

**Catechisms, Communion, and Latin Scholastic
Reception of Byzantine Thought:
St. John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* in
St. Bonaventure's *Breviloquium***

COREY J. STEPHAN
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI

Introduction

ALTHOUGH IT IS OFTEN NOTED that St. Bonaventure, together with other Western Scholastics, employed Burgundio of Pisa's twelfth-century Latin translation of St. John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* as a reference work, the Damascene's influence on Bonaventure's thinking remains understudied. What follows is partly a preliminary study of that influence.

Since Bonaventure intended the *Breviloquium* to be a catechism for fellow Franciscans, the work became his outline of the basic tenets of Christian orthodoxy. Although few in number, Bonaventure's citations of the Damascene appear at crucial moments. The Damascene is one of Bonaventure's chief authorities for matters of Christology, and he stands as Bonaventure's lone source for the Maximian dyothelite logic found in the *Breviloquium*. Further, from a grand view, it seems plausible that Bonaventure adopts *De fide orthodoxa*'s creedal structure for his own creed-like summary of the rule of faith.

By exposing the Damascene's influence on Bonaventure, the present author hopes to help further the modern development in historical scholarship of locating—even in the thirteenth century with its plethora of polemical tractates—an unmistakable consanguinity between Greek East and Latin West. To that end, the essay concludes with preliminary suggestions regarding how studies of this kind may contribute to modern Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox theological dialogue.

History

Andrew Louth is not hesitant to attribute landmark status to St. John Damascene: “The theological tradition to which he belonged . . . may be said to have culminated in John, and it is John who represents this tradition in later theology.”¹ Between *The Fountainhead of Knowledge* (of which *De fide orthodoxa* is only one quarter), the treatises against the Iconoclasts, and the myriad chants that are still standard in Orthodox liturgy, the Damascene’s works came to pervade Byzantine Christianity after his life. Yet the diffusion of the Damascene’s works to non-Hellenists was more complicated and less comprehensive. Old Slavonic, Arabic, and Georgian translations of *De fide orthodoxa* existed by the end of eleventh century.² The first Latin translation, traditionally attributed to the Hungarian Cerbanus, was completed partially in the early twelfth.³ Finally, Burgundio’s complete mid-twelfth-century translation became popular among the Latin Scholastics.⁴

The exact date of Burgundio’s translation of *De fide orthodoxa* is contested.⁵ However, it can be placed confidently between 1149 and 1154, with modern scholarship favoring 1153–1154 for two reasons.⁶ First, Pope Eugenius III, who died on July 8, 1153, sought his longtime trusted translator’s skills by ordering the project, showing that it was started no later than that time.⁷ Second, a gloss by one of Peter Lombard’s students

¹ Andrew Louth, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 16.

² John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa: Versions of Burgundio and Cerbanus*, ed. Eligius Marie Buytaert (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1955), “Introduction,” vii. Unless otherwise attributed, citations of *De fide orthodoxa* will be from the Latin translation by Burgundio as found in this volume. Buytaert’s “Introduction” will be cited as such.

³ Buytaert, “Introduction,” vii.

⁴ Buytaert, “Introduction,” vii; Basilio Studer, “John of Damascus,” in *Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon to John of Damascus*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino, trans. Adrian Walford (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2008), 229–36.

⁵ For a full discussion of dating the translation, see Buytaert, “Introduction,” ix–xv.

⁶ Michael McCormick, “Burgundio of Pisa,” in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); Buytaert, “Introduction,” ix.

⁷ Before translating *De fide orthodoxa*, Burgundio of Pisa (ca. 1110–1193) had already served as an interpreter for an official Western expedition to Constantinople (1136) and translated the compilation of St. John Chrysostom’s *Homiliae in Matthaeum* (now known to be pseudopigraphal) at Pope Eugenius III’s request (finished in November 1151). Clearly, Burgundio was both an accomplished translator of the Greek language and a trusted papal scholar.

suggests that the Lombard encountered Burgundio's translation of *De fide orthodoxa* during a trip to Rome.⁸ Since a copy of Burgundio's translation had arrived in Rome by the time that the Lombard was working on his *Sentences* (ca. 1155–1158), but the Lombard did not have access to Burgundio's translation earlier in his project, it seems that Burgundio just had finished his work by the time that the Lombard began his own.⁹ This places Burgundio's undertaking immediately before the Lombard's.¹⁰

The Franciscans who assembled the critical edition of the *Sentences* identify *De fide orthodoxa* as one of the Lombard's most important sources. Further, they see the Damascene's prominence as only behind that of St. Augustine, Hugh of St. Victor, and Peter Abelard, and they note that the Lombard cites the Damascene in such diverse matters as "faith, sacraments, creation, and predetermination."¹¹ However, since the Lombard did not have access to Burgundio's work until partway through his own project, he mixes quotations from the (incomplete) Cerbanus and (complete) Burgundio translations.¹² Occasionally, the Lombard blends the two translations in the same citation, suggesting that he may have used Burgundio's as corrective. As Eligius Marie Buytaert notes, the Lombard's use of both translations had far-reaching ramifications, making "traces of both of them run through the entire Scholastic literature."¹³

Yet the Scholastic reception of Burgundio's translation was not limited to transmission via the mixed citations of the *Sentences*. William of Auxerre and Philip the Chancellor both seem to have had access to Burgundio's

⁸ Buytaert cites a gloss of Bamberg: "The Master obtained this authority from that book while he was in Rome [A libro isto sumpsit magister hanc auctoritatem dum Rome esset]." Buytaert, "Introduction," ix. An introductory comment by an editor of Lombard's *Sententiae* agrees with Buytaert's assessment (presumably referring to the same gloss of Bamberg): "Perhaps by deficient time or money or some other thing, while in Rome Peter obtained only this sample of those chapters that were introduced to him in the other version [Forsitan hoc tantum, quod deficiente tempore vel pecunia vel utraque Romae Petrus obtinuerit exemplatum illorum capitulorum quae iam in altera versione ei innotuerant]"; see editorial comment in Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 3rd ed., vol. 1: *Prologomena* (Grottaferrata: Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad claras aquas, 1971), 121 (editorial introduction). Unless otherwise stated, all English translations are the original work of the present author.

⁹ Buytaert, "Introduction," ix–x.

¹⁰ Editorial comment in Lombard, *Sententiae*, 1:122–29.

¹¹ Editorial comment in Lombard, *Sententiae*, 1:121.

¹² Buytaert, "Introduction," ix; editorial comment in Lombard, *Sententiae*, 1:121.

¹³ Buytaert, "Introduction," v.

text.¹⁴ Among Franciscans, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure's teacher, appears to have drawn directly from Burgundio in his *Glossa*, his *Summa*, and elsewhere.¹⁵ Although Robert Grosseteste produced a corrected version of Burgundio's translation early in the thirteenth century, Burgundio's original (sans Grosseteste's corrections) became the text of study throughout the thirteenth century in the Latin West, including at the University of Paris.¹⁶

The Burgundio translation of *De fide orthodoxa* was so commonly studied that the Latin Scholastics, presumably imitating the form of the *Sentences*, divided it into four books (with additional chapter headings) for easy reference. Reliable thirteenth-and-fourteenth-century manuscripts from the various European and British centers of learning, especially Paris and Rome, abound.¹⁷ Those manuscripts reveal that studying *De fide orthodoxa* closely and frequently enough to merit indexing was a matter of routine.

By the time that the Italian Giovanni di Fidanza, the man who would become the *Doctor Seraphicus*, was born (ca. 1217–1221), *De fide orthodoxa* had inundated Western Scholasticism. When Bonaventure began studying at the University of Paris (ca. 1235), faculty were versed in the Damascene through both the *Sentences* (their main theological textbook) and the Burgundio translation itself.¹⁸ It seems likely that Alexander's familiarity with *De fide orthodoxa* influenced his young pupil. Scholars at Paris had few complete works (rather than *florilegia*) of Eastern Fathers.¹⁹ Largely for that reason, the only Greek figure with more direct influence on Bonaventure than the Damascene was Pseudo-Dionysius.²⁰ Alongside

¹⁴ Buytaert, "Introduction," xvi.

¹⁵ Buytaert, "Introduction," xvi.

¹⁶ For a discussion of the extent to which Burgundio's translation was received rather than Grosseteste's corrective version, see Buytaert, "Introduction," xv–xx. However, the reason(s) for the reception of Burgundio's over Grosseteste's are unknown.

¹⁷ Buytaert, "Introduction," xviii–ix. For example, at Oxford, the Dominican Robert Kilwardby, Bonaventure's contemporary, indexed the complete known works of the Damascene to assist the study of his fellow friars (M. Michèle Mulchahey, *"First the Bow is Bent in Study": Dominican Education before 1350* [Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998], 524). For a full discussion of the extant medieval manuscripts, see Buytaert, "Introduction," xx–xli.

¹⁸ Marianne Schlosser, for example, suggests 1235 ("Bonaventure: Life and Works," trans. Angelica Kliem, in *A Companion to Bonaventure*, ed. J. A. Wayne Hellman and Jarod Goff [Boston: Brill, 2013], 9).

¹⁹ Schlosser, "Bonaventure," 9.

²⁰ Jacques Guy Bougerol, *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure*, trans. José De

the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, the Greek patristic tradition's dominant representative for Bonaventure and his thirteenth-century Latin Christian contemporaries was *De fide orthodoxa*, the work of a seventh-to-eighth-century Syrian.²¹

What seems to be the earliest of hundreds of citations of *De fide orthodoxa* in Bonaventure's corpus appears in the second dubium in his commentary on the prologue of the *Sentences*.²² Here Bonaventure employs the Damascene alongside Scripture to help explain why teachers may write treatises to explain theological matters rather than allowing the Scriptures to speak for themselves, implicitly defending his own project.²³ Moving through Bonaventure's corpus, quotations of the Damascene appear to help identify the attributes of the one God, to help explain God's status as Trinity (especially vis-à-vis the divine *hypostases*), to discuss the Maximian relationship between *voluntas naturalis* ("natural will") and *voluntas deliberativa* ("deliberative will"), to help describe the sacraments, and to assist with other philosophical and theological matters.²⁴

Vinck (Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1964), 25.

²¹ Louth, *St. John Damascene*, 3.

²² Throughout his corpus, Bonaventure cites the Damascene by name over 250 times. Bonaventure's actual number of quotations and/or allusions to the Damascene is higher, but it would be difficult (if not impossible) to count them accurately.

²³ Bonaventure, *In sent.*, prol., dub. 2 (quoting *De fide orthodoxa* 1): "Likewise, from what is said—namely, 'with two denarii having been obtained,' 'supereroganti' [etc.]—it is asked: What is that 'supererogation'? If you should say that it is a superaddition to sacred Scripture from the masters and the Saints, against such an idea the Damascene says: 'What has been handed down to us by the Law and the Prophets, we do venerate, in no wise inquiring beyond it [Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: Prolatis duobus denariis supereroganti; quae sit ista supererogatio. Si tu dicas, quod sit magistrorum et Sanctorum superadditio ad sacram Scripturam; contra, Damascenus: 'Quae tradita sunt nobis per Legem et Prophetas veneremur, nihil ultra haec inquirentes']' (*Opera Omnia*, vols. 1–10 [Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1882–1889], 1:23; all citations of Bonaventure's commentary on the *Sententiae* will draw on the Latin from this edition). Bonaventure employs this quotation of the Damascene as offering an understanding of the sacred tradition that seems to oppose the existence of the theological enterprise. Yet Bonaventure moves on to explain that, in sum, additions to the sacred tradition are only pseudo-theological reflections that actually oppose it. For Bonaventure, true theology never involves additions to the repository of faith.

²⁴ For an example of Bonaventure citing the Damascene in discussion of attributes of the one God, see *In I sent.*, dist. 9, a. 1a, q. 4. Here Bonaventure quotes the Damascene: "God, a being with no limits and without time, generates without limits and unceasingly [Deus, infinite et sine tempore ens, infinite et iniquiescibiliter generat]" (*De fide orthodoxa* 8). For an example of Bonaventure citing the Damascene in discussion of God as Trinity, see Bonaventure, *In I sent.*, dist. 34,

However, Bonaventure is not averse to refuting the Damascene when he believes a refutation to be necessary. Addressing the question as to whether or not a person of the Trinity other than the Son may be called an “image,” Bonaventure cites the Damascene as an authority who writes that the Holy Spirit is an “image of the Son,” a quotation also adopted (and explained away) several times by Alexander in his *Summa* and Aquinas throughout his corpus. Bonaventure retorts: “To that which is objected from the Damascene, it is to be said that the Damascene was a Greek. And the Greeks do not properly accept the *ratio* of the image, like the Latins, since they do not truly understand about the origin of persons.”²⁵ Although other Latin Scholastics generally reject the notion that the Holy Spirit is literally or absolutely an “image of the Son,” Bonaventure is more severe than they in his handling of the Damascene’s claim.²⁶

where Bonaventure relies on the Damascene several times for his discussions of the *hypostases*. Bonaventure also relies on the Damascene throughout *Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Trinitatis*, citing *De fide orthodoxa* dozens of times—notably the earlier chapters, in which the Damascene explains who God is (1–15, especially 8, subtitled “De sancte Trinitate” in the Burgundio translation). For Bonaventure citing the Damascene in discussion of the divine will in God, see, for example, Bonaventure, *In I sent.*, dist. 47. For an example of Bonaventure citing the Damascene in discussion of the relationship between the two types of *voluntas*, see Bonaventure, *In II sent.*, dist. 24, pars 1, a. 2, q. 3, conc. The present author contends that Bonaventure is drawing upon *De fide orthodoxa*, esp. 58 (subtitled “On the wills and *autexousion* (that is, free choice) of our Lord Jesus Christ [De voluntatibus et autexousion (id est liberis arbitriis) Domini Nostri Iesu Christi]” in the Burgundio translation). For an example of the discussion of the sacraments, see Bonaventure’s discussion of baptism in Bonaventure, *In IV sent.*, dist. 4, pars 1, a. 1, q. 3, wherein Bonaventure quotes *De fide orthodoxa* 82 (subtitled “De fide et baptismo” in the Burgundio translation): “By baptism, pardon from sins is given to all similarly, but grace [is given] according to both the proportion of faith and the previous purification [Peccatorum omnibus similiter per baptismum venia datur, gratia autem secundum proportionem fidei et praepurgationem].”

²⁵ Bonaventure, *In I sent.*, dist. 31, pars 2, a. 1, q. 2, conc.: “Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur de Damasceno, dicendum, quod Damascenus fuit Graecus; Graeci autem non ita proprie accipiunt rationem imaginis, ut Latini, quia nec de origine personarum sic sane intelligunt.”

²⁶ Among other places, Aquinas addresses the matter of the Greeks calling the Holy Spirit an “image of the Son” in *Contra errores Graecorum* I, ch. 10. For Alexander’s treatment of the problem, see Alexander of Hales, *Summa Halensis* I, pars 2, inq. 2, tract. 2, sec. 1, q. 2, mem. 3, “De nomine ‘Imago’” (all citations from *Summa Halensis* are from the Latin in Alexander of Hales, *Summa Theologica*, ed. Bernardini Klumper [Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1924–1948]). Alexander addresses the Damascene’s claim twice, each time not outright denouncing the Damascene’s claim that the Spirit is an “image of the Son,” but rather clarifying

Yet even Bonaventure's rejections of specific claims in *De fide orthodoxa* help establish an initial observation for the present study: Bonaventure incorporates *De fide orthodoxa* into his corpus more thoroughly than he would have had he only known it via the Lombard's *Sentences* and his mentor's *Summa*. Rather, it seems that Bonaventure was intimately familiar with the Damascene's great synthesis of orthodoxy.

De fide orthodoxa in the *Breviloquium*

Bonaventure wrote the *Breviloquium* in 1257, the capstone of his twenty-year career of studying and teaching at the University of Paris, as an introductory theological textbook for fellow friars—a Franciscan catechism.²⁷ Thus, the *Breviloquium* has been described as “a concise synthesis of [Bonaventure's] mature teaching.”²⁸ Bonaventure labored to communicate the essentials of Christian belief in minimal language, writing in succinct, simple Latin prose.

Given Bonaventure's insistence upon *brevity*, as he demonstrates even by titling the work the *Breviloquium* (*brevis* + *loqui*), it seems reasonable to assume that he has chosen each outside reference due to its particular magnitude. The Scriptures and St. Augustine claim (predictable) pride of place, but Aristotle, St. Ambrose, St. Gregory the Great, Pseudo-Dionysius, Hugh of St. Victor, St. Anselm of Canterbury, and Peter Lombard are all included—as is the Damascene.

The lone *direct quotation* of (rather than citation of or allusion to) the Damascene in the *Breviloquium* appears in book V, ch. 10, no. 1. Here Bonaventure quotes *De fide orthodoxa* in order to explain how the Lord's Prayer (and all prayer) invites the Holy Spirit's gifts of grace by defining the types of prayer that God wills for each human to make:

He wishes not only for mental prayer [*oratio mentalis*], which is “an ascent of the intellect into God [*ascensus intellectus in Deum*],” but truly he also wishes for vocal prayer [*oratio vocalis*], which is “a petition for fitting things from God [*petitio decentium a Deo*],” not only by ourselves, but truly also by the Saints just as by divinely

that the Spirit is an “image of the Son” in a manner that is not absolute, contrasting the Spirit's status as a non-absolute image of the Son with the Son's status as an absolute image of the Father (“effective,” “effectively,” rather than “absolute,” “absolutely”).

²⁷ See Dominic V. Monti, O.F.M., “Introduction,” in Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure Texts in Translation 9, trans. and ed. Robert J. Karris, O.F.M. (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2005), xiv–xvii.

²⁸ Monti, “Introduction,” xvi.

given co-prayers with us, that we might be able to obtain more by the Saints than we are worthy by ourselves.”²⁹

Note that Bonaventure identifies “mental prayer” (*oratio mentalis*) as an “ascent of the intellect into God” (*ascensus intellectus in Deum*) and “vocal prayer” (*oratio vocalis*) as a “petition for appropriate things from God” (*petitio decentium a Deo*).

Alexander quotes the phrase *ascensus intellectus in Deum* in his *Summa*, where “Ioannes Damascenus” receives the first word in response to the question “whether Christ prayed according to an affect of reason or sensuality.”³⁰ Alexander eventually merges the Damascene’s definition of prayer as an “ascent of the intellect” with the Lombard’s seemingly contradictory concept of prayer as “from the human affect of sensuality, not reason.”³¹

This may be the only time that Alexander quotes the line in his extant corpus, but it came to permeate his disciple’s theory of prayer.³² Beside here in the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure writes some variant of “*oratio est ascen-*

²⁹ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* V, ch. 10, no. 1: “Vult autem orari non solum oratione *mentali*, quae est “ascensus intellectus in Deum,” verum etiam *vocali*, quae est “petitio decentium a Deo,” non solum per *nos* ipsos, verum etiam per *Sanctos* tamquam per coauditores nobis divinitus datos, ut quod minus digni summus impetrare per nos impetrare valeamus per Sanctos” (unless otherwise noted, all Latin quotations from *Breviloquium* are taken from *Tria Opuscula Seraphici Doctoris S. Bonaventurae: Breviloquium, Itinerarium mentis in Deum, et De reductione artium ad theologiam*, ed. Quaracchi Friars, 3rd ed. [Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1911]). Here Bonaventure quotes *De fide orthodoxa* 68.

³⁰ Alexander of Hales, *Summa Halensis* III, pars 1, inq. 1a, tract. 4, q. 2, c. 1: “utrum Christus oraverit secundum affectum rationis vel sensualitatis.” Since the Cerbanus translation does not have ch. 68, here Alexander draws directly from the Burgundio translation. In ch. 68, the Damascene discusses Christ’s prayer at the Garden of Gethsemane. He relies upon Chrysostom, the Nazianzen, and Maximus in order to offer a terse explanation of why Christ prayed. He is particularly dependent upon Maximus in order to discuss the interplay between Christ’s two wills (human and divine).

³¹ Alexander of Hales, *Summa Halensis* III, pars 1, inq. 1a, tract. 4, q. 2, c. 1, contra: “Ex affectu humano sensualitatis, non rationis.” Alexander cites Lombard, *Sententiae* III, dist. 17.

³² In a surprising parallel, this line appears only once in the corpus of St. Albert the Great but many times among the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas (see Albertus Magnus, *In IV sent.*, dist. 32, a. 10). Unlike Bonaventure, who only cites the full line (with *petitio decentium a Deo*) once, Aquinas does so many times. It would seem that Bonaventure tends to follow Alexander in only turning to the Damascene’s first definition, whereas Aquinas follows his own mentor in turning to both parts. Regardless, the Damascene’s definitions of prayer became definitive in the corpora of both Bonaventure and Aquinas.

sus intellectus in Deum” in his commentaries on books III and IV of the *Sentences* and his commentary on the Gospel of Luke.³³ Perhaps the most significant of Bonaventure’s uses of this formula is found in his commentary on the *Sentences* III, dist. 17, “whether it was fitting for Christ to pray,” wherein the Damascene’s definition appears multiple times.³⁴

It is unclear why Bonaventure categorizes both types of prayer as *oratio* rather than preserving Burgundio’s accurate rendering of the Greek *proseuchē* as *oratio* and the Greek *aitēsis* as *petitio*. Specifically, Bonaventure merges what the Damascene depicted as two separate acts into one act with two types, *oratio mentalis* and *oratio vocalis*.³⁵ It is possible that the broader context in the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure’s discussion of how the Lord’s Prayer allows the Christian to receive gifts of grace from the Holy Spirit, intimates an answer per se. For Bonaventure, prayer that is jointly a mental orientation (*mentalis*) and a vocal plea (*vocalis*) uniquely welcomes the Holy Spirit into one’s soul. The Lord’s Prayer, the prayer of the God-Man, is the paragon of such an *oratio*.

³³ See Bonaventure, *In III sent.*, dist. 9, a. 1, q. 1, conc.; dist. 17, q. 1 (several times); *In IV sent.*, dist. 45, a. 3, q. 1; *Super Lucam* 6, v. 12, no. 25.

³⁴ A moment at which Aquinas relies on the Damascene to address the same concerns as Bonaventure comes in his own *In III sent.*, dist. 17. Both Aquinas and Bonaventure rely on the Damascene’s definitions of prayer, especially as *ascensus intellectus in/ad Deum*, to address the Christological questions that arise from the scene of Christ praying at Gethsemane. Broadly, it seems that *De fide orthodoxa* 68 became particularly important for thirteenth-century commentaries on *Sententiae* III, dist. 17. Compare Aquinas, *In III sent.*, dist. 17, q. 1, a. 3, qca 1, arg. 1 to Bonaventure, *In III sent.*, dist. 17, q. 1. The alternative presence of *in* and *ad* in *ascensus intellectus in/ad Deum* in various Scholastic texts is curious. Because *ad* is both attested in the oldest (and best) manuscripts and reflects a tighter rendering of the Greek *pros*, it is probably Burgundio’s word (Buytaert, “Introduction,” 267). Yet here Bonaventure cites *in*, and Aquinas normally does the same—with a few exceptions, notably when he quotes the phrase in full (e.g., Aquinas, *Catena aurea super Matt* 26, lec. 10). Although the two prepositions with the accusative are typically synonymous in medieval Latin, *in* might carry a subtle change in theological meaning. Perhaps “ascent of the intellect toward God” became “ascent of the intellect into God” early in the manuscript tradition—early enough for the phrase to already appear with *in* in Alexander’s *Summa*. Regardless, *in* (Bonaventure’s reading) seems to fit more aptly than *ad* inside Bonaventure’s broader mystical project. The *ascensus intellectus in Deum* is the subject of Bonaventure’s work with a title reminiscent of the Damascene’s formula—the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*. It is not difficult to imagine the formula at least partly inspiring Bonaventure’s title for his mystical treatise.

³⁵ For comparison, although Aquinas normally discusses the two definitions separately, he preserves the Damascene’s distinction at the level of act when he quotes the entire phrase (e.g., Aquinas, *Catena aurea super Matt*. 26, lec. 10).

Bonaventure relies on the Damascene at least thrice to explain why God assumed full humanity, each time in *Breviloquium* IV, his discussion of the Incarnation. The first is in ch. 2, no. 4: “Et totum genus humanum lapsum fuerat et vitiatum, non solum ratione animae, verum etiam carnis: hinc est, quod necesse fuit, quod totum assumeretur, ut totum curaretur” (“And the whole human genus was fallen and spoiled, not only in *ratio* of the soul, but also of the flesh; that is, that it was necessary that it totally be assumed so that it would totally be cured”).³⁶ The editors of the Quaracchi edition of Bonaventure’s Latin opera and Dominic Monti agree that he is drawing upon chapter 50 of *De fide orthodoxa*. Monti directs the reader to the Burgundio translation (Ins. 41–46): “Totum enim totus assumpsit me, et totus toti unitus est, ut toti mihi salutem gratificet. ‘Quod enim inassumptum, incurabile’” (“For he wholly assumed my whole, and whole became one with whole, that with the whole he might bestow salvation [Latin adds “to me” here, *mihi*], ‘For what[ever] was unassumed [is] incurable’”).³⁷

Lombard’s *Sentences* III, dist. 2, ch. 1, “Why [Christ] accepted a full human nature, and what is to be understood by the name of ‘humanity’ or of ‘human nature,’” engrained this formula from the Damascene, who (in turn) adopted it from St. Gregory the Theologian, in Bonaventure’s mind.³⁸ Here the Lombard quotes the Damascene (quoting the Theologian) several times, including Burgundios’s rendering of the key line: “Totum enim totus assumpsit me, ut toti mihi salutem gratificet. Quod enim inassumptibile est, incurabile est” (“For he wholly assumed my whole, so that to the whole of me salvation might be granted. For what is not assumed is not curable”).³⁹

³⁶ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* IV, ch. 2, no. 4.

³⁷ See Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* IV, ch. 2, no. 4 (*Tria Opuscula*, 151; see 137 in Monti’s translation). The Damascene’s original Greek reads: *holon gar holos anelabe me, kai holos holō hēnōthē, hina holō tēn sōtērian charisētai* “to gar aproslēpton atherapeuton” (John Damascene, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 2 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1973], 121).

³⁸ Lombard, *Sententiae* III, dist. 2, ch. 1: “Quare totam humanam naturam accepit, et quid nomine humanitatis vel humanae naturae intelligendum sit.” For the original context of the phrase, see Gregory Nazianzus, Epistle 101 (“To Cledonius the Priest Against Apollinarius”). In addition to various commentaries on the *Sentences*, including Bonaventure’s own, the formula is quoted in an extant sermon by a renowned Franciscan who died during Bonaventure’s childhood, St. Anthony of Padua (Anthony of Padua, *Sermo in dominica XX post Pentecostem* 1.3).

³⁹ Cerbanus had also translated chapter 50. However, throughout this chapter in the *Sentences*, Lombard is loyal to the Burgundio translation. For example, whereas Cerbanus begins paragraph 3 with “therefore, he is united with the flesh by the medium [that is the] intellect of the Word of God [unitum igitur est carni per

It may seem problematic that Bonaventure does not explicitly quote Burgundio's translation of the formula. However, Bonaventure's language affirms his dependency. First, the vocabulary that Bonaventure employs is either identical with or synonymous to the Damascene's: *totum* matches *totum*, *totus*, and *omnia*; *genus humanum* aligns with *nostra natura*; *carnis* aligns with *corpus*; *ratione animae* aligns with *animam intellectualem et rationalem*; *assumeretur* matches *assumpsit*; *curaretur* aligns with *gratificet*. Second, Bonaventure's phrasing parallels the Damascene's: "et totum genus humanum" parallels "in nostra natura . . . omnia"; "non solum ratione animae, verum etiam carnis" parallels "corpus, animam intellectualem et rationalem, et horum idiomata"; "necesse fuit, quod totum assumeretur, ut totum curaretur" more loosely parallels "totum enim totus assumpsit me, et totus toti unitus est, ut toti mihi salutem gratificet." Although these parallels differ in transparency, they combine to show the connection between Bonaventure's formula and the Damascene's.

The second time that Bonaventure relies on the Damascene's discussion of why Christ had to assume full humanity comes implicitly in *Breviloquium* IV, ch. 8, no. 4. After citing the standard trope of his time (also seen in the *Sentences*) that Christ could not assume human *poenalitates vitiosae* ("vicious/corrupting penalties") because such was not possible for one "with supremely perfect innocence," Bonaventure writes: "Since truly [these] penalties, which are perfect *exercises* of virtue and true (not simulated) *testimonies* of humanity, are principally [traits] with respect to common nature, such as hunger and thirst in the absence of provisions, and sorrow and fear in the presence of a nuisance, it follows that it was fitting for him to assume these, and he did so assume."⁴⁰ For Bonaventure, Christ could not assume that which is innately spiritually corrupt. Yet in order to assume full humanity and, therefore, fully save humanity, Christ had to assume all natural and not innately spiritually corrupt aspects of being human. The Damascene claims the same at the beginning of chapter

medium intellectum *Verbi Dei*]," Lombard agrees with all of the Burgundio manuscripts in writing "therefore, he is united with the flesh by the medium [that is the] intellect, the Word of God [unitum igitur est carni per medium intellectum *Verbum Dei*]" (emphasis added).

⁴⁰ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* IV, ch. 8, no. 4: "Quia vero poenae, quae sunt *exercitativae* virtutis perfectae et *testificativae* humanitatis verae, non simulatae, potissime illae sunt quae respiciunt naturam in communi, sicut fames et sitis in absentia alimenti, tristitia et timor in praesentia nocimenti; hinc est, quod illas debuit assumere et assumpsit." For the trope that Christ could not assume *poenalitates vitiosae*, see Lombard, *Sentences* III, dist. 15, chs. 1–2; Bonaventure, *In III sent.*, dist. 15, a. 1, q. 2.

64 of *De fide orthodoxa*.⁴¹ In sum, for Bonaventure and the Damascene, Christ assumed everything human except sin.

The idea that Christ assumed everything human except sin certainly existed in medieval literature prior to the diffusion of the Burgundio translation, with that exact phrase having been used by Augustine and other Latin Fathers.⁴² Yet the Scholastics seem to have gained this exact formulation, with specific mention of Christ's innocence, from the Damascene. Alexander of Hales paraphrases the Damascene in his discussion of "whether Christ had all kinds of the corporeal passions" in his *Summa*.⁴³ Here in the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure may have been thinking of Alexander's paraphrased "Item, Damascenus. . .," the original text in *De fide orthodoxa*, or both. Regardless, this passage of the *Breviloquium* seems to be (at a minimum) thematically and theologically founded in the thought of the Damascene.

Bonaventure's third reliance on the Damascene in his discussion of why Christ had to assume full humanity is also implicit. At the end of *Breviloquium* IV, ch. 9, no. 1, Bonaventure writes: "For he is anathema who says that the nature of the Son of God, which he once assumed, he finally released [i.e. at the end of his earthly life]."⁴⁴ Here Bonaventure implicitly reiterates what he wrote in his *In III sententiae* in response to the question "whether in death the soul of Christ was separated from the divine nature": "Augustine and the Damascene [say]: 'Let him be anathema who says that the Word deposed what he once assumed;' if, therefore,

⁴¹ John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* 64: "For he assumed all man and all the things of man, except sin [Totum enim hominem et omnia quae hominis assumpsit, praeter peccatum]."

⁴² See, for example, Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Psalm 29 (enarratio 2, no. 3): "And it is confirmed, just as I have said, that that man, the Mediator, had all the things of man, except sin [et confirmatum est, quemadmodum dixi, hominem illum mediatorem habuisse omnia hominis, praeter peccatum]" (*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 38: 176). See also the Vulgate rendering of Hebrews 4:15: "For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our infirmities, but, rather, one who has been tested in every way with us, for similitude—yet without sin [non enim habemus pontificem qui non possit conpati infirmitatibus nostris temptatum autem per omnia pro similitudine absque peccato]" (emphasis added).

⁴³ Alexander of Hales, *Summa Halensis* III, pars 1, inq. 1a, tract. 5, q. 1, mem. 2, c. 2, a. 1: "utrum Christus habuerit omnia genera passionum corporalium." Here Alexander writes: "Likewise, the Damascene writes: 'He assumed all man and all the things that are of man, except sin [Item, Damascenus: 'Totum hominem et omnia quae hominis sunt, assumpsit praeter peccatum']'."

⁴⁴ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* IV, ch. 9, no. 1.

he assumed a soul, he never deposited the soul.⁴⁵ Citing Augustine and the Damascene together here requires paraphrasing.⁴⁶ It also reflects an addition to the way that his mentor Alexander addressed the same question, since Alexander only mentions Augustine.⁴⁷

Further, Bonaventure's placement of his discussion of the Incarnation in the *Breviloquium* seems to reflect *De fide orthodoxa*'s influence. For the Damascene (following Maximus and others), the Incarnation is the turning point of the history of the universe. Thus, the Damascene placed Gregory the Theologian's Christological axiom, as well as his broader definition of the Incarnation, in the fiftieth chapter of his hundred-chapter work—the exact center. In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure does the same, discussing the Incarnation in the fourth book of an eight-book treatise. *De fide orthodoxa*'s structure might inform this aspect of the *Breviloquium*'s organization.

The Damascene's discussion of what it means to be fully human also made its way into Bonaventure's text. In *Breviloquium* II, ch. 9, no. 8, Bonaventure explains that every human has two types of wills: "Finally, since *appetite* is able to be brought to something in two ways, either according to *natural instinct* or according to *deliberation* and choice, it follows that the *affective* potency is divided into *natural* will and *elective/deliberative* will, which is properly called *will*."⁴⁸ In his *In II sententiae*, Bonaventure makes the same distinction by explicitly citing the Dama-

⁴⁵ Bonaventure, *In III sent.*, dist. 21, a. 1, q. 1.

⁴⁶ For Augustine's comments, see *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*, tractatus 47, pars 10. Here Augustine writes, among other statements to the same effect: "If, however, we should say that the soul laid itself down and then assumed itself again, that sense is supremely absurd; for what was not separated from the Word was not able to be separated from itself [si autem dixerimus quia ipsa se anima posuit, et iterum ipsa se sumsit, absurdissimus sensus est; non enim quae a verbo non erat separata, a seipsa poterat separari]" (*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 36:410). For the Damascene's comments, see *De fide orthodoxa*, 71: "For the Deity remains inseparable from other parts, I mean, the soul and the body; and, accordingly, neither is the one *hypostasis* divided into two *hypostases* [deitas inseparabilis utrisque permansit, ab anima et corpore aio; et neque ita una hypostasis in duas hypostases divisa est]."

⁴⁷ Alexander of Hales, *Summa Halensis* III, pars 1, inq. 1a, tract. 1, q. 4, tit. 1, dist. 2, c. 5. Alexander's paraphrase also differs from Bonaventure's: "Let him be anathema who says that the Son of God deposed man, once it was assumed [Anathema sit, qui dicit Filium Dei hominem semel assumptum deposuisse]."

⁴⁸ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* II, ch. 9, no. 8: "Postremo, quoniam *appetitus* dupliciter potest ad aliquid ferri, scilicet secundum *naturalem instinctum*, vel secundum *deliberationem* et arbitrium; hinc est, quod potentia *affectiva* dividitur in voluntatem *naturalem* et voluntatem *electivam*, quae proprie *voluntas* dicitur."

scene, even writing that dividing *voluntas* “in thelesin et bulesin”—using the Damascene’s Greek terms, which Burgundio leaves transliterated while offering Latin equivalents—means “in naturalem et deliberativem.”⁴⁹ Here in the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure summarizes what he had discussed at greater length in *In II sententiae*.

The Damascene’s discussions in *De fide orthodoxa* of the two types of wills synthesize Maximian, contra-monothelite thought.⁵⁰ Having received the Damascene’s synthesis, in his *Summa* Alexander cites the Damascene almost identically to how his student Bonaventure does here in the *Breviloquium*.⁵¹ Aquinas employs the same language, which may suggest a broader influence of the Damascene for discussion of wills in the Parisian milieu—likely because he was the only readily available source for Maximian thought.⁵²

Another instance in which Bonaventure draws from *De fide orthodoxa* to discuss human will occurs in *Breviloquium* III, ch. 11, no. 3, wherein he identifies two ways in which an act may be considered sinful: “For [an act] is said to be involuntary in two ways, either by *violence* or by *ignorance*; the first by a defect of potency, the second by a defect of knowledge.”⁵³ In his *In II sententiae*, Bonaventure discusses *involuntarium per violentiam* (“involuntary by violence”) and *involuntarium per ignorantiam* (“involuntary by ignorance”) at separate places.⁵⁴ First, he discusses *involuntarium per violentiam* in answer to the question “whether free will is able to be compelled by any created agent.”⁵⁵ Explicitly citing both the Damascene and Aristotle, Bonaventure establishes that one may not be guilty of sinning if a normally sinful act was forced.⁵⁶ Next, Bonaventure discusses

⁴⁹ Bonaventure, *In II sent.*, dist. 24, pars 1, a. 2, q. 3.

⁵⁰ For a brief note on the Damascene’s appropriation of St. Maximus the Confessor’s discussion of wills, see Paul M. Blowers, “Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus on Gnostic Will (γνώμη) in Christ: Clarity and Ambiguity,” *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 63, no. 3–4 (2012): 44–50.

⁵¹ Alexander of Hales, *Summa Halensis* II 2, pars 1, inq. 4, tract. 1, sect. 2, q. 3, tit. 2.

⁵² See Aquinas, *In IV sent.*, dist. 50, a. 1, qca 1, resp.

⁵³ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* III, ch. 11, no. 3.

⁵⁴ For *per violentiam*, see Bonaventure, *In II sent.*, dist. 25, pars 2, a. 1, q. 4; for *per ignorantiam*, see *In II sent.*, dist. 22, a. 2, q. 3.

⁵⁵ Bonaventure, *In II sent.*, dist. 25, pars 2, a. 1, q. 4.

⁵⁶ The Damascene draws his own discussion largely from Nemesius of Emessa’s *De natura hominis*, with which Bonaventure may also have been directly familiar. *De natura hominis* was known to the Scholastics—and especially cited by Albert and Aquinas—via a Latin translation done by the same Burgundio (Michael McCormick, “Burgundio of Pisa”). Since they believed that the work actually had been authored by St. Gregory of Nyssa, the study of *De natura hominis* was common

involuntarium per ignorantiam in answer to the question “whether ignorance might be an excuse for guilt.”⁵⁷ Bonaventure does not cite the Damascene by name, but (as the Quaracchi editors agree) he depends upon the same chapter of *De fide orthodoxa* 38. The fact that Bonaventure cites the Damascene by name in his discussion of the same topic in the commentary on the *Sentences* is further evidence of his dependency upon *De fide orthodoxa* 38.

The Quaracchi editors suggest that *De fide orthodoxa* 36, which Burgundio subtitles “De passione et operatione,” influences Bonaventure’s division in *Breviloquium* II, ch. 9, no. 7 of the *potentia cognitiva* (“cognitive power”) into several *officia*.⁵⁸ Since this language is not reflective of the Burgundio translation, and since Bonaventure does not rely on the Damascene in the parallel comments that he makes regarding the *Sentences* II, dist. 24, verifying dependency here would be impossible.⁵⁹

Structural Appropriation?

The Quaracchi editors’ suggestion that Bonaventure appropriated the particular order of the Damascene’s distinctions is in part a claim on structural influence. As noted, the Damascene’s Incarnation-centric configuration of *De fide orthodoxa* seems to have informed Bonaventure’s decision to do the same in the *Breviloquium*. In addition, a case may be made for *De fide orthodoxa* subtly influencing the *Breviloquium*’s entire pattern.

Both *De fide orthodoxa* and the *Breviloquium* are structured to trace the course of salvation history. In this regard, both the Damascene and Bonaventure appropriate the pattern of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed as the core of their catechisms. A table is appended to this article that outlines how the pattern of both works echoes the structure of the Creed. The structures of the Creed, *De fide orthodoxa*, and the *Breviloquium* do not have perfect point-by-point correspondence, but all three progress in a common sequence: (1) God and God as Trinity; (2) creation; (3) the need for salvation (the fall); (4) the Incarnation; (5) the Passion; (6) the resurrection; (7) the Holy Spirit’s work, the Church, and the sacraments; and (8) the eschaton.

There are (at least) two possible ways of explaining the structural corre-

among the Scholastics (F. L. Cross, E.A. Livingstone et al., eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd ed. [London: Oxford University Press, 1974], s.v. “Nemesius of Emessa”).

⁵⁷ Bonaventure, *In II sent.*, dist. 22, a. 2, q. 3.

⁵⁸ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* (Monti trans.), 86n1.

⁵⁹ Bonaventure, *In II sent.*, dist. 24, pars 1, a. 2, q. 1.

spondence between the Creed, *De fide orthodoxa*, and the *Breviloquium*. On the one hand, the correspondence could be viewed as strictly coincidental. In such a view, the project of writing a catechism necessitates following the Creed's structure per se. On the other hand, since Bonaventure was intimately acquainted with *De fide orthodoxa*, his structuring of the *Breviloquium* could be viewed as either implicitly or deliberately informed by the structure of the Damascene's work. In such a view, the Damascene creatively expanded upon the structure of the Creed as the first Christian theologian to publish a major catechesis of this kind (systematized and comprehensive), and Bonaventure appropriated the Damascene's structuring for his own project.

The second possibility is more consistent with the evidence. While it cannot be proven whether Bonaventure's assumption of the structure of *De fide orthodoxa* was intentional or subconscious, Bonaventure's knowledge of *De fide orthodoxa* at large and dependency upon it in the *Breviloquium* suggests that *De fide orthodoxa* is one of the *Breviloquium*'s organizational guides.

Some of the structural parallels are trivial. For example, it is chronologically sensible to treat the Passion after the Incarnation. Additionally, in certain places the parallels between the three are untidy. For example, *Breviloquium* III, in which Bonaventure discusses sin and the need for salvation, does not align neatly (regarding structural location) with either a particular place in the Creed or a particular chapter of *De fide orthodoxa*. However, two things should be kept in mind. First, the Western medieval insistence on structuring claims in seven parts, based on the belief that seven is a theologically perfect number, also informs Bonaventure's structuring of the *Breviloquium*. Second, the claim here is that Bonaventure is guided by *De fide orthodoxa*'s overall pattern—not that he summarizes or copies the Damascene's work.

There is also technical evidence for Bonaventure's structural dependency. First, while the *Breviloquium* differs considerably from the Creed in the amount of space that it dedicates to each of the themes (1–8), at several places it agrees completely with *De fide orthodoxa* (see the appendix). For example, chapters 1–14 of *De fide orthodoxa*, or one seventh of the work, define God; *Breviloquium* I, or one seventh of that work, does the same.

Second, more tenuously, the *Breviloquium*'s smooth Latin is perhaps more similar to the Burgundio translation than it is to other great Western Scholastic texts, differing from both the ridged analytical style of the *Sentences* and various *summae*, on the one hand, and the conversational style of homilies, on the other. Of course, there are other possible explanations for the similarity between the two works' Latinity. Because the

Breviloquium is a formal work (unlike a homily) meant to be read from beginning to end (rather than checked for reference like the *Sentences* and *summae*), Bonaventure likely felt compelled to write outside of the standard genres for theological works. However, given Bonaventure's broad use of *De fide orthodoxa*, it remains plausible that the Burgundio translation's Latinity in some way affected that of the *Breviloquium*.

Third, both the Damascene and Bonaventure close their respective works by insisting on the magnitude of the coming eschaton. Bonaventure begins *Breviloquium* VII with *sine dubio* ("without doubt"), perhaps imitating the Damascene's fervent repetition of certitude at the beginning of chapter 100 (the final chapter) of *De fide orthodoxa*.⁶⁰ In each work, like in the Creed, the eschaton is not only the bold crescendo at the end of salvation history but also (as a result) the bold crescendo at the end of the work.⁶¹ Without the coming eschaton, everything discussed previously—chapters 1–99 of *De fide orthodoxa* and parts I–VI of the *Breviloquium*—would be meaningless. The Christian must believe in the final judgment and the resurrection of the dead *sine dubio*.

John Damascene, Bonaventure, and Matters of Greek East and Latin West

Since *De fide orthodoxa* and the *Breviloquium* both were written as expanded creeds outlining the tenets of orthodox Christian belief, their respective authors assume (with few exceptions) that an orthodox Christian will believe what they have written *sine dubio*.⁶² As noted, Bonaventure does not accept *De fide orthodoxa* in its entirety, especially in matters

⁶⁰ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium* VII, ch. 1, no. 1. The Damascene writes: "And we also believe in the resurrection of the dead. For [this] there really will be—there will be the resurrection of the dead. And [when] speaking of resurrection, we affirm the resurrection of bodies [*Pisteuomen de kai anastasin nekrôn. Estai gar hontôs, estai nekrôn anastasis. Amastasin de legontes, sômatôn phamen anastasin*]" (John Damascene, *Die Schriften*, 2:234). Burgundio's translation reads: "Credimus autem et in resurrectionem mortuorum. Erit enim vere, erit resurrectio mortuorum. Resurrectionem autem dicentes, corporum aimus resurrectionem."

⁶¹ The Damascene begins this section of *De fide orthodoxa* with the same word that begins the Creed: *pisteuomen*.

⁶² For one example of an exception, in *Breviloquium* VII, ch. 2, no. 6, Bonaventure writes "ut magis credo" ("as I rather believe") in reference to his preferred method of describing the manner in which souls are actually purged in purgatory. Bonaventure favors "virtus gratiae interius" ("the power of indwelling grace") as the cleansing power, but he concedes the possibility that "ignis ille spirituales habeat virtutem divinitus sibi datam" ("the fire [itself] has a divinely-given spiritual power").

pertaining to the Holy Spirit's procession (or lack thereof). However, he does treat *De fide orthodoxa* both as an authoritative reference work for a range of theological concerns and as an example of a catechism that follows the basic structure of the Creed.

In the *Breviloquium*, Bonaventure cites the Damascene in reference to prayer and willing—both in Christ and in fallen human beings—and in reference to the Incarnation, specifically why Christ assumed full humanity. It is unclear whether or not a consistent rationale underlies such citations. Since the Damascene's broader thought pervades Bonaventure's corpus, it could be a matter of coincidence that all of Bonaventure's citations of the Damascene in the *Breviloquium* pertain to Christology. However, at least in the specific case of the *Breviloquium*, that trend may suggest that Bonaventure sees the Damascene as crucial for understanding how Christ's fulfillment of the economy allows human will to be brought into full accord with the divine will.

If true, for Bonaventure, the Damascene's Maximus-informed discussion of wills and Gregory-informed synthesis of the Greek patristic understanding of why Christ assumed full humanity combine to make *De fide orthodoxa* the funnel through which he receives Greek patristic Christology. As Gregory makes clear, *what Christ did not assume, he did not save*. Thus, what Christ assumed had to include a human will; how Christ's human will interacted with his divine will is explained by St. Maximus the Confessor. These and other treasures of the Greek tradition became known to Bonaventure and his fellow Latin Scholastics via *De fide orthodoxa*. The Damascene's stated goal to synthesize the Patristic tradition for future generations partly came to fruition in thirteenth-century Latin Scholasticism.⁶³

The Damascene's influence on Latin Scholastic theology at large merits more scholarly engagement. Regarding Bonaventure, future study may reveal that Bonaventurian concepts generally attributed to sources such as the *Corpus Areopagiticum* actually stem from or were mediated by *De fide orthodoxa*. Bonaventure is often framed as a disciple of Pseudo-Dionysius, but perhaps he should also be called a disciple of the Damascene. For Scho-

⁶³ In the *Introductory Epistle to The Fountainhead of Knowledge* (of which *De fide orthodoxa* is the final part), the Damascene writes, among other statements to this effect: "I shall not speak sayings pertaining to the fruit of my own mind [*lalēsō logia ou tēs dianoias, karpon, tēs emēs*]" (*Die Schriften*, 1:52). The Damascene is adamant that he has undertaken the project not to express his own views but, rather, to synthesize the preceding tradition. Louth takes issue with the common notion that the Damascene is a mere compiler, preferring to understand the Damascene as a creatively faithful organizer (*St. John Damascene*, viii).

lasticism more broadly, in his monograph on the Damascene, Louth hints that *De fide orthodoxa* inspires the entire *summa* enterprise.⁶⁴ Following this study, which serves as evidence for Louth's claim, the present author urges an analysis of the extent to which *De fide orthodoxa* structurally and theologically informs Scholastic *summae* at large.

Finally, there is merit in studying the weight of the Damascene in Latin Scholastic thought for the sake of modern Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox dialogue. St. Bonaventure, the theologian known to Catholics as the *Doctor Seraphicus*, routinely drew upon one of early Byzantium's greatest minds, another figure revered by Catholics as a great saint and doctor of the Church. In fact, St. John Damascene's definition of prayer—presumably because it was quoted habitually by Bonaventure, Aquinas, other Scholastics, and their disciples—opens the modern *Catechism of the Catholic Church*'s own definition.⁶⁵

As Marcus Plested writes in the conclusion to his *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* regarding the need for an Eastern Orthodox re-appropriation of St. Thomas Aquinas, who is revered by Roman Catholics as not only a saint but the *Doctor Angelicus* and *Doctor Communis*: “Such an appropriation would serve to explode the very human and time-bound construct of an East–West dichotomy and to demonstrate the fundamental congruity and, so to say, consanguinity of Greek and Latin theological traditions.”⁶⁶ Scholarship of this kind should help guide Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox (in some modest way) along the journey to full (re-)communion. St. Bonaventure does not retreat from disagreements; neither should modern theologians. However, Bonaventure's view that “Damascenus” sometimes errs because “fuit Graecus” does not prohibit him from revering the Damascene as a theological authority. In this way, St. Bonaventure can serve as a model for all involved in Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox theological dialogue.

N.V

⁶⁴ Louth writes that “in later Western theology, beginning with the great *Summae* of the scholastic theologians . . . [the Damascene's] epitome of patristic doctrine (known in the West as *De Orthodoxa Fide*, ‘On the Orthodox Faith’) became [the] principal resource for the Trinitarian and Christological doctrines defined by the Oecumenical Synods of the early Church” (*St. John Damascene*, 3).

⁶⁵ The Latin of the modern *Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae* quotes the formula—in the Burgundio translation, no less, although it replaces *intellectus* with *mentis* and follows Bonaventure and Aquinas with *in* instead of *ad*: “Oratio est ascensus mentis in Deum: aut eorum quae consentanea sunt postulatio a Deo” (§2559, citing *De fide orthodoxa* 68).

⁶⁶ Marcus Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 228.

**Appendix: The Structure of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed⁶⁷
in *De fide orthodoxa* and the *Breviloquium***

Concept	Creed	<i>De fide orthodoxa</i>	<i>Breviloquium</i>
(1) God and God as Trinity	I believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible. I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages. God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father;	chapters 1–14 book I in the medieval four-book division	book I
(2) Creation	through him all things were made.	chapters 15–44 book II in the medieval four-book division	book II
(3) Need for Salvation (the fall)	For us men and for our salvation	(scattered throughout, esp. in ch. 73)	book III
(4) Incarnation	he came down from heaven, and by the Holy Spirit was incarnate of the Virgin Mary, and became man.	chapters 45–67 most of book III in the medieval four-book division	book IV, chapters 1–7
(5) Passion	For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate, he suffered death and was buried,	chapters 68–73 end of book 3 in the medieval four-book division	book IV, chapters 8–10

⁶⁷ This is the English translation of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed promulgated by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops at usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/.

(6) Resurrection	and rose again on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures. He ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead and his kingdom will have no end.	chapters 74–81 (roughly) start of book IV in the medieval four-book division	(discussed some in book IV, chapter 10)
(7) Holy Spirit's work, Church, and Sacraments	I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified, who has spoken through the prophets. I believe in one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the forgiveness of sins,	chapters 82–98 (roughly) most of book IV in the medieval four-book division	books V and VI
(8) Eschaton	and I look forward to the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen.	chapters 99–100 end of book 4 in the medieval four-book division	book VII