that humans might also now turn their gaze toward the heavens in love, and in so doing return to its original role of mediator the cosmos to God (*Brev.* VII).⁵⁶⁰

Conceiving of the relationship of the first day of adornment and *Brev.* IV in this way allows us to see the larger synthesis of creation-distinction-adornment and the *principium et exemplar effectivum-refectivum-perfectivum*. Indeed, it is God's identity as the *principium et exemplar refectivum*, explored in *Brev.* IV, and the hexaëmeral operation of adornment that provide the connective link that joins the structure of the *Breviloquium* to the hexaëmeral tradition, as Bonaventure himself acknowledges *via* his analogy of adornment and completion in *Brev.* IV.4. Thus, an hexaëmeral reading of the *Breviloquium* is plausible and as we have seen, quite rich as it expands our vision of what the *Breviloquium* has to offer.

In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure synthesizes an important genre of biblical commentary with his own understanding of theology as an affective science. Doing

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. *Brev.* II.12.2 (V 230).

⁵⁶⁰ *Brev.* II.12.4 (V 230).

so, he provides a coherent and lucid vision of Scripture, from which all truth flows, and to which all truth returns, having been reformed and perfected in the superabundant love of Christ. Indeed, it is this marriage of the hexaëmeral genre with the affective aspiration for perfection in Christ that so marks the *Breviloquium*, and is summarized at the end of Anselm's prayer. "Let your love grow in me here; and there be made complete, so that here my joy may be great with expectancy, and there be complete in reality. . . Let my soul hunger for it; let my flesh thirst for it; my whole being desire it, until I enter into the joy of my Lord, who is three and one, blessed forever! Amen."⁵⁶¹

⁵⁶¹ *Brev.* VII.7 (V 291).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Alexander of Hales. *Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales Summa theologica*. Edited by Constantino Koser. 4 vols. Grottaferrata: Collegii san Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 1979.

Ambrose. *Exameron*. CSEL 32.1. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1897.

— — —. *Hexameron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*. Translated by John Joseph Savage. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1961.

Augustine. *De genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 28. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1894.

— — —. *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. 2 vols. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.

Basil. *Saint Basil: Exegetic Homilies*. Translated by Agnes Clare Way. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963.

— — —. *Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron*. Edited by Stanislas Giet. 2nd ed. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968.

— — —. *Sur l'origine de l'homme*. Edited by Alexis Smets and Michel van Esbroeck. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970.

— — —. *On the Human Condition*. Translated by Nonna Vernon Harrison. Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005.

Beda Uenerabilis. *Libri quattuor in principium Genesis usque ad natiuitatem Isaac et eiectiōem Ismahelis adnotationum*. Edited by Charles W. Jones. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 118A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1967.

Bede. *On Genesis*. Translated by Calvin Kendall. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008.

- Bonaventure. *Opera Omnia*. Eds. PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae. 9 vols. Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1882–1902.
- — —. *Collations on the Six Days*. Translated by Jose de Vinck. Patterson, NJ: St. Anthony's Guild, 1970.
- — —. *Disputed Questions on the Mystery of the Trinity*. Translated by Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1979.
- — —. *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*. Translated by Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1992.
- — —. *On the Reduction of the Arts to Theology*. Translated by Zachary Hayes, O.F.M. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1996.
- — —. *Breviloquium*. Translated by Dominic Monti, O.F.M. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2005.
- — —. *Disputed Questions on Evangelical Perfection*. Translated by Robert J. Karris. Saint Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2008.
- Hugh of. St Victor. *De Sacramentis Christianae Fidei*. Edited by Rainer Berndt. Munster: Aschendorff, 2008.
- — —. *De tribus diebus*. Edited by Dominique Poirel. Corpus Christianorum Continuato Medievalis 177. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.
- — —. *Didascalicon de studio legendi*. Edited by C. H. Buttmer. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1939.
- — —. *On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith*. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2007.
- — —. "On the Three Days." In *Trinity and Creation*. Edited by Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter, 61–102. New York: New City Press, 2011.

Origen. *De Principiis*. Origenes Werke V. Edited by Paul Koetschau. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1913.

— — —. "In Genesim homiliae." In *Origenes Werke VI: Homilien zum Hexateuch*, edited by W. A. Baehrens, Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, 1–144. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1920.

— — —. *On First Principles*. Translated by G. W. Butterworth. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973.

— — —. *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*. Translated by Ronald Heine. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

Peter Lombard. *Sententiae*. Ed. Ignatius Brady. 2 vols. Spicilegium Bonaventurianum, 4–5. Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1971–1981.

— — —. *The Sentences*. Translated by Guilio Silano. Vol. 2. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2008.

Philo of Alexandria. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Edited by L. Cohn, P. Wendland, S. Reiter. Berlin: Reimer, 1896–1915.

— — —. *Philo of Alexandria, On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Robert Grosseteste. *Hexaëmeron*. Edited by Richard C. Dales and Servus Geiben. Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

— — —. *Hexaëmeron*. Translated by C. F. J. Martin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Armstrong, A. H. *Spiritual or Intelligible Matter in Plotinus and St. Augustine*. Paris: Études augustinienes, 1954.

Armstrong, Gregory T. *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche. Die drei Kirchenväter*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962.

- Ayres, Lewis. *Augustine and the Trinity*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2010.
- Backus, Irena Dorota. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: from the Carolingians to the Maurists*, vol. 1. Leiden, Brill, 1997.
- Baldner, Steven. "St. Bonaventure and the Temporal Beginning of the World." *The New Scholasticism* 63 (1989): 206–228.
- — —. "St. Bonaventure and the Demonstrability of a Temporal Beginning: A Reply to Richard Davis." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 71 (1997): 225–236.
- Benson, Joshua C. "Structure and Meaning in St. Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de scientia Christi*." *Franciscan Studies* 62 (2004): 67–90.
- — —. "Identifying the Literary Genre of the *De reductione artium ad theologiam*: Bonaventure's Inaugural Lecture at Paris." *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 149–78.
- — —. "Bonaventure's Inaugural Sermon at Paris: *Omnium artifex docuit me sapientia*, Introduction and Text." *Collectanea franciscana* 82 (2012): 517–562.
- — —. "The Christology of the *Breviloquium*." In *A Companion to Bonaventure*, edited by Jay M. Hammond, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M., and Jared Goff, 247–87. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Bentwich, Norman. *Philo-Judæus of Alexandria*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1910.
- Berube, Camille C., and Servus Gieben. "Guibert de Tournai et Robert Grosseteste: Sources inconnues de Saint Bonaventure, suivi de l'edition critique de trois chapitres du *Rudimentum Doctrinae de Guibert de Tournai*." In *San Bonaventura 1274-1974*, II, 627–54. Grotteferrata: Collegio san Bonaventura, 1973.
- Bettoni, Ephrem. *S. Bonaventura*. Brescia, Italy: La Scuola, 1945.

Bordoy-Torrents, Pedro. "Técnicas divergentes en la redacción del Breviloquio de San Bonaventura." *Cientia Tomista* (1940): 442–51.

Bougerol, J. Guy. *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*. Translated by José de Vinck. Patterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1964.

Bougerol, Jacques Guy, O.F.M. *Manuscrits franciscains de la Bibliothèque de Troyes*. Ad Claras Aquas, Quaracchi: Collegii san Bonaventurae, 1982.

— — —. *Introduction à Saint Bonaventure*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1988.

Bourke, Vernon J. *St. Augustine's View of Reality*. The St. Augustine Lecture. Villanova, PA: Villanova Press, 1964.

Bouteneff, Peter C. *Beginnings: Ancient Christian Readings of the Biblical Creation Narratives*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2008.

Bowman, Leonard J. "What Kind of Journey is Bonaventure's Itinerarium?" In *Itinerarium: The Idea of Journey: A collection of papers given at the Fifteenth International Congress of Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 1980*, edited by Leonard J. Bowman, 94–112. Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg, 1983.

Brady, Jules M. "St. Augustine's Theory of Seminal Reasons." *The New Scholasticism* 38 (1964): 141-58.

Brenk, Frederick E. "Darkly Beyond the Glass: Middle Platonism and the Vision of the Soul." In *Platonism in Late Antiquity*, edited by Stephen Gersh and Charles Kannengiesser, 39–60. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1992.

Brown, Michelle P. "Bede's Life in Context." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bede*, edited by Scott DeGregorio, 3-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo: a biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Chenu, M.-D. *La théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1957.

— — —. *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*. Translated by Jerome Taylor. edited by Lester K. Little. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Coolman, Boyd Taylor. *The Theology of Hugh of St. Victor: an Interpretation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

— — —. "General Introduction." In *Trinity and Creation*, edited by Boyd Taylor Coolman and Dale M. Coulter, 23–48. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.

Coulter, Dale M. "The Victorine Sub-structure of Bonaventure's Thought." *Franciscan Studies* 70 (2012): 399–410.

Cullen, Christopher M., S.J. *Bonaventure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dales, Richard C. *Medieval Discussions on the Eternity of the World*. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Daniélou, Jean, S.J. *Philo of Alexandria*. Translated by James Colbert. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2014.

Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Delio, Ilia, O.S.F. "Revisiting the Franciscan Doctrine of Christ" *Theology Studies* 64 (2003): 3–23.

Dillard, Peter Spotswood. "Removing the Mote in the Knower's Eye: Education and Epistemology in Hugh of St. Victor's *Didascalicon*." *Heythrop Journal* (2014): 203–15.

Distelbrink, Balduinus. *Bonaventurae scripta: authentica dubia vel spuria critice recensita*. Roma: Istituto Storico Cappuccini, 1975.

Donneaud, Henry. "Le sens du mot *theologia* chez Bonaventure: Étude critique à propos d'un ouvrage récent." *Revue Thomiste* 102 (2002): 271–95.

— — —. *Théologie et intelligence de la foi: au XIIIe siècle*. Paris: Parole et Silence, 2006.

Du Roy, Olivier. *L'Intelligence de la Foi en la Trinité selon Saint Augustin. Genèse de sa Théologie Trinitaire jusqu'en 391*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1966.

Esmailpour, Abolqasen. *Manichaean Gnosis and Creation Myth*. Sino-Platonic Papers 156. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Emery, Gilles. *The Trinitarian Theology of Thomas Aquinas*. Translated by Francesca Aran Murphy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Emery, Kent, Jr. "Reading the World Rightly and Squarely: Bonaventure's Doctrine of the Cardinal Virtues." *Traditio* 39 (1983): 183–218.

Esmailpour, Abolqasen. "Manichaean Gnosis and Creation Myth." *Sino-Platonic Papers* 156 (2005).

Evans, G. R. *The Thought of Gregory the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Falque, Emmanuel. *Saint Bonaventure et l'entrée de Dieu en théologie*. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 2000.

— — —. "Le contresens du mot *theologia* chez Bonaventure: Réponse au frère Henry Donneaud." *Revue Thomiste* 102 (2002): 615–24.

— — —. *God, the Flesh, and the Other: from Irenaeus to Duns Scotus*. Translated by William Christian Hackett. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015.

Fedwick, Paul J. "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea." In *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic: A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, vol 1, edited by Paul J. Fedwick, 3–20. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.

- Fichtenau, Heinrich. *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages, 1000-1200*. Translated by Denise A. Kaiser. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.
- Fitzgerald, Alan, and John Cavadini, eds. *Augustine through the Ages: an Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- Freibergs, Gunar. "The Medieval Latin Hexaëmeron from Bede to Grosseteste." Ph.D. diss. University of Southern California, 1981.
- Furry, Timothy J. *Allegorizing History: The Venerable Bede, Figural Exegesis, and Historical Theory*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publishers, 2013.
- Gerken, Alexander, O.F.M. "Identität und Freiheit: Ansatz und Methode im Denken des heiligen Bonaventura." *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 37 (1974): 98–110.
- — —. "Identity and Freedom: Bonaventure's Position and Method." *Greyfriars Review* 4.3 (1974): 91–105.
- Gilson, Etienne. *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure*. Translated by Illtyd Trethowan and Frank J. Sheed. Patterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1965.
- Ginther, James R. *Master of the Sacred Page: a Study of the Theology of Robert Grosseteste*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Girolimon, Michael T. "Hugh of St Victor's *De sacramentis Christianae fidei*: The Sacraments of Salvation." *Journal of Religious History* 18 (1994): 127–38.
- Grant, Edward. *God and Reason in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Hadot, Pierre. *What is Ancient Philosophy?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Hammond, Jay M. "Order in the Itinerarium." In *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology*, 192–271. St. Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, 2001.

- — —. "Bonaventure's Itinerarium: A Respondeo." *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 301–22.
- — —. "Dating Bonaventure's Inception as Regent Master." *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 179–226.
- Harkins, Franklin. "Historia, Reading, and Restoration in the Theology of Hugh of St. Victor." Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2005.
- Harrison, Carol. *Beauty and Revelation in the Thought of Saint Augustine*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Hayes, Zachary, O.F.M. *The General Doctrine of Creation in the Thirteenth Century*. München: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1964.
- — —. "Christology and Metaphysics in the Thought of Bonaventure." *The Journal of Religion* 58: Supplement: Celebrating the Medieval Heritage (1978): S82–S96.
- — —. *The Hidden Center: Spirituality and Speculative Christology in St. Bonaventure*. St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 2000.
- — —. "Bonaventure's Trinitarian Theology." In *A Companion to Bonaventure*, edited by Jay M. Hammond, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M., and Jared Goff, 189–245. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Hellmann, J. A. Wayne, O.F.M. *Divine and Created Order in Bonaventure's Theology*. Translated by Jay M. Hammond. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2001.
- Hildebrand, Stephen. *Basil of Caesarea*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Houtepen, Anton. "The Dialectics of the Icon: A Reference to God?" In *Iconoclasm and Iconoclasm: Struggle for Religious Identity*, edited by Willem van Asselt, Paul van Gesst, Daniela Müller, and Theo Salemink, 49–74. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hughes, Kevin L. "St. Bonaventure's *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*: Fractured Sermons and Protreptic Discourse." *Franciscan Studies* 63 (2005): 107–29.

- Johnson, Timothy J. "Bonaventure's *Legenda Maior*." In *A Companion to Bonaventure*, edited by Jay M. Hammond, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M., and Jared Goff, 453–508. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Klauk, Hans Josef. "Theorie der Exegese bei Bonaventura." In *San Bonaventura 1274–1974*, IV, 71–128. Grotteferrata: Collegio san Bonaventura, 1973.
- LaNave, Gregory. "Knowing God through and in All Things: A Proposal for Reading Bonaventure's *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*." *Franciscan Studies* 67 (2009): 267–99.
- — —. "Bonaventure's Theological Method." In *A Companion to Bonaventure*, edited by Jay M. Hammond, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M., and Jared Goff, 81–120. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Levy, Ian Christopher. "The Study of Theology in the Middle Ages." In *The Routledge History of Medieval Christianity: 1050–1500*, edited by R. N. Swanson, 64–76. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.
- Love, Rosalind. "The World of Latin Learning." In *The Cambridge Companion to Bede*, edited by Scott DeGregorio, 40–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Lubac, Henri de. *Exégèse médiévale. Théologie*. Paris: Aubier, 1961.
- Koehler, Théodore A. "The Language of St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas: A Study of their Vocabulary on Mercy." *Marian Library Studies* 29 (2015): 11–24.
- McEvoy, James. *Robert Grosseteste*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- McGinn, Bernard. *The Flowering of Mysticism: Men and Women in the New Mysticism 1200–1350*. New York: Crossroad, 1998.
- McLynn, Neil B. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Miller, Paula Jean, F.S.E. *Marriage: the Sacrament of Divine-Human Communion*. Quincy, IL: Franciscan Press, 1995.

- — —. "Cosmic Semiosis: Contuiting the Divine." *Semiotica* 178 (2010): 303–44.
- Monti, Dominic, O.F.M. "Introduction." In *Breviloquium*, ix-l. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2005.
- Moorhead, John. *Ambrose: Church and Society in the Late Roman World*. London: Longman, 1999.
- Muckle, J.T. "The Hexameron of Robert Grosseteste: The First Twelve Chapters of Part Seven." *Mediaeval Studies* 6 (1944): 151–74.
- O'Connell, Robert J., S.J. *Art and the Christian Intelligence in St. Augustine*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- O'Keefe, John J. "'A Letter That Killeth': Toward a Reassessment of Antiochene Exegesis, or Diodore, Theodore and Theodoret on the Psalms." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8 (2000): 83–104.
- O'Toole, Christopher, C.S.C. "The Philosophy of Creation in the Writings of St. Augustine." Ph.D. diss., the Catholic University of America, 1944.
- Perkams, Matthias. "The Origins of the Trinitarian Attributes: *potentia, sapientia, benignitas*." *Archa Verbi* 1 (2004): 25–41.
- Plagnieux, Jean. "Aux sources de la doctrine bonaventurienne sur l'état originel de l'homme: Influence de saint Augustin ou de saint Irénée." *San Bonaventura*, 1274–1974, IV, 311–328. Grottaferrata: Collegio San Bonaventura, 1973.
- Poirel, Dominique. *Livre de la nature et débat trinitaire au XIIIe siècle, Le De tribus de Hugues de Saint-Victor*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. Edited by Angelo Di Berardino. Translated by Placid Solari. Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics, 1986.
- Quinn, John Francis. "Chronology of St. Bonaventure (1217–1257)." *Franciscan Studies* 32 (1972): 168–86.

- — —. *The Historical Constitution of St. Bonaventure's Philosophy*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1973.
- Ramsey, Boniface. *Ambrose*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1989.
- Reist, Thomas, O.F.M. Conv. *Saint Bonaventure as a Biblical Commentator: A Translation and Analysis of his Commentary on Luke, XVIII, 34–XIX, 42*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1985.
- Robbins, Frank Egleston. "The Hexaëmeral Literature: a Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1912.
- Robson, Michael. "A Mendicant Perspective: Saint Bonaventure of Bagnoregio." In *Biblical Interpretation: The Meanings of Scripture—Past, Present, and Future*, ed. John M. Court, 71–87. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Roche, W. J. "Measure, Number, and Weight in St. Augustine." *The New Scholasticism* 15 (1941): 350–76.
- Rombs, R. J. "A Note on the Status of Origen's *De Principiis* in English." *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007): 21–29.
- Rorem, Paul. *Hugh of Saint Victor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Rousseau, Philip. *Basil of Caesarea*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Runia, David T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: a Survey*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Schaefer, Alexander. "The Position and Function of Man in the Created World According to Saint Bonaventure." *Franciscan Studies* 20 (1960): 261–316.
- Scheeben, Matthias Joseph. *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik*. Second edition. Freiburg: Herder, 1948.

Schlösser, Marianne. "Bonaventure: Life and Works." In *A Companion to Bonaventure*, edited by Jay M. Hammond, Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M., and Jared Goff, 9–59. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Silic, R. *Christus und die Kirche: Ihr Verhältnis nach der Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura*. Breslau, 1938.

Smalley, Beryl. "The Bible in the Medieval Schools." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, edited by G. W. H. Lampe, vol 2, 197–219. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Stoyanov, Yuri. *The Other God: Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Thompson, Samantha. "What Goodness Is: Order as Imitation of Unity in Augustine." *The Review of Metaphysics* 65 (2012): 525–53.

Van Veldhuisen, P. "The Question of the Possibility of an Eternally Created World: Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas." In *The Eternity of the World: in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas and His Contemporaries*, edited by J. B. M. Wassink. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Van Winden, J. C. M., O.F.M. "In the Beginning: Some Observations on the Patristic Interpretation of Genesis 1:1." *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963): 105–21.

— — —. "In the Beginning: Early Christian Exegesis of the Term *archè* in Genesis 1:1, inaugural address, Leiden 1967." In *Arche: A Collection of Patristic Studies*, edited by J. Den Boeft and David T. Runia, 79–93. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Vasquez, Todd D. "The Art of Trinitarian Articulation: A Case Study on Richard of St. Victor's *de Trinitate*." Ph.D. diss., Loyola University Chicago, 2009.

Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Historical Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

- Wakefield, Walter L. and Austin P. Evans. *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Wass, Meldon C., O.F.M. *The Infinite God and the Summa Fratris Alexandri*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1964.
- Wanda Cizewski. "Reading the World as Scripture: Hugh of St. Victor's *De Tribus Diebus*." *Florilegium* 9 (1987): 65–88.
- Wetherbee, Winthrop. *The Cosmographia of Bernardus Sylvestris*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.
- Whittaker, John. "Goodness Power Wisdom: a Middle Platonic Triad." In *Sofīēs maiētores "Chercheurs de sagesse": hommage à Jean Pépin*, edited by Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Goulven Madec, and Denis O'Brien, 179–94. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1992.
- Williams, Rowan. "'Good for Nothing'?: Augustine on Creation." *Augustinian Studies* 25 (1994): 9–24.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Vol. 1. 5th ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Young, Frances M. "Creation and Human Being: The Forging of a Distinct Christian Discourse." In *Studia Patristica XLIV*, edited by J. Baum, A. Cameron, M. Edwards, and M. Vincent, 335–48. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Zinn, Grover A., Jr. "Book and Word: The Victorine Background of Bonaventure's Use of Symbols." In *San Bonaventura 1274-1974*, II, 143–69. Grottaferrata: Collegio San Bonaventura, 1973.