

## Saint Anthony Of Padua And The Victorines

Jean Châtillon

*Il Santo* 22 (1982) 171-202

Translated by Sergius Wroblewski, O.F.M.

The biographers of St. Anthony of Padua have made the case from the 13th century on that he had the opportunity in Italy to enter into a relationship with the celebrated commentator on the writings of Denys, Thomas Gallus, a religious from the abbey of St. Victor of Paris. The latter settled in Verceil in the winter of 1218-1219 in order to found there the monastery of canons regular of St. Andrew where he soon became abbot.<sup>1</sup> The evidence for this relationship was a eulogy for the saint that Thomas Gallus had included in his *Explanatio in Hierarchiam ecclesiasticam Dionysii* after the death and canonization of Antony. This text remained unknown for a long time. Scholars who have taken up the study of the sources of the theology of Antony have established, on their part, that his Sunday and Festival Sermons were inspired sometimes by the writings of Richard of St. Victor and contain in several instances sentences and passages of some importance. Certain historians have not neglected to compare these facts and to explore their significance.

Such was the case with the late Jacques Heerinckx fifty years ago. This good student of the writings of St. Anthony had observed some of the citations from Richard to which we alluded above. He indicated that these were less numerous and apparent in the Sunday Sermons than in the Festive Sermons. He wrote that, "In the Sunday Sermons we find only one passage from Richard of St. Victor, the celebrated mystical writer of the 12th century. Moreover, this passage does not come from *Beniamin Maior* which is the principal work of the great Victorine, but from *Beniamin Minor*. On the other hand, in the Sermons for the Solemnities of the Saints which the saint composed the year of his

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. S. Antonii Patavini, *Sermones dominicales et festivi ad fidem codicum* recogniti, 3 vol., Patavii, 1979, t.I, Introd., pp. XVII-XVIII, n. 36 and G. Théry, "Saint Antoine de Padoue et Thomas Gallus" *La vie spirituelle* 37 (1933), Suppl. pp. 94-115. Unless otherwise indicated, it is to the new edition of 1979 that we refer and whose volume and page only we shall indicate whenever we make reference to the sermons of St. Antony.

death, a certain number of passages were inspired by *Beniamin maior* or were even copied literally without any mention of Richard"<sup>2</sup>

J. Heerinckx concluded that the great Franciscan doctor had not used the writings of Richard of St. Victor very frequently during the first years of his career and that he had become truly familiar with them later under the influence of Thomas Gallus. "In fact," J. Heerinckx added, "there had been manifestly an evolution in the doctrine of the saint. We believe that St. Antony did not study or know Richard of St. Victor at all during his theological studies, and the influence of the Victorian mysticism upon his late work had been due to a close friendship with the Victorine, Thomas of Verceil."<sup>3</sup>

This tentative judgment does not lack probability. Nevertheless, it should be nuanced and made more precise, at least on certain points, because of the research done on the person and work of St. Antony in the last decade. In this article we shall take note of the most significant aspects.

The works of the late R. P. G. Théry, whose first results came to be known after the publication of Heerinckx's article, have been the first to furnish historians with points for a revised judgment. One of the very great merits of his work was to bring to light an accurate text of the eulogy on St. Antony that Thomas Gallus left us; and that gives us a more exact idea of the kind of relationship that existed between the two men.<sup>4</sup> A different kind of progress was achieved thirty years later with the thesis that M.F.da Gama Caeiro dedicated to St. Antony, rightly called St. Antony of Lisbon.<sup>5</sup> This important work probed at length the origins and youth of the great doctor. M. da Gama Caeiro established that before taking the habit of the sons of St. Francis and before leaving Portula, that is to say, at the time when he was still called Ferdinand, Antony had received an excellent theological formation with the canons regular of St. Vincent of Lisbon and of the Holy Cross at Coïmbre. He showed that those monasteries, or at least the one at Coïmbre, had enjoyed a relationship with the Victorines and had some of their works and so could not have been completely ignorant of their teachings. It is a strong probability that the young Ferdinand had been able to familiarize himself, at least superficially, with the literature and spirituality of the school of St. Victor well before he met Gallus. This evidence led M. da Gama Caeiro to interpret differently

<sup>2</sup>Cf. J. Heerinckx, "Les sources de la théologie mystique de saint Antoine de Padoue" *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 13 (1932), p. 232-233.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. p. 233.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. G. Théry, art. cit., 37 (1933), Suppl., pp. 94-115 and 163-170 and 38 (1934), Suppl. pp. 22-51.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. F. Da Gama Caeiro, *Santo Antonio de Lisboa*, 2 vol., Lisbon 1967-1969.

from G. Théry himself the text of the eulogy on St. Antony that we find among the writings of Thomas Gallus and to consider afresh the citations from Richard of St. Victor that we find in the Sermons, Sunday and Festive.

The new edition of these sermons of Antony invites us to go on to a new phase. In fact, it permits us to approach with greater ease a text that is more certain and readable, provided with a critical apparatus and tables. Identifying the sources of the Sermons, the new edition gives us the means to measure more exactly what Antony owed the Victorine theologians and perhaps also to understand better how he was influenced by his relationship with Thomas Gallus. We thus have the opportunity to reassemble the results achieved by previous research on the different points that have been brought up in order to see how these results are connected and to reply to the following three questions:

- 1) At what moment in his career did St. Antony begin to use the Victorine authors and to familiarize himself with their teaching?
- 2) What could have been the relationship of St. Antony with Thomas Gallus and what does the eulogy which he later left us exactly mean?
- 3) How did St. Antony read, utilize and understand the Victorine writers and what did he retain of their teachings?

#### I. At What Moment of his Career did St. Antony begin to Use the Victorine Authors?

As far as the first point, it is quite true that the ancient biographers of St. Antony were interested above all in his Franciscan career and did not seek at all to know what his youth had been like. M.F.da Gama Caeiro, in reaction, paid the greatest attention to it. What we have learned about the young Ferdinand's noviceship as a canon enables us to understand better what the first formation of the saint was, especially his first theological formation.

First, we know that the future St. Antony began by attending the cathedral school of Lisbon. Like all the establishments of this kind, instruction had to be given in this school by clerics or canons belonging to the chapter. Ferdinand was initiated into the liberal arts, notably grammar and rhetoric, perhaps also dialectic. He also received a literary training of which he never had to be ashamed, since the language and style of the *Sermones* demonstrate excellent quality.<sup>6</sup>

About the age of 15, Ferdinand was admitted to the monastery of St. Vincent, situated near the town of Lisbon, but outside the walls of the city. It was

---

<sup>6</sup>Op. cit. vol. I pp. 3-15.

there that he was invested with the habit of the canons regular.<sup>7</sup> He had to become familiar with the Rule of St. Augustine and to put its norms into practice. In fact, for more than a century the canons regular considered this Rule as theirs, and all the monasteries belonging to their Order had to possess at least one copy. It is quite possible that, at the beginning of this period, Ferdinand had his first contact with victorine literature and customs. A brief inventory of the manuscripts located in the abbey of St. Vincent towards the middle of the 13th century, a text of which has been reproduced by M. da Gama Caeiro, mentions in fact *De institutione novitiorum*, which is very likely the treatise that had been published under the same title among the works of Hugh of St. Victor.<sup>8</sup> It is a practical work without any theological pretensions; but its presence in this Portuguese monastery testifies to the interest they attached to writings of victorine origin. It is very probable that beyond the spiritual formation which was likely given to all the young religious, Ferdinand also received at St. Vincent a biblical and theological formation, at least an elementary one. Nevertheless for lack of sufficient documentation it is very difficult to say in what exactly it consisted.

After having spent two years at St. Vincent, Ferdinand left this monastery and was received by the canons regular of the Holy Cross Abbey of Coïmbre. The situation there was very different from that which the young religious had known at Lisbon. The abbey of Holy Cross, which had adopted the customs of the Order of St. Rut, was also a school conducted by eminent masters and provided with a library apparently voluminous. According to the evidence, it was there that Ferdinand received the best of his theological formation in conditions about which M. F. da Gama Caeiro has given us important details.<sup>9</sup> Thus we know that several religious of the abbey of Holy Cross had attended the Parisian schools and had obtained there the *licentia docendi* in the course of the 12th century and at the beginning of the 13th. Moreover, grants were set up for that purpose.<sup>10</sup> The students who came from Holy Cross of Coïmbre and resided in Paris, did they not frequent the abbey of St. Victor, the school that was attached to it and the masters who taught there? There is no text to

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. pp. 17-45.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. pp. 32-33. The authenticity of *De institutione novitiorum* (PL 176, col 925-951) had been at times contested but it is today unanimously acknowledged. Cf. R. Baron, *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de S.-V.* Paris 1957, p. XXIX, and D. van den Eynde, *Essai sur la succession et la date des écrits de Hugues de S.-V.* (Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani, 13) Rome 1960, pp. 113-115.

<sup>9</sup> Op. cit. vol. I, pp. 47-96.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. pp. 58-69.

make it certain, but there is every reason to think so. The religious of Holy Cross were in effect canons regular. Sojourning at Paris, it is most likely they would seek relationships with an abbey that was then the most prestigious monastery of canons regular in the capetian capital. We have all more reason to believe it since the very cosmopolitan abbey of St. Victor carried on a policy of welcome and "public relations," which we know about from numerous testimonies.<sup>11</sup>

In this hypothesis, we can ask ourselves what masters the canons of Coïmbre knew at St. Victor and what teachings they received. The abbey of Holy Cross had been founded in 1132 and was approved by Pope Innocent II in 1135.<sup>12</sup> If this monastery had taken the initiative at this time to send some religious to Paris to continue their studies, these students would have been able to follow there the lectures of the most famous Victorines. There is not much probability that they met Hugh who died in 1141. However, it is likely that they had been able to hear the exegete André, who did not leave Paris for the abbey of Wigmore in England until the middle of the century; or abbot Alchard, who left only in 1161 in order to take the episcopal see at Avranches; or, more likely still, the prior Richard who died in 1171.

The canons of Coïmbre who belonged to that first generation of students could not have been masters of St. Antony. If we can believe the calculations of his biographers, Antony entered St. Vincent of Lisbon about 1210 or 1211 and was admitted to Holy Cross two years later, towards 1212 or 1213.<sup>13</sup> His teachers did not live in Paris until towards the end of the 12th century or the beginning of the 13th. They could not have known those masters at St. Victor whose names we cited, but only those who were still teaching there around 1200.<sup>14</sup> Thomas Gallus, whom P. Glorieux mentions in his *Répertoire des*

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid. pp. 69-74.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. P. David, art. *Coïmbre* in *Dict. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclésiastiques*, t. 13, Paris 1956, col. 207. F. Da Gama Caeiro, I, pp. 86-88.

<sup>13</sup>F. da Gama Caeiro, I, p. 20.

<sup>14</sup>In the account given in the new edition of the *Sermones* of Antony and which he kindly communicated to me (*Antonianum* 73, 1980, pp. 771-723), R. P. Jacques Guy Bougerol, following F. da Gama Caeiro, cited the names of two religious of Holy Cross, the prior Joao and the canon Raimondo who could have been the masters of the young Ferdinand and who had very probably studied at Paris and lived at the abbey of St. Victor. It is nevertheless difficult to believe that these two personages had been "formed by Achard of Saint-Victor." Achard, in fact, was deceased in 1171, having left Paris at the beginning of 1161 to become bishop of Avranches. We know that Joao and Raimondo still exercised important functions at Holy Cross in 1228 (Cf. F. da Gama Caeiro, I, pp. 38-40, 58). It would have been necessary for these two personages to have become nearly centenarians to have been students of Achard at St. Victor. On the other hand, they had

*maîtres en théologie de l'Université de Paris au XIIIe siècle*,<sup>15</sup> was of this number and, as we have said, could not have left for Italy until 1218-1219. But even if they had not known the school of St. Victor during its most brilliant period, the future masters of Antony could have frequented it when it was still very alive and when it conserved the memory of its intellectual traditions, both in the domain of exegesis or theology, as well as in that of morality or speculative mysticism. Furthermore, the religious and liturgical life of the Parisian abbey never ceased to exercise a great influence, even from a distance. We have remarked just now that the monastery of St. Vincent in the 13th century possessed a copy of *De institutione novitiorum* of Hugh of St. Victor. The *Sermones* of Antony provide us in their turn with a testimony that merits attention. Their new editors have, in fact, indicated two citations borrowed from the sequences of Adam of St. Victor.<sup>16</sup> It is not very likely that Antony learned to know these liturgical poems after his admission into the Franciscan Order. In all probability it was with the canons regular of St. Vincent of Lisbon or Holy Cross of Coïmbre that he had heard these admirable sequences chanted, which he himself undoubtedly had sung and some of whose verses were engraved on his memory so that he could later cite them.

Moreover, other testimonies merit our attention. An inventory of manuscripts preserved at Holy Cross of Coïmbre in the 13th century informs us that the library of the monastery possessed then some Victorine works. Let us not stop at the *Expositio in regulam sancti Augustini*, which seems to have been anonymous in the manuscript that we know,<sup>17</sup> but which, having been included among the works of Hugh of St. Victor,<sup>18</sup> was sometimes attributed to Letbert of St. Ruf. Hugh's authorship undoubtedly ought to be rejected and it has not been proven that the work was Letbert's. But it was the abbey of St. Ruf, rather than St. Victor of Paris, which influenced Holy Cross and from which came the manuscript formerly preserved at Coïmbre. We must look for the origin of this commentary then at St. Ruf.<sup>19</sup> Let us observe also in this

---

certainly been able to know Thomas Gallus at Paris.

<sup>15</sup>t. I, Paris 1933, n. 116, p. 277.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. *Sermo in Pascha Domini* (I, 209, 1.31-32); *Sermo in Annuntiatione Domini* (II, 109, 1.19-20).

<sup>17</sup>Cod. 54 of Holy Cross, today n. 101 of the *Biblioteca publica municipal de Porto*, mss of the 12th century, indicated by F. da Gama Caeiro, I, p. 92.

<sup>18</sup>PL, 176, col 881-924.

<sup>19</sup>For the problems of authenticity posed by this work see R. Baron, "Hugues de S.-V. est-il l'auteur d'un commentaire de la Règle de saint Augustin?" *Recherches de sciences religieuses* 43 (1955), pp. 342-360 and *Etudes sur Hugues de Saint-Victor*, Paris 1963, pp. 63-66 which is favorable

inventory of the library of Holy Cross the presence of Hugh's *De sacramentis*, copied at the beginning of the 13th century, and that of *Beniamin minor* or *De praeparatione animi ad contemplationem* of Richard of St. Victor, copied in the 12th century.<sup>20</sup> Here we are dealing with works whose authenticity has never been placed in doubt. It seems then that, even if Antony had not been able to acquire a profound knowledge of the victorine authors while he was still at Holy Cross, he nevertheless heard about them and became familiar at least with their methods and modes of thought. It was probably not a scholarly knowledge such that he could supply himself straightway with possible citations and consequently introduce them into his writings. Rather, he had a working knowledge, a trace of which we see in some of the themes that he later developed in his sermons.<sup>21</sup>

To cite some examples of these themes, let us first mention the link between wisdom and knowledge. Here there are similarities between Hugh and Antony which merit examination and which, even though they are not the result of a literary dependence properly speaking, lead to connections worthy of interest.<sup>22</sup> Likewise, we must notice the important doctrine about the diverse senses of Scripture, on which the exegesis in the *Sermones* is based. Generally, the Victorines acknowledged the existence of three distinct senses: the literal, allegorical and tropological or moral.<sup>23</sup> Antony retained the same distinctions but with this modification that he spoke more often of the moral sense or of

---

to attributing it to Hugues; and D. Van den Eynde, "Deux opuscules faussement attribués à Hugues de S.-V." *Franciscan Studies* 19 (1959), pp. 318-324, which rejects it categorically. I have explained the reasons for which this *Expositio* seems to me to have come from St. Ruf in an article entitled "Un commentaire anonyme de la règle de saint Augustin," to appear in a collective work consecrated to the Cod. n. 37 of the Grand Séminaire de Strasbourg, called codex of Guta and Sintram.

<sup>20</sup>Cod. 16 and 32 of Holy Cross; today n. 40 and 34 in the *Bibl. publ. Mun.* de Porto (F. da Gama Caeiro, I, p. 94).

<sup>21</sup>Some of these themes have been pointed out by R.P. Jacques Guy Bougerol in the review cited above, note 14.

<sup>22</sup>The *Index rerum notabilium* of the new edition (III, pp. 380-401) is unfortunately very short. The word *sapientia* does not figure there and we find only two references to the word *scientia*. One can consult with profit the *Indice analítico*, vol. II, t. I (pp. 263-267) of F. da Gama Caeiro, the words *Ciência, Contemplanção, and Sabedoria*.

<sup>23</sup>Cf. p. ex. Hugues de S.-V, *Didascalicon* V, 2 ed. C. H. Buttmer, Washington 1939, pp. 95-96, and Richard de S.-V, *Liber exceptionum*, I, lib. II 3, ed. J. Chailion, Paris 1958, p. 115. On the three senses of Scripture according to Hugues de S.-V see R. Baron, *Science et sagesse* pp. 111-113 and 113, and for a most general treatment on the interpretation of Scripture of the Victorines, cf. B. Sinalley, 2nd ed. Oxford 1952, pp. 83-111 and H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'Écriture* t. III Paris 1961, p. 287-435.

morality than of the tropological sense or of tropology.<sup>24</sup> He also spoke of anagogy.<sup>25</sup> Just as the Victorines had themselves subdivided the allegorical sense into simply allegory and anagogy,<sup>26</sup> we can easily make the divisions present in the *Sermones* of Antony coincide with theirs. On that score it is necessary to add that St. Antony, in order to interpret or comment on Scripture, had recourse to instruments of work, the use of which the Victorines had spread during the second half of the 12th century and in whose creation they may have had a hand. What comes to mind here is the *Historia scolastica* of Pierre le Mangeur and above all the *Glossa ordinaria*, which quite often was a source of inspiration for the *Sermones*. That is evident in the indices of the new edition.<sup>27</sup> St. Antony's anthropology, in its turn, brings to mind that which the Victorines often developed. The *Sermones* in fact go back deliberately to the traditional doctrine about man as an image and likeness of God.<sup>28</sup> In this connection they mention the theme of *regio dissimilitudinis*, undoubtedly widespread in the 12th century and often taken up by the Victorines.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Cf. p. ex., "Sermo in Dom IX post Pent." (II 5, 1.8-18). The methods of interpretation of Scripture used by St. Antony have been very neglected by historians of medieval exegesis. They have been examined by F. da Gama Caeiro I. pp. 195-205 and very recently, by B. Smalley, "L'uso della Scrittura nei 'Sermones' di sant'Antonio" *Il Santo* 21 (1981), pp. 3-16.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. p. ex. "Sermones, Prologus" (I, 1, 1.12-14).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Hugues de S.-V., "De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris," 3, PL. 175, col 12AB and R. Baron, op. cit. pp. 110-111.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Index auctorum* (III, 311); *Index locorum Glossae* (III, 369-379); B. Smalley, art. cit. p. 5. Pierre le Mangeur, towards the end of his career had been rightly linked with St. Victor, and his *Historia scolastica* has been often associated in the manuscripts with *Allegoriae in Vetus et Novum Testamentum*, extracts from Richard's *Liber exceptionum* (Cf. *Lib. except.* ed. cit., Introd. p. 76). As for the *Glossa*, although it was not of victorine origin, it had been known, widely distributed and often used by the Victorines. Already in his *Liber exceptionum*, although he did not, strictly speaking, cite the *Glossa*, Richard of St. Victor frequently quoted the patristic and medieval texts found there. He very likely had a *Glossa* before him which, without having the definitive form which it had later, already came very close to it.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. p. ex "Sermo in Dom. XXIII post Pent." (II, 415, 1, 11-20). Cf. p. ex "Sermo in Dom. XXIII post Pent." (II 415, 1, 11-20). As for the importance this doctrine of man as the image and likeness of God had for the Victorines, see S. Otto, *Die Funktion des Bildbegriffes in der Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, XL.i). Münster in West. 1963, p. 107-163 and the texts that I have cited in *Théologie, spiritualité et métaphysique dans l'oeuvre oratoire d'Archaud de S.-V* Paris 1969, p. 155-165. Cf. also R. Javelet, *Image et ressemblance au douzième siècle, de saint Anselme à Alain de Lille* 2 vol., Paris 1967.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. "Sermo in Dom. III post Pascha" (I, 197-198). In this passage, it is true, Antony seems to be inspired more by St. Bernard, *De diversis* 42, 2. (PL 183, col 661.) But this theme appeared often in the Victorines. Let us cite among others Richard de S.-V. *Liber exceptionum* II, 7, 33, ed. cit. p. 338; *De exterminatione mali et promotione boni* I, 1, PL, 196, col. 1073 D; *Adnot.* in Ps. 28, *ibid.* col. 313 B; *Adnot.* in Ps 84, *ibid.*, col. 328 D.



These well-understood themes appear in most of the other authors of the 12th century and their presence in the *Sermones* cannot be considered as evidence of a literary or doctrinal dependence to the exclusion of everything else. Nevertheless it is probable that writings of victorine origin or the teaching of the masters at Holy Cross who had frequented the parisian abbey of St. Victor contributed to familiarising Antony with the victorine manner of seeing, judging and thinking, a trace of which can be found in his *Sermones*. The theological formation that Antony received at St. Vincent of Lisbon and at Holy Cross of Coïmbre ought to have drawn his attention to others as well. It was in that period that he would have become conversant with the works of St. Bernard and with the celebrated letter to the brothers of Mont-Dieu of Guillaume de Saint-Thierry, which he cites under the name of abbot of Clavaux.<sup>30</sup> At the end of the 12th century, moreover, the methods of the Parisian masters developed under the influence of such men as Peter the Cantor, Peter of Poitiers and Etienne Langton. The religious of Coïmbre who had attended the parisian schools in that period must have experienced the influence of these new masters. Upon their return to Portugal they would have made known in their monastery of origin these changes of perspective. Perhaps they even contributed in a way to clarifying their scope.

We find evidence of the influence that these new orientations exercised on Antony, not only in his writings, but more so on the decision that he shortly made to leave Holy Cross and to ask for admission into the Order of St. Francis. At St. Victor, in theological research as well as in the lifestyle adopted by the monastery, they held to a plan coming from Hugh according to which the *lectio*, that is the reading in the strict sense and theological teaching, had to find its extension in the *meditatio* and the *contemplatio*;<sup>31</sup> but Parisian theologians at the end of the century had adopted and developed a different plan. For them the *lectio* had to lead to the *disputatio* and the *praedicatio*<sup>32</sup> that is to say the study of Scripture ought to be the point of departure for a theological reflection which sets to work, in the *disputatio*, all the resources of dialectic, which

<sup>30</sup>Cf. *Index auctorum* (III, p. 306), s.v. Bernardus. The editors have attributed this work to Guigues le Chartreux. But this view, was abandoned a long time ago. (Cf. A. Wilmart, "Les écrits spirituels des deux Guigues, la lettre aux Frères du Mont Dieu," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 5 (1924) pp. 127-158, and reproduced in *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots* Paris 1932, p. 248-259).

<sup>31</sup>Cf. p. ex., Hugues de S.-V., *Didascalicon* ed.cit., Praef. p. 2; III, 7, p. 57; III, 10, p. 59; V, 9, p. 109.

<sup>32</sup>See among others Pierre Le Chantre, *Verbum abbreviatum* (PL 205, col 25. Cf. B. Smalley, art. cit. p. 5 and *The Study of the Bible* pp. 196-213; J. Chatillon, *Le mouvement théologique dans la France de Philippe Auguste* to appear in *La France de Philippe Auguste* (Actes du colloque international du C.N.R.S. held at Paris from September 29 to October 4, 1980.)

in turn is placed at the service of an active preaching, reforming and eventually missionary. Antony, the canon regular of Holy Cross of Coïmbre, was perhaps not satisfied with the orientation of the canons of his monastery nor with the stability that it supposed nor even with the pastoral tasks for which his community undoubtedly had responsibility. It is no surprise that he was attracted by the ideal of the sons of St. Francis. Their preaching, joined to a life of poverty which gave it vitality, was open to new possibilities. It even wanted to reach distant peoples who had not yet known the Gospel. Antony left the canons regular of Coïmbre. He took with him, however, in spite of the renunciations required by his new vocation, the literary, biblical and even spiritual culture that the order of the canons had transmitted to him. This patrimony, which he could not renounce, was undoubtedly an advantage later in the dialogue between Antony, the canon regular who became Franciscan, and the Victorine Thomas Gallus.

## II. St. Antony Of Padua And Thomas Gallus

What we know about the relationship between Thomas Gallus and St. Antony can throw light on the conditions under which Antony acquired at Holy Cross of Coïmbre his elementary knowledge of Victorine theology.

We shall first recall what we know about the meeting of the two men at Verceil. Then we shall examine the text of the eulogy which Thomas Gallus left us about Antony, and we shall ask ourselves what information we can gather from it.

### 1. *The Meeting at Verceil*

Thanks to an important study by G. Théry modestly entitled *Biographical Sketch*, we know quite a bit about who Thomas Gallus was.<sup>33</sup> As his name indicates, this Victorine was French by origin. He entered the canons regular of Paris towards the end of the 12th century. At this time the school of the abbey, though still quite alive, no longer occupied among the Parisian schools, whose number had multiplied, the rank it had enjoyed for a long time. Beginning with this period, Thomas Gallus was in charge of theological education, a position he retained during the first years of the 13th century.<sup>34</sup> Like many of the masters who came from his monastery, Thomas had been at first an exegete. G. Théry even thought that he played a role in the creation of

<sup>33</sup> Cf. G. Théry, "Thomas Gallus. Aperçu biographique" *Archives d'hist. doctr. et litt. du moyen âge* 12 (1939), pp. 141-208.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. above n. 15.

the first biblical concordances.<sup>35</sup> In any case we know that he composed in Paris a commentary on Isaiah, a fragment only of which remains and of which he was quite proud.<sup>36</sup> In 1218-1219, however, Thomas Gallus was called to leave France at the invitation of Cardinal Guala Bicchieri in order to found at Verceil a monastery of canons regular. Here he pursued his studies of the works of Denys, continuing an interest begun in Paris. We do not need to provide here a list and chronology of these writings, but it is for these that he is particularly well-known. It was at Verceil that he had to have met St. Antony.

This meeting, despite its importance, was not attended to in any of the first biographies of Antony. There was no question about it, either in the *Vita prima* composed about 1234, nor in the *Vita secunda* dated from 1235-1240, nor in the *Dialogus de gestis sanctorum fratrum minorum*, which had to have been written about 1244-1246.<sup>37</sup> G. Théry thought that the first testimony relative to this meeting was that which *Vita Sancti Antonii* gives us, called also *Legenda Raimundina* because it is commonly attributed to the Franciscan Peter Raymond of Saint Romain.<sup>38</sup> This *Vita* treats of it in a long and heavy paragraph which we must forgo translating. Its importance obliges us, however, to reproduce it as presented by G. Théry:<sup>39</sup> I have written *audiendis* and *abbate* rather than *audiendos* and *abbati* rendered by G. Théry:

Erat enim [Antonius] mysticorum eloquiorum capacissimus et in audiend[i]s sancti Dionysii libris supermundanis eruditissimo totius saeculi viro, fratri scilicet Adam de Marisco, condiscipulus longe potentius, eo doctrinam illam deificam capere dicebatur a communi eorum didasculo abbat[e] scilicet Vercellensi, cujus laudes id circo ad praesens taceo, quia in ipsius operibus sapientissimis elucescunt.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. G. Théry, *ibid.* pp. 165-166 and "Thomas Gallus et les concordances bibliques" in *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Supplement and, III, I), Munster in West. 1935, pp. 427-446.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. G. Théry, "Thomas Gallus. Aperçu..." p. 164 and above all by the same author, "Commentaire sur Isaïe de Thomas de Saint-Victor" *La vie spirituelle* 47 (1936) Suppl. pp. 46-162 where we find the text of the fragment discovered by G. Théry.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. G. Théry, *Saint Antoine de Padoue et Thomas Gallus*, *loc. cit.*, 37 (1933). Suppl., pp. 195-199; F. da Gama Caeiro, I, p. 144. As for the dates for the composition of these Lives, rather than those proposed by the old work of G. Théry, I hold to those given in the new edition of the *Sermones* of Antony (Introd. I, p. XIV-XLVI).

<sup>38</sup>cf. G. Théry, *ibid.*, p. 99-102; F. da Gama Caeiro, *ibid.*

<sup>39</sup>Op cit. p. 100 citing the *Legenda seu vita et miracula sancti Antonii de Padua* edit. Josa, Bologne 1883, p. 90. With the new edition of the *Legenda Raimundina* published by G. Abate, "Le fonti biografiche di S. Antonio" *Il Santo* 10 (1970) p. 23.

This text informs us that Antony would have been a disciple of Thomas Gallus at the same time as brother Adam of Marsh, another son of St. Francis. It explains that Antony showed himself particularly apt to taste and grasp all that related to mystical theology; that in his competency for understanding the supernatural books of St. Denys, he surpassed his fellow-student Adam, the most learned man of that whole age; that, finally, he acquired a profound knowledge of this divine theology. The *Legenda Raimundina* adds that all this is testified to by the common master of Antony and of Adam, namely, the abbot of Verceil. Here there is not enough space to reproduce the praises he addressed to his disciple. They shine brilliantly, however, in his writings. We can undoubtedly ask ourselves what degree of confidence this narrative merits. *Legenda Raimundina* was not published until about 1293. But the author had used sources dating back to the second quarter of the 13th century which were themselves dependent on a contemporary of St. Antony. According to G. Théry, what has been reported to us in the text cited above will remain "among the essential sources" and "entirely in conformity with historical reality."<sup>40</sup>

The point is to find out what G. Théry understands by "essential sources." In a follow-up to his study, he examined with care innumerable elaborations of the meeting of Antony and Thomas Gallus in other biographers. Let us mention, for example, and without citing it, the *Legenda "Benignitas"*. A recent critique judges it to have been composed about 1276-1280 and that it could have been the work of the English Franciscan John Peckham; G. Théry dated it at the beginning of the 14th century. The author of this biography, 15 years before that of the *Legenda Raimundina*, spoke already of the meeting between Antony and Thomas Gallus. He reversed the roles, however, for while he acknowledged that the abbot of Verceil had acquainted Antony with the writings of Denys, it was Antony, according to him, who had taught theology to Thomas. He added that the Saint had miraculously appeared to the abbot of Verceil shortly before dying.<sup>41</sup> Later texts, notably the *Legenda sancti Francisci* (about 1322) or the *Liber miraculorum* (after 1367), remained closer to the *Legenda Raimundina*, but added new details.

If we can believe these narratives, it would have been by the will of St. Francis himself that Antony and Adam Marsh had been designated for the

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. pp. 101-102.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 104; F. Da Gama Caeiro, l.p. 144. For the reasons why the *Legenda "Benignitas"* is dated from the years 1276 to 1280 and for the possible attribution of this work to John Peckham, cf. V. Gamboso, "Ricerche sulla Legenda Antoniana 'Benignitas'" *Il Santo* 15 (1975), pp. 22-41.

study of theology; and it was because the first Franciscan *studium* had been transferred from Milan to Verceil that these two friars minor had been led to pursue their studies with Thomas Gallus, who had recognised quickly the exceptional talents of his two disciples, who remained with him 5 years. In the 16th century, Surius, in his *Vie de saint Antoine*, adopted a presentation of the facts closer to that proposed by the *Legenda "Benignitas"* with this difference, that the apparition of Antony to Thomas Gallus did not happen until after the death of the saint.<sup>42</sup>

It is evident that these later developments lack foundation. G. Théry had no trouble demonstrating that<sup>43</sup> Adam Marsh, first of all, could not have been a fellow-student of Antony; for he had not entered the Franciscan Order until around the time of the saint's death. He entered shortly afterwards, it seems, or at most one or two years before. He spent the first years of his religious life at Oxford. Moreover, there was never a Franciscan *studium* at Milan, nor was there a transfer from Milan to Verceil, but only from Bologna to Padua. It is therefore unlikely that Antony had been sent to Verceil to pursue his studies or that he had been a student of Thomas Gallus there. Moreover, St. Antony could not have spent five years of his life at Verceil; a sojourn of such duration in that city is incompatible with the chronology at our disposal. As we have seen, G. Théry rejects several of the assertions proposed by the *Legenda Raimundina*, though he had, however, given this document some credit. He singularly limits those "essential sources" which he claimed were "in conformity with historical reality." If then it is certain, as is shown by the text of the eulogy of Antony, which we are going to read, that Antony had met Thomas Gallus, the circumstances of that encounter remain obscure. To give a definite date is itself difficult. Some think for various reasons that it happened in the years 1222-1224, perhaps during the Lent of 1224 when Antony had gone to Verceil. During that time it could have been possible for him to strengthen his amicable relations with the abbot of the monastery of St. Andrew. But these hypotheses are not certain. We must limit ourselves then to the modest conclusions which G. Théry finally proposes at the end of his research and in spite of the tentative confidence he had accorded to the testimony of the *Legenda Raimundina*: "All that we know for certain, is that St. Antony knew Thomas Gallus well; but the circumstances (a sermon of An-

---

<sup>42</sup>G. Théry, *ibid.* pp. 105-114; F. da Gama Caeiro, I, pp. 144-145.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.* p. 171-177; F. da Gama Caeiro, I, pp. 145-146.

tony) and the date of the meeting of these two men (1222-1224) remain obscure. All that has been said about it is conjectural.<sup>44</sup>

## 2. *The Eulogy of St. Antony by Thomas Gallus*

If we do not know the circumstances in which Antony met with Thomas Gallus, at least we can set forth the exact text of the eulogy that the abbot of Verceil gave for the saint. This eulogy, to which several ancient biographers referred using a system difficult to decipher, was recovered and published by G. Théry after long and patient researches, whose history we need not review here. Let us simply recall that it appeared in the *Explanatio in Hierarchiam ecclesiasticam Dionysii* which the abbot of Verceil completed in 1244, two manuscripts of which have been recovered by G. Théry. As the latter demonstrated, Thomas had divided each chapter of the work on Denys into paragraphs, each marked by a letter of the alphabet. The eulogy of St. Antony had been inserted into chapter III, paragraph N, an explanation of the *La Hiérarchie ecclésiastique*. This paragraph N, so we are informed by G. Théry, coincides with the section of the text going from the words *Et hoc autem sancte*, etc., to the words *Igitur quas quidera* etc., according to the version of Jean Sarrazin. In our modern editions this section corresponds to the space occupied by the last sentence of paragraph 9 and paragraph 10 of chapter III.<sup>45</sup> In this passage, the abbot of Verceil gives an explanation of the sentence that Jean Sarrazin had rendered thus:<sup>46</sup>

Etenim ad sanctissimum euntes sacrificium, mundari convenit et ab ultimis animae phantasiis et ad ipsum accedere per similitudinem [secundum quod est possibile].

<sup>44</sup>Ibid. pp. 177-178. At the time when I corrected the proofs for this article, R.P.A. Poppi sent me an extract of a study by V. Gamboso, *Saggio di cronotassi antoniana* destined to appear in *Il Santo* 21 (1981), according to which (pp. 568-569) Antony's sojourn at Verceil was after his trip to France and took place around 1228. This chronology is very much in accord with what I believe could be said about the influence exercised by Thomas Gallus over St. Antony.

<sup>45</sup>G. Théry, *ibid.* 38 (1934), Suppl., pp. 33-34 which refers to the version of Jean Sarrazin reproduced in the *Opera omnia* of Denys le Chartreux (ed. Tournai 1902, t. XVI, p. 609). They discovered this text in *Dionysiaca* t. II. Bruges s.d. (1950), pp. 1225-1232, which corresponds to PG. 3, col 437 C-440 B. The way in which the abbot of Verceil subdivided the chapters of Denys's books and his own *Explanatio* in the dionysian corpus has been clearly explained by J. Barbet in her edition of the *Commentaires du Cantique des Cantiques de Thomas Gallus* (Textes philosophiques du moyen âge, XIV), Paris 1967, Introd., pp. 18-19.

<sup>46</sup>G. Théry, *ibid.*, p. 34 and *Dionysiaca* t. II, p. 1229; cf. PG, 3, col. 440 A. G. Théry has omitted the last four words of this sentence which perhaps he translated some lines later. I have put them back with *Dionysiaca*, loc. cit.

G. Théry translated it into French thus:<sup>47</sup>

“Ceux qui s’approchent du très saint sacrifice doivent être purifiés même des plus légères imaginations de l’âme pour se conformer autant qu’il est possible à la sainteté du mystère. [Those who approach the very holy sacrifice ought to be purified from the slightest imaginings of the soul in order to be conformed as much as possible to the holiness of the mystery].”

The abbot of Verceil commented on this sentence in the following terms, evoking the memory of St. Antony to illustrate the teachings that he drew from it:<sup>48</sup>

*Maxime igitur prelati ecclesiastici eruditi esse debent in supersubstantialibus theologiis, D I M. Et post eos sacerdotes nec oporteret eos exerceri multum in doctrinis, Ysa. 29 d, MT. 15 b, que in ymaginacione et fantasia tractantur: quosdam autem sanctos episcopos qui littera minus habundabat, uncio docuit de omnibus, ut sanctos Martinum, Elygeum, Nycolaum, qui fervore spiritus excedentes nitido speciali privilegio cognoverunt Deum divinissima agnitione de quo D 7 I. Quod etiam in sancto Antonio ordinis fratrum Minorum familiariter expertus sum qui misticam theologiam prompte hausit et firmiter retinuit, cum ipse litteris secularibus minus habundaret, sed exemplo Iohannis Baptiste ardebat et ex ardore lucebat, Io. 5f: Joannes erat lucerna ardens et lucens.*

This text is not particularly difficult to translate. After having explained how those who approach the sacred mysteries ought to rid themselves of all vain thoughts and useless imaginations which could encumber their spirit, Thomas Gallus goes on to say what he thinks of the study of sacred science. Such study is necessary for prelates, that is, for those who have pastoral responsibilities of some importance, and who, in order to acquit themselves worthily of them, must be instructed in the secrets of supersubstantial theology, as Denys explains this in chapter I of his treatise on the *Noms divins*.<sup>49</sup> On the other hand, simple priests ought not apply themselves any more than necessary to studies which involve the imagination, the *fantasia*. Thomas Gallus then was mistrustful of an intellectual curiosity which could not be

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Text established by G. Théry, loc. cit., p. 35 after the Vienna manuscripts, Bibl. nat. 695, f. 135r, and Oxford, Merton Coil. 69, f. 45r, reproduced by F. da Gama Caeiro, I. p. 147. To understand the Scriptural references in this text, it is necessary to know that the abbot of Verceil had subdivided the chapters of the inspired books into paragraphs marked each by a letter of the alphabet, as he had done for the books of Denys (cf. J. Barber, loc. cit.). As G. Théry has shown, the three biblical references that we find there refer to Is 29:10, Mat 15:7-10 and Jo 5:35. For the meaning of the abbreviations DIM and D71 see below notes 49-50.

<sup>49</sup> In the system of references adopted by Thomas Gallus, the abbreviation DIM refers to Denys, *De divinis nominibus*, cap. I M which corresponds in our modern editions to ch. I.8 (Dionysiaea. t. I, Bruges 1939, p. 51-53, or PG 3, col. 597 AB).

justified by the necessity of bringing the light to others. He clearly preferred the simple to the learned. There were in fact saintly bishops, he added, whom the unction of the Holy Spirit had instructed in all kinds of things, even though they had not been versed in the study of letters.

Such was the case, notably of St. Martin, of St. Elijah<sup>50</sup> and of St. Nicholas. Thanks to a singular fervor which had been given them to surpass the limits of their own spirit, and by a special privilege, all three had arrived at the most divine knowledge of God of which Denys speaks in chapter VII of his *Noms Divins*.<sup>51</sup>

The abbot of Verceil had himself noticed, because of his familiar conversations with St. Antony (*familiariter expertus sum*, he wrote), that this friar minor had benefited from a similar privilege. Even though Antony was not particularly versed in the science of secular letters, he had rapidly penetrated the hidden things of mystical theology (*misticam theologiam prompte hausit*) and had perfectly retained its teachings (*firmiter retinuit*). Thomas Gallus also tells us that Antony was like John the Baptist, whom Scripture describes as “a lamp lit and shining” (Jn 5:35). Antony also burned with a fire whose ardor gave light.

In rereading this eulogy, which he took pains to edit, G. Théry thought that it painted an ideal portrait “of a true son of St. Francis” such as he, a learned Dominican, might imagine him. He believed he understood that Antony had appeared to Thomas Gallus as “a very simple young man, entirely filled with the love of God,” open “to the intuitions of mysticism,” understanding “perfectly the abbot of St. Andrew’s explanations of the books of Denys” and fired up with “the reading of his dionysian works” from which “he drew nourishment for his interior life” but who knew “little” “of the human sciences” and who, “unsuited to the argumentation of speculative theology,” was “not at all versed in the rational sciences,” who was neither “a philosopher nor a theologian.” G. Théry thought that, because of all this, the abbot of Verceil could not but congratulate Antony, for he himself “took up arms against speculative

<sup>50</sup>G. Théry, *ibid.*, p. 140 was translated *Elygeus* by Eliseus and referred in this connection to II Kgs 19:19. In reality, it had to do with St. Elias. Elias, it is true, is used instead of Eligius, but *Elygeus* is closer to Eligius, and the mention of saint Elias, bishop of Noyon, is more in agreement with that of saints Martin and Nicholas than that of the prophet Eliseus.

<sup>51</sup>D7 I refers to *De div. nom.* cap. VII, I(I being here a letter and not a roman numeral) or, in our modern editions, ch. VII. 3 (*Dionysiaca*, I, p. 406; PG. 3, col. 872 AB).



theology and the use of philosophy”<sup>52</sup> These evaluations need at least some retouching, and M.da Gama Caeiro was right in contesting their accuracy.<sup>53</sup>

### 3. *What is mystical theology?*

If we want to understand what Antony gained from his relationship with Thomas Gallus, we must find out what the latter meant when he declared that the saint had quickly penetrated the hidden things of mystical theology and that he had retained their teachings. Everything depends on what the abbot of Verceil understood here by *mystical theology*. This expression, whose dionysian resonance is evident, could refer to the doctrine of Denys which Thomas taught to Antony. It could nevertheless have a broader and more general meaning, the content of which is not precise, but which might be discovered from a better knowledge of the teaching of the abbot of Verceil and of Antony.

At first sight, the first interpretation is the most satisfying. It has the merit of being perfectly in agreement with the testimony of the *Legenda Raimundina*, according to which, we recall, Antony had given proof of a remarkable aptitude for comprehending the books of the Pseudo-Areopagite and had even surpassed in this matter his learned fellow-student, brother Adam Marsh. We might add that the abbot of Verceil was himself an admirer of Denys to such a

---

<sup>52</sup>The singular and picturesque text already cited by F. da Gama Caeiro (I, p. 150, n. 21) from which we have extracted some words, deserves to be reproduced in its entirety for the entertainment of the reader: “What impression did Antony make on the Victorine monk?” so wrote G. Théry (art. cit., pp. 42-43) whom one should remind that Thomas Gallus was not a monk. “We have already given an account. Antony was a very simple young man, full of the love of God. He knew little of the human sciences; he was not at all versed in logic and Thomas Gallus congratulated him on that, Thomas who fought speculative theology and the use of philosophy. St. Antony was a contemplative. He was not a philosopher nor a theologian. The testimony of the abbot of Verceil, who had seen St. Antony, had known him and admitted him into his confidence, was most precious in order to give us an idea of the true son of St. Francis. He has been presented to us as a theologian. If one understands by that a theologian like Alexander of Hales, Antony was not that. He was more than that. If he was unsuited for the reasonings of speculative theology, his soul however was open to the intuitions of the mystical. He understood in a marvelous way the abbot of St. Andrew’s explanations of the books of Denys: his soul was on fire with the reading of his dionysian works. He drew from them nourishment for his interior life. St. Antony lived by this interior life. It was the essential. Please! under the pretext of enhancing his prestige, as the author of the *Legenda ‘Benignitas’* wanted to do, don’t try to make of him a master in theology. There is a tendency today—a well marked tendency—to depict for us a St. Antony versed in theology. That is a distortion, a deviation. Antony was most authentically in the line of St. Francis.... Let us leave him his simplicity, his supernatural ardor. Let us preserve intact the portrait which the abbot of Verceil traced: ‘Since he himself was less versed in secular learning, he burned like John the Baptist with an ardor that gave light.’” Would we have to conclude from this text that, for G. Théry, Alexander of Hales, because he was a theologian and did not don the Franciscan habit until later in his life, had not been “most authentically in the line of St. Francis?”

<sup>53</sup>Cf. F. da Gama Caeiro, I, pp. 150-152.

point that he consecrated the last years of his life to commenting on and explaining his writings. It is very likely then that, while sojourning at Verceil and having made there the acquaintance of the abbot of St. Andrew, Antony undertook to read the works of Denys and familiarised himself with dionysian thought, thereafter identified with "mystical theology" by the author of *Explanatio in Hierarchiam ecclesiasticam*.

There is a difficulty with this explanation. Let us at once recall, before formulating the necessary objection, that the testimony of the *Legenda Raimundina* cannot be considered decisive. G. Théry himself indicates that this biography of Antony introduced into its narrative details of fantastic character and inexactitude. A notable example is making Adam Marsh a fellow-student of Antony. Might it not have been equally wrong in vaunting the dionysian competence of the young Franciscan? This *Legenda* was published at the end of the 13th century, that is, at a period when the reputation of Thomas Gallus as a dionysian commentator had been solidly established. Having made Antony a student or disciple of the abbot of Verceil, it was entirely natural that, in order to give substance to his narrative, the author imagined that Thomas's teaching dealt principally with the writings of Denys. From there it was just a short step to say that the young son of St. Francis himself became rapidly and remarkably knowledgeable in dionysian thought. One is all the more tempted to limit the importance of the witness in the *Legenda Raimundina* inasmuch as the teachings of Denys did not leave much of a trace in the writings of Antony. J. Heerinckx, in any case, insisted repeatedly that he found none.<sup>54</sup> M.F.da Gama Caeiro, it is true, has criticized this too summary judgement. In the *Sermones* he showed some themes and some expressions in which he recognised an echo of dionysian thought, for example the theme of "angelic spectacles" or of darkness and light.<sup>55</sup> These observations deserve attention; and it is quite possible that a certain dionysian light illuminates the oratorical work of Antony. Nevertheless it seems to me that this light is only indirect, that it has come to Antony screened and filtered through other intermediaries. The new edition of the *Sermones* indicates that the passage in which there is question of "angelic spectacles" was borrowed

---

<sup>54</sup>Cf. art. cit. p. 232: "Another spiritual writer of whom we do not see a trace in the sermons of St. Antony even though he exercised a very considerable influence on the mysticism of the later middle ages was Ps.-Denys;" and further, p. 254: "Nowhere in the writings of St. Antony does one perceive a dependence on Ps.Denys." A judgment reproduced by P. Philippe, in *La Contemplation au XIII siècle (Dict.de spiritualité, t. 2, Paris 1952, col. 1966 and 1969)*.

<sup>55</sup>F. Da Gama Caeiro I, pp. 160-168; II, pp. 72-89.

from a chapter in *Benjamin maior* of Richard of St. Victor, which we will take up later.<sup>56</sup>

Surely, we must proceed prudently. It is possible that a deeper study of the *Sermones* might reveal texts, citations and allusions that no one to this day has noticed. It is also possible that Antony, having familiarised himself with the writings of Denys, deliberately abstained from using them in sermons meant for listeners who were not prepared to understand them. Such an attitude was not unlikely. We will see later that the Franciscan doctor, in citing Richard of St. Victor, showed great reserve and discernment. We must, however, honestly admit that if we limit ourselves to his sermons, traces of dionysian knowledge are rare. The last editors of the *Sermones*, moreover, show no citation of Denys, and the name of the Pseudo-Areopagite does not even figure in their lists. Further, in one of the rare passages of the *Sermones* that is believed to have been inspired by Denys because the word *mystical* appears there in connection with the obscurity in which divine realities remain hidden (*obscuritas mysticorum*), the new edition rightly does not take us back to Denys, but to the *Glossa ordinaria*;<sup>57</sup> and if one goes back to the source of the *gloss* for this passage, it turns out to be finally St. Jerome's<sup>58</sup> *In Zachariam*, far removed from Denys or his disciples. This makes us think that when Thomas Gallus spoke of mystical theology in the eulogy for Antony, he had no intention of identifying it exclusively with the teaching of Denys. So far as we know and until we are better informed, we must conclude that Antony did not choose to cite in his *Sermones* the writings of Denys.

It is necessary then to understand the expression employed by the abbot of Verceil in the broader and more general sense. In order to understand its meaning, we must find out which authors outside of Denys most inspired Thomas. The task is quite difficult because the works of this master are almost all unpublished or difficult of access.

G. Théry once more can serve as guide. He in fact informs us that one of the authors whom Thomas most readily cited or used was none other than

<sup>56</sup>Cf. *Sermo in Resurrectione Domini* (III, p. 186, 1. 16, cited by F. da Gama Caeiro, I, p. 162, according to edit. Locateiii, 856 b), reproducing Richard, *Benjamin maior*, V, 14, PL. 196, col. 186 A.

<sup>57</sup>*Sermo in Dom II post Pascha* (I, p. 260, 1.22-23, cited by F. da Gama Caeiro, I, p. 168, n. 62, according to Locatelli, 151 b). Contrary to what had been proposed by P. Philippe, art. cit., col. 1969, St. Antony happened to use the word *mystical*

<sup>58</sup>I, i, 8-13, *Corp. Christ. Ser. lat.*, 76 A, p. 756, 1, 263-264.

Richard of St. Victor. He wrote<sup>59</sup> that "Thomas Gallus loved to recall the doctrine of Richard (d.1173) to whom he gave the name of prior." In 1218, in his commentary on Isaiah composed at Paris, the future abbot of Verceil cited one treatise which he designates by its opening words (*Justus meus*) but which is none other than the celebrated *De Trinitate* of the great Victorine.<sup>60</sup> "In his commentary, *Duplici modo*, on the *Mystical Theology* of Denys," adds G. Théry, "the abbot of St. Andrew had before his eyes the *Beniamin maior* of Richard," and "one could say that the *Explanatio* on the *Mystical Theology* was only an adaptation" of this same work.<sup>61</sup> In his *Explanatio in Hierarchiam coelestem*, finally, Thomas refers to Richard twice, once again to the *De Trinitate* of the celebrated prior and then, further on, to his *In Ezechielem*.<sup>62</sup> If we run through the *Commentaires du Cantique des Cantiques* of the abbot of Verceil, published by Mademoiselle J. Barber, we find several references relating also to *De Trinitate*, always entitled *Justus meus*, as well as to the two *Beniamin* and to the *Adnotatio in Psalmum 2* of the great Victorine.<sup>63</sup> This two-fold fidelity to Denys and to Richard, whose teachings are not always perfectly compatible, have not been without some problems for Thomas. Not long ago M. Robert Javelet raised a question on that point. He had attentively studied the text of the *Explanatio in mysticam theologiam Dionysii* by the abbot of Verceil and compared its content with that of *Beniamin maior*, *De Trinitate* and some other works of Richard.<sup>64</sup> In the conclusion of this important article, he set in

<sup>59</sup>G. Théry, *Thomas Gallus, Aperçu...* p. 163.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., pp. 163-164.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 164.

<sup>63</sup>Cf. J. Barber, op. cit., pp. 134, 155 and 167. We find thus a total of six references to Richard in the *Commentaire*. Several among them, it is true, appear in a manuscript which is not that which Mlle. J. Barber has chosen as the basic manuscript. I do not know if these references had actually been chosen by Thomas Gallus himself; still that seems to me very probable. At any rate, even if they had been written down by a copyist, these references testify to a certain notable dependence on Richard in the work of the abbot of Verceil.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. J. Javelet, "Thomas Gallus et Richard de Saint-Victor mystiques," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 29 (1962), pp. 206-233 and 30 (1963), pp. 88-121. In this study M. Javelet refers to a manuscript of *Explanaciones* of Thomas Gallus kept at Vienna (Austria) under n. 695. It points to an edition of *Thomas Gallus, Grand commentaire sur la théologie mystique*, edit. Haloua, Paris 1934, mentioned by G. Théry, but which today cannot be found (cf. J. Barber, op. cit., p. 16). Nevertheless, I have been able to examine the *Extractio* from the books of Denys which we owe to Thomas Gallus, reproduced in *Dionysiaca* (t. I and II) but which I have consulted in the edition of Pedro Hispano, *Exposição sobre os livros do beato Dionísio Areopagita*, published by M. Alonso, S.J. (Lisbon 1957, Appendix, pp. 507-671), which M. de Gama Caeiro found for me. In this *Extractio*,

opposition Thomas Gallus, "the anti-intellectualist who loves in the night," with Richard of St. Victor, "the intellectual who loves in the light," not without having shown first how the former had integrated the teachings of the latter into his own synthesis. But beyond what constituted its proper object, this study demonstrated all that Thomas Gallus owed to his illustrious Victorine predecessor.

We can reasonably surmise that when they met at Verceil, Thomas and Antony did not speak only of Denys. They also considered the teachings of the great doctors, St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great and St. Bernard, often cited by Antony, and certainly of Richard of St. Victor. The mystical theology in which the young Franciscan made such remarkable progress was not so much that of the Pseudo-Areopagite as that of the Victorines, and above all, Richard. Several reasons incline us to think that. At the time when the conversations took place, whatever the date, Thomas Gallus knew Denys very well already, since he had treated the celestial hierarchies in his commentary on Isaiah, composed before he left Paris for Italy,<sup>65</sup> but he was not yet the selector and commentator on the dionysian corpus whose great works in that domain would appear only later. On the other hand, the abbot of Verceil found in the person of Antony a former canon regular who had had in his hands at Coïmbre some Victorine works and who must have been disposed by that fact to deepen his knowledge of them. For these reasons, whose importance one can dispute, we must add one other of much greater weight. If we consult the lists of the *Sermones*, we notice that the new editors refer us fifteen times to the writings of Richard.<sup>66</sup> This number is not very high. The references to the works of Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville and even St. Bernard or Pierre le Mangeur, are much more numerous. Those that refer to the writings of Richard, however, merit notice because, except for some verses of Adam of St. Victor mentioned above, there are no others that

---

which follows very closely the text of Denys and limits itself to adding brief considerations, I have not noticed references to Richard.

<sup>65</sup>Cf. M. Th. D'Aiverny, "Le second commentaire de Thomas Gallus, abbé de Verceil, sur le Cantique des Cantiques" *Archives d'hist. doct. et litt. du moyen âge* 13 (1940-1942), p. 399.

<sup>66</sup>Cf. t. III, p. 312. We need not take into account, in this table, the two references which we relegate, under the name of Richard, to *De gradibus caritatis*. This little work, published among the Victorine works (PL 196, col 1195-1208), is not authentic, but has as author an unknown personage called Ives, as G. Dumeige has shown in the introduction to a new edition of this text under the title *Epistola ad Severinum* (cf. G. Dumeige, *Ives, Épître a Séverin sur la charité - Richard de Saint-Victor, Les quatre degrés de la violente charité*. Paris 1955, pp. 20-25).

point to certainly authentic Victorine works.<sup>67</sup> It is true that Antony never mentioned Richard by name. But he reproduced rather long passages from his work. These passages are often borrowed from works whose titles do not appear in the inventories of St. Vincent of Lisbon or of Holy Cross of Coïmbre which M.F.da Gama Caeiro has given to us. Several of them are relatively little widespread, which gives us reason to believe that the saint had at his disposal, at a certain time in his life, a Ricardian library which was quite well stocked.

At this point we return to the remarks made by J. Heerinckx reported at the beginning of this study.<sup>68</sup> It is evident that St. Antony cited Richard much more often in his *Sermones festivi* than in his *Sermones dominicales*. With the exception of a text of five or six lines borrowed from *Beniamin minor*,<sup>69</sup> these latter contain only four or five brief citations, some words at the very most, borrowed from *Beniamin maior*<sup>70</sup> or from the *Expositio in Cantica*<sup>71</sup>

In the *Sermones festivi*, on the other hand, the citations are more numerous and often also longer. These citations, on the one hand, are not only borrowed from *Beniamin minor*,<sup>72</sup> and *Beniamin maior*<sup>73</sup> which the *Sermones dominicales*

<sup>67</sup> Contrary to what could be believed, the table of cited authors in the new edition (III, p. 309) does not mention any authentic work of Hugh of St Victor. The *De anima* cited in t. I, p. 1292, is only a compilation whose third book to which they referred us had been partially published among the works of St. Bernard (PL. 184, col. 507-560), but this treatise is no more the work of the abbot of Clairvaux than that of Hugh. As to the *Summa sententiarum* cited in t. II, p. 397 and which had been published among the works of Hugh (PL, 177, col 41-174), no decisive argument permits attribution to this Victorine. We can at most classify it among the doubtfully authentic works as has been done recently by R. Goy (*Die Überlieferung des Werke Hugos von St. Viktor*. Stuttgart 1976, p. 486-487).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. note 2 above

<sup>69</sup> Cf. *Sermo in Dom. II in Quadr.* (I, 95), citing *Beniamin min.*, 71, 73-74 (PL, 196, col. 51 B and 52 D-53 A).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. *Sermo in Dom II in Quadr.* I, 424) with an allusion to *Beniam. maior* I. 1. PL, 196, col 63-65.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *Serm. in Dom. I Quadr.* (I, 82); *In Dom. III Quadr.*, (I, 151-152 and 160) which refer respectively to Richard, *Explicat. in Cant.*, 25, PL 196, col 481 C (some words): 25, col 480 A (a rather approximate citation of three lines which might better be designated a reminiscence); 37, col 509 C (two lines on the properties of the palm tree that we find in Gregory the Great and they were probably not borrowed directly from Richard). A fourth reference in the *Sermo in Dom. IV Quadr* (I, 464) refers us to the same work of Richard (I, col. 410). The connection between these two texts seems to me both vague and uncertain.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. *Sermo de sanctis Apost. Petro et Paulo* (III 287), citing some words from *Beniam min.*, 2-4 PL, 196, col. 2-4.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *Sermo in festo S. Ioannis evang.* (III, 32); *In convers. beati Pauli* (III, 97); *In Resurrect. Domini* (III, 186-187); *De sanctis Apost. Petro et Paulo* (III, 287), citing respectively *Beniamin maior*, V, 5, PL, 196, col. 174 A; V. 2, col 170 A; V 14, col. 186 AB; V, 15 col. 185 C; IV, 11, col 147 AB.

had already known, but equally from other works, such as *De Trinitate*,<sup>74</sup> *De eruditione hominis interioris*<sup>75</sup> and *Adnotatio mystica in Ps 121*.<sup>76</sup> This disproportion seems to me proper to the writings of Richard. In examining the citations from St. Bernard, I noticed that these were more numerous in the *Sermones dominicales* than in the *Sermones festivi*, which is quite understandable since the former occupy the first two volumes of the new edition, a total of more than a thousand pages, whereas the latter take up less than 300 pages in the third volume.

What we can learn from these facts depends obviously on the chronological system which one supports. It is commonly admitted that the *Sermones dominicales* were published before the *Sermones festivi*. Since we have noticed in the first of these two series only a few short citations from Richard, I am inclined to believe with J. Heerinckx that these *Sermones dominicales* were composed at a period when Antony had a less profound knowledge of the writings of Richard, a knowledge probably acquired at St. Vincent of Lisbon or more likely at Holy Cross of Coïmbre. The *Sermones festivi*, on the other hand, were not published until much later, after St. Antony had become acquainted with Thomas Gallus. It was the abbot of Verceil who had drawn his attention to Richard's writings; it was Thomas also who had placed at his disposal such works as *De eruditione interioris hominis* or *Adnotatio mystica in Ps 121*, which were less known than the two *Beniamin* or the *De Trinitate*.

If this hypothesis were correct, it would help enlighten us about the significance of the eulogy accorded the saint by Thomas Gallus. The latter, having transmitted the works of Richard to this young Franciscan preoccupied with the theological and spiritual content of his preaching, would have directed his reading and pointed to certain texts particularly worthy of attention. Thomas was struck by the interest that Antony brought to these works and by the exceptional facility with which he assimilated the content. He was no doubt reminded of this in his *Explanatio in Hierarchiam ecclesiasticam Dionysii*, a work which he himself, as G. Théry tells us, devoted in large part to the teaching of Richard.

<sup>74</sup>*Sermo in festo Pentecostes* (III, 257) citing *De Trinitate* VI, 14, PL, 196, col 978 CD and 979 A.

<sup>75</sup>*Sermo in Resurrect. Domini* (III, 185-186), citing *De eruditione hom. int.* II, 1, PL, 196, col. 1299 AC (and not III, 1, col. 1229, as the edition points out, p. 186, n. 63).

<sup>76</sup>*Sermo in Circumcis. Domini* (III, 64), citing *Adnot. myst. in Ps. 121* PL, 196, col. 365 BD and 366 B.

### III. St. Antony, Student of Richard of St. Victor

Whatever the circumstances were in which Antony became acquainted with the writings of Richard of St. Victor, we must ask ourselves how he read and utilised the texts which he had at his disposal and which he cited in his *Sermones*.

An examination will show us that the great Franciscan doctor used those texts in a very personal and careful way. He retained only what he wanted. It is possible that if he had written a treatise of mystical theology rather than sermons destined for a rather large public, Antony would have proceeded differently. The point is not then to know what the saint thought, deep down in himself, about the teachings of Richard, but to know what he judged opportune to retain, to cite and to reproduce in his own writings.

There is evidently little to say about the citations that we have noted in the *Sermones dominicales*. We have already said that they were few in number; the majority of them were quite short. Nevertheless, there is one that merits our attention.

It is the one that the new editors pointed to in the *Sermo in Dominica II in Quadragesima*, the Sunday on which the Gospel about the Transfiguration is read. Antony took the opportunity to speak about contemplation, and he reproduced in his development some phrases or formulae borrowed from chapter 71-74 of the *Beniamin minor*. According to the symbolism which constitutes the framework of the sermon, Richard saw in Benjamin a figure of contemplation and in Rachel his mother, who died giving birth to her son, a figure of reason. Antony took these images into account. He did not content himself with assembling some texts which in the work of Richard are quite scattered. He abbreviated the formulae of the great Victorine, and in doing this, he very deliberately weakened their import. In order to understand better the way in which he proceeded we must place the text of Richard and that of Antony side by side.



Richard de Saint-Victor  
*Benjamin minor*, cap. 71, 73-74  
 (PL 196, col 51 B, 52 D-53 A):

...sic per Benjamin intelligimus gratiam  
 contemplationis...

...et Benjamin nascituret Rachel  
 moritur, quia cum mens hominis supra  
 seipsam rapitur, omnes humanae  
 ratiocinationis angustias supergreditur.  
 Ad illud enim quod supra se elevata, et in  
 extasi rapta, de divinitatis lumine conspicit,  
 omnis humana ratio succumbit. Quid est,  
 enim Rachelis interitus, nisi rationis  
 defectus? Benjamin itaque nascente, Rachel  
 moritur....

...Nemo ergo se existimet ad illius  
 divini luminis claritatem argumentando  
 posse penetrare; nemo se credat humana  
 illud ratiocinatione posse  
 comprehendere. Si enim aliqua  
 argumentatione adiri potuisset, lumen  
 illud divinum utique inaccessible non  
 fuisset. Denique Apostolus gloriatur, ad  
 illud se non quidem isse, sed absque  
 dubio raptum fuisse.

Saint Antony *Sermo in Dominica II*  
 in *Quadragesima* (I, 95):

Per Benjamin gratia contemplationis,  
 per Rachel humana ratio designatur.  
 Nascente ergo Benjamin moritur Rachel,  
 quia mens in contemplatione supra se  
 elevata, dum de divinitatis lumine aliquid  
 conspicit, omnis humana ratio succumbit.  
 Rachel interitus rationis est defectus.

Unde quidam dixit: Nemo illuc  
 humana ratione venit ubi Paulus raptus  
 fuit.

Comparing these two texts we can see at a glance that Antony omitted several significant words of the *Benjamin minor* text, which he must have had before his eyes. These omissions were certainly deliberate. With Richard he does without doubt explain that the spirit in contemplation is "elevated above itself," but he avoids twice the word *rapitur* and keeps the participle *raptus* only to evoke St. Paul's elevation into the third heaven, which *Benjamin minor* deals with in the same passage. He neglects to speak of ecstasy as well, though he utilises and remodels Richard's text in which there is a question of ecstasy. Further on he acknowledges that the spirit in contemplation achieves in a certain manner the light of divinity, but he restricts the import of that affirmation. He omits the words, *omnes humanae ratiocinationis angustias supergreditur*, indicating, it seems, that he hesitated to admit that the spirit can pass beyond, even in contemplation, the strict limits of human reason. Finally, in the last

sentence reproduced above and attributed to someone who could have been only Richard, he resumes the position of the author of *Benjamin minor*, but in terms more brief, concise and nuanced, the very meaning of which he modifies.

The citations from Richard which appear in the *Sermones festivi* lead us to similar assertions. They give evidence in their turn that Antony took liberties with the texts by which he was inspired, and he used them with prudence. One of them is especially significant in this regard. In the *Sermo in Circumcisione Domini*, a series of biblical comparisons and interpretations led the Franciscan doctor to cite a verse from the book of Job (5:7) where there is reference to the flight of birds. It gave him occasion to speak of those heavens in which St. Paul invites us to hold our conversation (Phil.3:20) and to cite in that connection several passages from a short treatise by Richard to which the editors have given the title *Adnotatio in Psalmum 121*. We find in fact in this little work an interpretation of the rapture of St. Paul in the third heaven (II Cor.12:3), which takes us to a description of the three heavens of contemplation. Here too, in order to see the way Antony proceeds, we must set Richard's text alongside his sermon.

Richard of St. Victor  
*Adnotatio mystica in Ps. 121*  
(PL 196, col. 365-366):

Apostolus gloriatur se raptum fuisse usque ad tertium coelum. Iste, ut audis, se sperat iturum. Primum coelum, *subtilitas intelligentiae; secundum coelum claritas justitiae, tertium coelum, sublimitas gloriae. In primo coelo contemplatio veritatis, in secundo coelo dilectio aequitatis, in tertio coelopenitudo aeternae jucunditatis. De primo et secundo dicit Apostolus: "Nostra conversatio in coelis est" (Phil. 3:20); non dicit "in coelo," sed "in coelis," non de uno solo intelligas. De tertio dicit: "Scio hominem hujusmodi rapture usque ad tertium coelum" (II Cor. 12:3)...*

St. Antony,  
*Sermo in Circumcisione Domini*  
(III, 64):

Et nota quod *non* dixit "*in coelo*" sed "*in coelis.*" *Tres sunt caeli. Primum, subtilitas intelligentiae; secundum, claritas justitiae; tertium, sublimitas gloriae. In primo, contemplatio veritatis; in secundo, dilectio aequitatis; in tertio, plenitudo aeternae iucunditatis.*

...*In primo illuminatur ignorantia; in secundo extinguitur concupiscentia; in tertio absorbetur miseria.* In primo et secundo interim conversari potest, ad tertium rapi valet, ire autem non potest. Toties ad tertium admittimur, quoties per excessum mentis illa interna et aeterna dulcedine aliqua ex parte fruimur. Tunc ad tertii coeli secreta mens cujuslibet rapitur, cum aeternae illius felicitatis pelago absorbetur, et super coelestis torrente voluptatis eousque inebriatur, ut non solum exteriora omnia per memoriam nesciat, sed ipse etiam sibi inoblivionem veniat, ita ut postmodum ad se reversus cum Apostolo proclamet et dicat: "Sive in corpore, sive extra corpus, nescio, Deus scit" (II Cor. ibid.)...

....*Frater, si te circumfulget lux veritatis, tenes primum coelum; si te succendit flamma charitatis, inhabitas secundum; si delibasti gustum quemdam internae suavitatis, admissus es ad tertiu.*

*In primo illuminatur ignorantia, in secundo extinguitur concupiscentia, in tertio absorbetur miseria.*

*Si tec circumfulget lux veritatis, tenes primum coelum. Si te succendit flamma amoris, inhabitas secundum. Si delibasti gustum quemdam internae suavitatis, admissus es ad tertium.*

A comparison of these texts shows that Antony reproduces faithfully several phrases from Richard's *Adnotatio*. We can conclude that he had before his eyes this little work or at least extracts carefully copied. Let us equally observe that Antony again omits the words *raptum* or *rapi* and that he neglects all that refers to *excessus mentis*. Moreover he does not speak of secrets, like Richard, to which the soul is initiated when it reaches the third heaven (*tertii coeli secreta*), nor of the supercelestial joy with which it is inundated nor of the spiritual inebriation which accompanies it (*supercoelestis torrente voluptatis eousque inebriatur*) nor of the forgetfulness of all exterior things which characterises that state. In short, Antony refrains from describing the properly mystical states that Richard dealt with. Undoubtedly, he spoke of the light of truth that fills the soul with brilliance, of the fire of love that inflames it and of the interior joy that it tastes, but he limits himself to a very sober vocabulary

and deliberately rejects whatever of Richard's was more evocative and audacious.

Elsewhere, it is true, Antony does not hesitate to mention *excessus mentis*. In a passage of his *Sermo de Apostolis Petro et Paulo*, he deals with the encounter with God in which the spirit goes out of itself in order to stand before the Savior and to contemplate with joy the light of supreme wisdom. He takes up in this connection diverse formulae from *Benjamin maior* which the new editors have identified. Perhaps, if a comparison is made between Antony's text and Richard's, one can perceive that the latter had some daring ideas which the saint rejected. Inspired by the well-known texts of St. Paul, Richard added that, from the moment of this encounter with God in the *excessus mentis*, the soul saw God already face to face and grasped the divine light, not as in a mirror and enigma, but without the veils or shadows of figures and, if one can say it, in the pure simplicity of truth. Let us again set these texts in parallel, in order to see better how Antony proceeded:

Richard of St. Victor  
*Beniamin maior*, IV, cap. 11  
(PL 196, col. 147 AB):

Sed ille quasi de tabernaculo *in* advenientis *Domini occursum egreditur*, egressus autem quasi facie ad faciem intuetur, qui *per mentis excessum extra semetipsum ductus, summae sapientiae lumen*, sine aliquo involucro figurarumve adumbratione, denique non per speculum et in aenigmate, sed in simplici, ut sic dicam, veritate *contemplatur*.

St. Antony,  
*Sermo de Sanctis Apostolis Petro et Paulo* (III, 287):

Tabernaculum est militia vitae activae, a qua quis *egreditur et in occursum Domini currit*, cure expeditus in contemplatione se suspendit et *per mentis excessum extra semetipsum ductus, summae sapientiae lumen in gaudio mentis contemplatur*.

As one can easily notice, these terms all evoke an immediate grasp of or a kind of face to face vision of the divine light, which terms Antony tended to avoid. It has to do with a doctrinal decision, already noted by J. Heerinckx and by R.P. Blasucci.<sup>77</sup> Richard affirms that in the *excessus mentis*, the spirit comes

<sup>77</sup> Cf. J. Heerinckx, art. cit. p. 245: "Richard declared that in ecstasy there is a certain vision of the divine essence. On this point Antony of Padua distances himself from his master, for he denies the direct vision of divinity in simple ecstasy." An exact judgment on the whole, as well as on Richard relative to the vision of God, does not speak of "the divine essence." A. Blasucci expresses himself

in a certain way to an immediate vision of the divine reality. Antony does not share that opinion. On the contrary, he introduces the word *gaudium*, which did not appear in Richard's text. Without denying the role of a certain intellectual activity in contemplation, Antony wants, more than *Benjamin major* had done here, to draw the attention of the readers to the affective aspects which one experiences.

Other citations enlighten us still more on the way in which the *Sermones festivi* move away from the positions adopted by Richard although inspired by his most important writings. These are from book V of *Benjamin major* and are found in the three sermons, *In conversione Pauli*, *In festo sancti Ioannis* and *In festo Resurrectionis Domini*. Book V is the last work of Richard; it is also the most important. Here, actually, there has long been a question of the highest degrees of contemplation and notably of those superior states to which *Benjamin major* gives the names of *alienatio mentis*, *excessus mentis* or sometimes *extasis*. Let us see first how the *Sermo in conversione Pauli* uses book V. In a passage often noted, this sermon cites a dozen lines from chapter 2 where Richard, the great lover of classifications, distinguishes what he calls the three modes of contemplation: the *dilatatio mentis*, the *sublevatio mentis* and the *alienatio mentis*.<sup>78</sup> Curiously enough, Antony, inspired by this development, neglects the first completely and retains only the last two, literally reproducing the definitions which Richard provided. Of course, the author of the *Sermo in Conversione beati Pauli* took little trouble to justify this deliberate omission since, as was his habit, he did not cite the name of the one from whom he borrowed the texts he reproduced.

Nevertheless, we understand the reasons why Antony proceeded in this way. The first explanation can be found in the fact that for Richard the *dilatatio mentis* is a way of contemplation which one can attain by one's own effort (*ex industria*) without any special help of grace being necessary. It has to do with what modern spirituality calls acquired contemplation, or even perhaps, natural contemplation. In neglecting to speak of the *dilatatio mentis*, Antony lets it be understood that he does not wish to give the name of contemplation to a way of apprehending the mystery which would be the fruit of the subject's own

---

in the most adequate way when he writes: *Così S. Antonio si distacca qui da Riccardo di S. Vittore, che sembra ammettere, almeno nell'excessus roentis, una visione più immediata di Dio. (cf. A. Blasucci, "La teologia mistica di S. Antonio, in S. Antonio dottore della Chiesa. Atti delle settimane antoniane tenute a Roma e a Padova nel 1946, Città del Vaticano 1947, p. 206).*

<sup>78</sup>Cf. *Sermo in convers. beati Pauli* (III, 97, 1.10-17), and *Beniamin maior*, V, 2. PL, 196, col. 169-171. On these texts see J. Heerinckx, art. cit. pp. 242-246; A. Blasucci, art. cit. p. 208; F. da Gama Caieiro, I, p. 155 and II, pp. 20-22.

activity. Contemplation is a free gift. The name of contemplation ought to be reserved either to this drawing near of the divine, the fruit of joint action of human industry and grace which Richard had called *sublevatio mentis* or to that which depends only on grace, that is, to the *alienatio mentis*.

To this explanation another ought to be added, one that is more significant and more decisive. Before reproducing literally the definitions of *sublevatio* and of *alienatio mentis* proposed by Richard, Antony, in treating of contemplation, spoke, in effect, of an interior sweetness that accompanies it. He explained in this connection that it was necessary to distinguish the sweetness connected with the activity of the intelligence from that connected with affectivity: the first appearing in the *sublevatio mentis*, and the second in the *alienatio*.<sup>79</sup> This distinction did not come from a passage in *Beniamin maior*, which Antony had before his eyes. It was due to Antony's initiative, who insisted on the affective character of the highest degrees of contemplation. Certainly, he did not deny the role that intelligence played in the spiritual ascent of the soul. Intelligence contributed in leading the soul to that *sublevatio mentis* which we have seen was the fruit of human industry and grace. But its role ceased there. In the following stage which was the highest, that in which the soul arrived at *alienatio mentis*, the pure gift of grace, it was affectivity or the will which became the seat of contemplative activity.

The decision taken by Antony to insist on the affective character of the highest degrees of contemplation was all the more evident since after having taken up the definitions of *sublevatio* and of *alienatio mentis* proposed by Richard,<sup>80</sup> the *Sermo in conversione Pauli* omitted the commentaries which *Beniamin maior* had given on them. These referred almost exclusively to the *alienatio mentis* and underlined the place given in that state to a vision or a grasp of the divine of an intellectual order.<sup>81</sup> In the *alienatio mentis*, as Richard in effect tells us, the ark, a figure of the soul, goes beyond the veil which separates it from the Holy of Holies into which it is now ushered, and this veil closes behind it; the soul's perception (*acumen mentis*), thus established in the most intimate aspect of its being, loses all memory of exterior things.<sup>82</sup> This third degree, Richard wrote, is also the mountain which the Savior ascended

<sup>79</sup>III, 97, 1.7-10.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid. 1.10-17, reproducing *Beniam.maior*, V, 2 col. 170 A.

<sup>81</sup>*Beniam.maior*, ibid. col. 170-171.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., col. 170 B.

on the day of Transfiguration. It is the luminous cloud which enveloped him with his disciples, the cloud by which Moses before them had himself been shrouded.<sup>83</sup> But to enter into the cloud was nothing other than to go out of oneself in the *excessus mentis*, that is, to arrive at that state in which the soul, having lost memory of all that is exterior to it and being absorbed by its vision of divine realities, is by that fact, simultaneously enveloped by darkness and inundated with light.<sup>84</sup> These reasonings did not appear in the *Sermo in conversione beati Pauli* at all. Here also, as in the *Sermo in Dominica II in Quadragesima*, Antony retained from Richard's text only what was in accord with his own views, while he dismissed all that corresponded to an intellectualistic interpretation of the *alienatio mentis*.

The long citations from book V of *Beniamin maior* noted in the *Sermo in Resurrectione Domini* deserve even more attention. Antony reproduced there several sentences from chapter 14 where there is again question of *alienatio mentis*, of *excessus* and of *extasis*.<sup>85</sup> This chapter is of great interest. It is preceded in Richard's work by long explanations consecrated to the three ways in which the soul could be carried beyond itself to the *alienatio mentis*, which itself is identified with *excessus mentis*: by the fervor of a desire (*ex fervente desiderii aestuatione*) which devotion, accompanied eventually by an interior revelation, would have awakened in the soul; by extreme admiration (*ex magnitudine admirationis*) sustained by a revelation with which it had been favored in meditation; or, finally, by the intensity of joy (*ex magnitudine jucunditatis*) to which the ardor of charity would have given birth.<sup>86</sup>

If we compare the texts extracted by Antony from passages in *Beniamin maior*, we must make two observations immediately. We see that here, as in other citations previously indicated, Antony clearly avoided certain words. He did not mention *excessus mentis* nor *extasis*, although these terms appear several times, the first especially, in that chapter of *Beniamin maior* which Antony cites. He also carefully avoided the word *alienatio* to such a point that in a sentence which he reproduced almost literally, he substituted the word *elevatio* for the word *alienatio*, which Richard had used and which Antony himself, in a passage of the *Sermo in conversione beati Pauli* examined above, had not judged

<sup>83</sup> *ibid.*, col. 170 CD.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, col. 171 BC.

<sup>85</sup> *Sermo in Resurrect. Domini* (III, 186-187), citing *Beniamin maior*, V, 14, col. 186 AB and 185 A.

<sup>86</sup> *Beniamin maior* V, 4-13, col. 172-184.

necessary to avoid. Speaking of the soul which was elevated beyond itself, Richard had in effect written: "*Sic...anima sancta...dum supra semetipsam ire mentis alienatione urgetur...*,"<sup>87</sup> but Antony reproduced this text as follows: "*Sic...anima sancta dum supra semetipsam ire mentis elevatione urgetur.*"<sup>88</sup> No variant in the new critical edition gives us reason to believe that this is not an authentic text of Antony. Why such a change? The reason seems evident. The word *alienatio*, in the theology of Richard, was the equivalent of *excessus*. Antony knew that perfectly, and since he did not care to speak of *excessus*, although he sometimes did use that word, he equally avoided *alienatio*, of which Richard gave descriptions which Antony abstained from reproducing. He wanted simply to speak of contemplation, and he did not concern himself with classifying the kinds, modes and species in a systematic way as *Beniamin maior* had done. In these perspectives, the term *elevatio*, less technical and more neutral, had the advantage of not being charged with all the overtones that the word *alienatio* carried.

But a second observation, more interesting for the history of spirituality, is worth noticing. Richard, we recall, had explained that the soul could be carried beyond itself in the *alienatio mentis* in three different ways. Citations in the *Sermo in Resurrectione Domini* were all borrowed from the chapter in *Beniamin maior* (V, 15) where there is question only of the third, that is, of that intense joy (*magnitudo jucunditatis*) that the ardor of charity enkindles in the soul and transports beyond itself. Antony abandoned the fervor of desire and the grandeur of admiration which Richard had said were capable of producing the same effects as joy. The reasons for such a position were evident. For Richard the fervor of desire could be awakened by devotion, itself stirred by a revelation. The grandeur of admiration in its turn finds its source in the lights of an interior revelation from which the soul can benefit in meditation. In both cases, Richard makes a lot of room for the properly intellectual modalities of *alienation* and for all that in it arises from knowledge. But Antony, as we have observed, was not interested in the properly technical meaning of the word *alienatio* which he hesitated even to use.

He wanted to highlight the affective aspects of the contemplative ascent, above all when he described its highest stages. He abandoned everything that in Richard implied a direct reference to an interior revelation to knowledge,

<sup>87</sup> Ibid. V, 14, col. 186 A.

<sup>88</sup> *Sermo* cit. (III, 186, 1.14-16).



generally speaking. There are, on the other hand, passages from the work of the Victorine where there is question of charity and love, to which Anthony paid attention and which he inserted into his own work.

Moreover, it occasionally happened that Anthony changed certain texts of Richard so they said something other than what was intended. We find an example in the *Sermo in festo sancti Ioannis evangelistae*. This sermon used some lines from that book V in *Beniamin maior* which Anthony seemed to have used very frequently. It has to do with a passage in chapter 5 in which Richard presented an examination of the three causes of *alienatio mentis* about which we spoke above: the grandeur of devotion, the grandeur of admiration and the grandeur of exultation or of interior joy. Anthony, without employing the word *alienatio*, used the verb *alienari*. Skillfully modifying Richard's text, he lets us understand clearly that if a human being could be elevated beyond himself by the intensity of his devotion or by that of his admiration, it was the fervor of his exultation which alone could lead him to alienation of the spirit. Richard had expressed himself in the following way: *Nam modo prae magnitudine devotionis, modo prae magnitudine admirationis, modo vero prae magnitudine exultationis fit, ut...mens...supra semetipsam elevata in abalienationem transeat.*<sup>89</sup> On the other hand, we read in Anthony's sermon which speaks to the masculine because it has to do for him, no longer with the *mens* but with the spiritual man: "*Magnitudine devotionis supra semetipsum elevatur, magnitudine admirationis supra semetipsum ducitur, magnitudine exultationis a seipso alienatur.*"<sup>90</sup> It is clear that more or less consciously Anthony wanted to make the text which inspired him say that the alienation of the spirit, having become for him synonymous with contemplation conceived as a gratuitous gift of God, cannot be of the order of intelligence, but arises from the affectivity or the will. Certainly, Anthony is not trying to deceive us, since he does not state anywhere that he intends to cite Richard or to transmit his teaching to his own readers. But he took from the Victorine the means of expression and a vocabulary which he could adapt to his own views. The Franciscan doctor was already a

<sup>89</sup>*Sermo in festo S. Ioannis* (III, 32, 1.16-18). This text and the one which will be cited in the following note have been observed and analysed by M. F. da Gama Caeiro (op. cit. I, p. 156, n. 31). We cannot subscribe entirely to the commentary that accompanies them: *A explicacao final que Antonio faz das tres causas e simples resumo das definicoes correspondentes dadas por Ricardo no passo acima referido*. Anthony, in fact, modified Richard's formulae and gave them a somewhat different meaning.

<sup>90</sup>*Beniam. maior* V, 6(?) col. 174 A.

representative of that affective theology, of that *theologia cordis et affectus*, which consequently became dear to the sons of St. Francis and to the whole Franciscan school.<sup>91</sup>

This also explains how, in other circumstances, Antony felt perfectly at ease with Richard and experienced no need to modify texts whose profound teachings were in full accord with the convictions of Antony's intelligence and the movements of his heart. We find a remarkable example of this accord in the three sentences in Richard's *De Trinitate* which Antony reproduced in his *Sermo in festo Pentecostes* without changing one word, limiting himself to modifying the order in which they were first presented. These few lines, which celebrate the fire of charity enkindled by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the faithful, are worth citing here by way of conclusion. Better than any other analysis, they bring out what appealed to Antony in the Victorine writings, with which he became acquainted while living with the canons regular of Lisbon and Coïmbre, with which he became better acquainted under the tutelage of Thomas Gallus, and in which he was able to reveal what was best and most profound. After the manner of Richard Antony wrote:

What is the Holy Spirit if not the divine fire?<sup>92</sup> What corporeal fire does for iron, the fire of which we speak does for the heart that is impure, cold and hard. Penetrated by this fire, the human spirit gradually loses all darkness, all coldness and all hardness. It is entirely transformed into an image of the one who inflames it. The Holy Spirit is indeed given to a human being, is breathed into a human being, in order that the human might be configured as much as possible to this Spirit. For burning with this divine fire, the soul is entirely inflamed, entirely enkindled; it liquefies in the love of God, according to the word of the Apostle (Rom 5:5): "The love of God has been poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit which has been given to us."

<sup>91</sup> According to E. Longpré (art. *Bonaventure* in *Dict. de spiritualité*, I, Paris 1937, col. 1797-1798), St. Bonaventure, for example, recognised the existence, alongside *intellectual contemplation*, a *sapiential contemplation* which is "an affective perception" of the divine presence; to that he "accords primacy because love goes further than vision." These positions remain classic in the heart of the Franciscan school. Matthew of Aquasparta, another example, will teach in his *Quaestiones disputatae* (t. I, q. 9, ed. de Quaracchi 1903, pp. 399-410) that the rapture is provoked by the vehemence of devotion and depends much less on intellectual activity than on that of the *affectus*.

<sup>92</sup> *Sermo in festo Pent.* (I, 257, 1.8-19) citing Richard, *De Trinitate* PL 196, col 978 C-979 A. My translation was prompted by that of G. Salet in *Sources chrétiennes*, 63 (Paris 1959), pp. 415-417.