

INTENTIO MOYSI: Bede, Augustine, Eriugena and Plato in the *Hexaemeron* of Honorius Augustodunensis.

R. D. Crouse

I

The rich tradition of hexaemeral literature, which forms the context of medieval interpretations of the creation narrative of Genesis, is not readily amenable to summary presentation. The range of interests embraced by such literature is so broad, the quantity of it so vast, and the theological significance of it so decisive, that an adequate account of its history would constitute a history of Christian thought and culture. No portion of biblical text has been so seminal as this for the formation of Christian cosmology and anthropology, and for the determination of Christian attitudes towards the natural order. For patristic and medieval theologians, the exegesis of the creation story contributed to speculation about the Divine Nature, and about the origin and destiny of man, at the same time as it provided an invitation to reflection upon the manifold phenomena of natural and human history.¹

The broad scope of hexaemeral literature may be illustrated by a few examples. Josephus, the Jewish historian, whose account of the antiquities of his people was to become one of the most popular textbooks of medieval Christians, regarded the biblical account of God's six days work as the opening chapter of human history. The first section of his first book is, in effect, an "Hexaemeron."² For

1. Surveys of hexaemeral literature are offered by F. E. Robbins, *The Hexaemeral Literature: A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis* (Chicago, 1912), and E. Mangenot, "Hexameron," *Dict. de théol. cath.* VI, cols. 2325-2354; "Genèse," cols. 1185-1221. Recent studies, more limited in scope, include G. T. Armstrong, *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche: Die drei Kirchenväter* (Tubingen, 1962; on Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian); J. C. M. van Winden, "In the Beginning," *Vigiliae christianae*, XVII (1963), 105-121, and *In den beginne: vroeg-christelijke exegese van de term arche in Genesis 1:1* (Leiden, 1967); *In principio: Interprétations des premiers versets de la Genèse* (Études augustiniennes, Paris, 1973) contains essays on many aspects of this literature, ancient and modern, including a most useful study by R. Roques, "Genèse 1, 1-3 chez Jean Scot Érigène," pp. 173-212. Still valuable, especially for its incomparably rich patristic documentation, is the treatise of Dionysius Petavius, *De opificio sex dierum* (*Opus de theologicis dogmatibus*, III (Antwerp, 1700), 117-303).

2. On the translation of the *Jewish Antiquities* at Vivarium, and the wide dissemination of the text in the Middle Ages, see F. Blatt, *The Latin*

Philo, Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, the same story, interpreted allegorically, provided the structural formula for a consideration of the relation of the multiplicity of finite being to its logical principle in the unity of the Divine Nature; and the synthesis of biblical categories with those of Greek philosophical science which he effected in that enterprise was to be paradigmatic for similar undertakings by the Church Fathers.³ Basil, Bishop of Caesarea, in a series of homilies on Genesis for Lent, offered a combination of theological and cosmological speculation with extended and detailed consideration of biological phenomena and curiosities of natural history; a presentation which, with the translation of it by Eustathius, constituted an important model for Christian hexaemeral literature in both East and West.⁴ By virtue of this broad range of interests, historical, physical, metaphysical, and anthropological, which it elicited, the exegesis of Genesis was inevitably a focal point of that encounter and symbiosis of Hellenism and Christianity which constituted the spiritual destiny of Western civilization.⁵

Medieval authors addressing themselves to the interpretation of Genesis had at their disposal a rich heritage of patristic exegesis, and to establish in detail the historical context of medieval

Josephus, I (Copenhagen, 1958), 12-16; on its use in medieval exegetical works, see C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge* (Paris, 1944), p. 78, n.3.

3. Philo, *De opificio mundi* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929 [Loeb Classical Library, 226]). Of the many studies in which the influence of Philo in patristic exegesis is emphasized, see especially J. Daniélou, *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1958), and H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, I: Faith, Trinity and Incarnation* (2 ed., Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

4. Basil's *Hexaemeron* has been edited, with valuable introduction and notes, by S. Giet, *Basile de Césarée: Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron* (Paris, 1950 [Sources chrétiennes, 26]). On Basil's sources, in Greek philosophy and in Philo, see also Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile et l'hellénisme* (Paris, 1934). Eustathius' translation has been edited by E. Amand de Mendieta and S. Rudberg, *Eustathius: Ancienne version latine des neuf homélie sur l'Hexaéméron de Basile de Césarée*, (Berlin, 1958 [Texte und Untersuchungen, LXVI]). On the dating of the translation (before 400) and its influence in Augustine, see B. Altaner, "Eustathius, der lateinische Übersetzer der Hexaemeron-Homilien Basilius des Grossen," *Zeitschr. f. neutest. Wissenschaft*, XXXIX (1940), 161-70.

5. On this subject generally, see M. Landmann, *Ursprungsbild und Schöpfungsthat: Zum platonisch-biblischem Gespräch* (Munich, 1966), esp. "Die Welterschöpfung im 'Timaios' und in der Genesis," pp. 142-71; K. Gronau, *Poiseidonius und die jüdische-christliche Genesisexegese* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1914); J. H. Waszink, "Der Platonismus und die altchristliche Gedankenwelt," in *Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, III [Geneva, 1955]), pp. 139-79.

discussions of the creation story would be an undertaking of vast proportions. One may, however, attempt to single out certain prominent features of the hexaemeral tradition, and certain tensions within it, to illuminate in some measure the problems with which their *auctoritates* confronted these interpreters.

Chief among those authorities was, unquestionably, Augustine. No medieval Christian could approach the exegesis of Genesis unconscious of the *De genesi ad litteram*, and the extensive discussions of the same texts in the *De civitate dei*, the concluding books of the *Confessiones*, and other treatises of the Bishop of Hippo.⁶ But while his word might carry decisive weight, Augustine's meaning was not always clear and unambiguous. That his medieval readers found him often obscure and confusing is both evident from their comments,⁷ and readily understandable. The tensions and ambiguities which characterize the autobiographical books of the *Confessions* have their counterparts in the "Hexaemeron," which, as a philosophical and theological meditation on the meaning of time and history, concludes that work. On the one hand, Augustine moves in that world of Neoplatonic metaphysical speculation where the phenomena of finite existence are shadows of a true reality which lies beyond them, a *principium* of being from which they flow into a multiplicity which verges upon non-being, and to which they return in the unity of Divine contemplation. On the other hand, dissatisfied with a position which would appear to deprive the particulars of history and of human experience of any ultimate significance, and moved by the implications of the stupendous fact of the Word made flesh, Augustine decisively modifies his Platonism with a profound concern for concrete phenomena, individual and social, of the temporal order.⁸ Symbolic of a lingering ambivalence, however, to

6. The Venerable Bede, in the preface to his own *Hexaemeron*, expressly reminds his readers of these works of Augustine; see Bede, *Libri quatuor in principium genesis usque ad nativitatem Isaac et eiectionem Ismahelis adnotationem*, ed. C. W. Jones in *Corpus christianorum*, Series latina, CXVIII, pars II, I (Turnholt, 1967), p. 1 (=PL, 91, cols. 10-11).

7. See, for instance, the comments of Guibert of Nogent, *Moralia in Genesin*, PL, 156, cols. 20D-21 A.

8. The *locus classicus* for Augustine's misgivings about the "Platonists" is *Confessiones*, VII, IX, 13-XVI, 22 (ed. A. Solignac, in *Oeuvres de saint Augustin*, 2 série, XIII [Paris, 1962], I, 608-626; discussion by Solignac, pp. 682-689). For general presentations of this problem in Augustine, see C. Boyer, "Éternité et création dans les derniers livres des *Confessiones*," *Giornale di Metafisica*, IX (1954), 441-48; E. Gilson, *Philosophie et incarnation selon saint Augustin* (Paris and Montreal, 1947); R. J. O'Connell, *St. Augustine's confessions: The Odessey of Soul* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969); C. J.

choose but one example, is his vacillation on the question whether the paradise of Genesis is to be understood allegorically, as a reference to the transcendent perfection of human nature in the Divine thinking, or historically, as an account of an initial perfection within the temporal order.⁹ Whether this ambiguity is subtly resolved in Augustine's thought is a subject of continued debate; but it is at any rate clear that for his medieval students, as for those of later centuries, his position presented them with alternatives rather than a clearly unified system: the alternatives as to whether the story of creation should be understood as an adumbration of a cosmic metaphysic, or as the narrative of the primary Divine act endowing the particulars of temporal existence with justification and significance, or, indeed, as a reconciliation of both these perspectives.

Augustine's prolix discussions of Genesis were not, of course, the only models of hexaemeral exegesis inherited by medieval scholars. Patristic biblical commentaries found a place in every monastic library. Notably, Basil's *Hexaemeron* was available, as were the Holy Week homilies of Ambrose, in a measure dependent upon those of Basil. These treatises, particularly the *Hexaemeron* of Ambrose, were influential both directly and by the mediation of the Venerable Bede, who was markedly dependent upon them in his own *Hexaemeron*.¹⁰

But crucially important for the history of medieval hexaemeral literature are two other factors serving to modify the influence of Augustine. The first of them is that new infusion of Greek patristic influence which came to Western Europe in the ninth century, with the translation of Pseudo Dionysius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus the Confessor, and the synthesis of that tradition of cosmic philosophy with the Latin patristic (predominantly Augustinian) heritage of Western Christendom at the hands of John Scotus Eriugena, that Irish scholar, "*barbarus, et in finibus mundi positus*,"¹¹ whose spectacular erudition graced the court of Charles

Starnes, "Saint Augustine and the Vision of the Truth," *Dionysius*, I (1977), pp. 85-126.

9. Cf. *De genesi ad litteram*, CIII, 1 (ed. J. Zycha, CSEL, XXVIII, 1 [Vienna, 1894], 229-232).

10. Bede refers specifically to Basil, Eustathius and Ambrose (*op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*), and his indebtedness to those sources is indicated in C. W. Jones' notes (*ed. cit.*). On the sources and problematic of Ambrose's *Hexaemeron*, see the thorough study by J. Pépin, *Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne* (Ambrose, Exam. I, 1, 1-4) (Paris, 1964).

11. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, as quoted by T. Gale, *Joannis Scoti Erigenae De divisione naturae libri quinque diu desiderati* (Oxford, 1681), "Testimonia," p. xiii.

the Bald. The work of Pseudo Dionysius exercised its own influence directly upon later medieval scholars, through Eriugena's and three other translations;¹² but its influence in the tradition of hexaemeral literature came first and principally by way of the Scot's use of it in the exegesis of Genesis which forms a large portion of the *De divisione naturae*.

Convinced that the fulfillment of faith must consist in the intellectual vision of God, and that the *auctoritas* of scripture and the Fathers afforded simply a proleptic grasp of what was to be more perfectly realized in sapiential understanding, Eriugena sought to embrace the traditions of scriptural exegesis and philosophical speculation in a system at once metaphysically consistent and authentically Christian.¹³ His extensive employment of Augustine in the interests of such a system is sometimes thought of as a "utilisation tendancieuse,"¹⁴ or as a misinterpretation, conscious or otherwise, of a position radically different from his own.¹⁵ Perhaps a better statement of the case would be that the

12. A synoptic edition of the four medieval Latin versions has been published by P. Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* (Paris, 1937). On the character and general importance of the influence of this tradition in the West, see E. von Ivanka, *Plato christianus: Übernahme und Umgestaltung des Platonismus durch die Väter* (Einsiedeln, 1964), Ch. VIII: "Das westliche Mittelalter." On Eriugena's role in particular, see G. Théry, "Scot Érigène traducteur de Denys," *Archivum latinum aevi* ("Bulletin du Cange"), VI (1931), 185-278, and R. Roques, "Traduction ou interprétation? Brèves remarques sur Jean Scot traducteur de Denys," in J. O'Meara and L. Bieler, edd., *The Mind of Eriugena* (Dublin, 1973), pp. 59-77.

13. For a contrary view, see B. Bosnjac, "Dialektik der Theophanie über den Begriff der Natur bei J. S. Eriugena," in *La filosofia della natura nel medioevo* (atti del terzo congresso internazionale di Filosofia medioevale [Milan, 1966]), pp. 264-71), p. 71: "Die Synthese von Gott und Welt in dem mystischen Dynamismus Eriugenas ist im Wesen ein Gegensatz dem christlichen Auffassung von Gott als dem Schöpfer der Welt aus Nichts . . . Eriugenas Pantheismus ist im Wesen ein mystischer Materialismus." On the supposed "pantheism" of Eriugena, see the judicious comments of E. Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1956), p. 613 (with bibliography). For Eriugena's understanding of the relation of *auctoritas* to reason, see *De divisione naturae*, I, 66; III, 1 (*PL*, 122, 511B; 619B).

14. This is the comment of G. Mathon, "L'utilisation des textes de saint Augustin par Jean Scot Érigène dans son *De predestinatione*," in *Augustinus Magister* (Paris, 1954), III, 419-428; quotation from p. 424.

15. See B. Stock, "Observations on the Use of Augustine by Johannes Scottus Eriugena," *Harvard Theological Review*, LX (1967), 213-20, and more fully, "The Philosophical Anthropology of Johannes Scottus Eriugena," *Studi medievali*, 3 series, VIII (1967), 1-57; cf. I. P. Sheldon-Williams' essay "Eriugena's Greek sources," in *The Mind of Eriugena*, pp. 1-15, esp. p. 5: "Eriugena constantly misrepresents St. Augustine, for whereas St.

requirements of a scientific system dictated that his use of Augustine be selective; that he choose those elements, unquestionably present among others in Augustine, which would contribute to a coherent metaphysics or "physiology."¹⁶

Eriugena, like Augustine in one of his aspects, was a Neoplatonist. But his was a Platonism which, mediated by the Greek Fathers, and more systematically developed by himself, had been more profoundly modified by the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*. For him, matter was no longer that independent and opposing principle which it had so readily appeared to be for earlier Christian interpreters of the *Timaeus*; nor was it that "nearly nothing," but yet something, which troubled Augustine's striving for a philosophically consistent cosmology.¹⁷ In Eriugena's view, creation was eternally constituted, *primordialiter et causaliter*, in the activity of the Divine thinking, that transcendent *analytike*, in which *exitus* and *reditus*, dividing and uniting, are but two aspects of one timeless moment.¹⁸ Thus God is in all things, and all things are in God.¹⁹ All things are eternally created in the Word.²⁰ God precedes creation, not by a temporal, but by a logical and ontological (and in that sense, causal) priority, as the mind precedes its thinking.²¹ The *cosmos* is the harmonious order, the unity in diversity, of Divine expression: it is *theophania*.²²

Augustine's thought was always moving away from Neoplatonism, Eriugena's is moving into it, and St. Augustine is made to approximate to the Pseudo-Dionysius rather than the opposite."

16. Eriugena refers to the *De divisione naturae* as "noster physiologia," V, 1 (*PL*, 122, col. 741C). For a striking example of those elements in Augustine to which I refer, see V. Capanga, "La deificacion en la soteriologia agustiniana," *Augustinus Magister*, II, 745-54. See also R. Russell, "Some Augustinian Influences in Eriugena's *De divisione naturae*," in *The Mind of Eriugena*, pp. 31-40.

17. On the problem of matter in patristic thought, see H. A. Wolfson, "Plato's Pre-existent Matter in Patristic Philosophy," in L. Wallach, ed., *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1966), pp. 409-420; on the problem in Ambrose, J. C. M. van Winden, "St. Ambrose's Interpretation of the Concept of Matter," *Vigiliae christianae*, XVI (1962), 205-215; for the problem in Augustine, see *Confessions*, XII, IV 3ff. (*ed. cit.*, pp. 346-56; the expression, "*prope nihil*," p. 350) and Solignac's note 23, pp. 599-603.

18. *De divisione naturae*, II, 1; III, 23 (*PL*, 122, cols. 526; 689B).

19. *Ibid.*, III, 19 (col. 678C).

20. *Ibid.*, II, 36; III, 8; V, 24 (cols. 616A; 639C; 907C).

21. *Ibid.*, II, 21 (cols. 561A-562B).

22. Eriugena defines "theophania" as "*divinae apparitiones*"; *ibid.*, II, 23 (col. 577; cf. V, 26 (col. 919C): "*Theophanias autem dico visibilibus et invisibilibus speciebus, quarum ordine et pulchritudine cognoscitur Deus esse.*" On the concept of "theophany," see J. Trouillard, "Érigène et la théophanie créatrice," in

The creation story of Genesis, in the context of this philosophy, has a twofold significance. It is first an allegory of creation in *principio*, in the Divine Word, in a paradise of wisdom, wherein man, *imago Dei*, exercises a rightful (intellectual) dominion over all creatures which are embraced by, and exist in, his understanding.²³ But it is also a representation of the fall of man, of that wilful turning from the vision of unity according to which all things are seen in the order and coherence which they have in their Principle, to an immersion in the multiplicity of phenomena, empirically regarded.²⁴ The mark of this degeneration is increasing multiplicity and disorder. Thus man, one in his intelligible nature, is phenomenally divided by numberless particularities. The great symbol of this descent in the Genesis account, in Eriugena's view, is the specification that man, one in his true nature, and one in his final destiny (in resurrection) is divided as male and female. This can be regarded only as provision, in Divine prescience, for his fallen condition.²⁵

Though creation is fallen, there is, for Eriugena, no evil element within it.²⁶ The corruptible corporeality of mundane phenomena is, to be sure, a consequence of the fall;²⁷ but this corporeality is nothing other than a "coagulation" of qualities which are themselves intelligible.²⁸ That body, which was in its ideal creation intelligible, and will again, in resurrection, be intelligible, is in no ultimate opposition to spirit.²⁹

Fallen angels and man are in their true natures good, and the inferior creation, fallen in man, is good in every element; so far as it exists, it manifests the self-diffusive goodness of God, and is "theophanic." Rightly regarded, the phenomena of fallen creation

The Mind of Eriugena, pp. 98-113, and the remarks of W. Bierwaltes, in "Negati Affirmatio, Or the World as Metaphor," in *Dionysius*, I (1977). pp. 127-159.

23. *Ibid.*, IV, 16 (cols. 819-821D), on paradise; on the creation of all things in human understanding, see IV, 7 (cols. 769-774); IV 9 (col. 779C): ". . . ut in divino intellectu omnia causaliter, in humana vero cognitione effectualiter subsistant."

24. *Ibid.*, II, 7 (col. 533).

25. *Ibid.*, II, 1; IV, 9 (cols. 523; 777B-778B).

26. *Ibid.*, V, 31 (col. 942C).

27. *Ibid.*, V, 13 (col. 884D).

28. *Ibid.*, I, 58 (col. 502A-503B); Eriugena derives the doctrine from Gregory of Nyssa (col. 502B).

29. Thus all creation is to be saved in human nature: ". . . quoniam in ipsa omnis creatura constituta est . . . et in ipsum reversura, et per ipsum salvanda. Audi Creatorem ipsius dicentem: Praedicate Evangelium omni creaturae; homine profecto"; *ibid.*, IV, 5 (760A); cf. IV, 42 (799-800).

are still *divinae apparitiones*,³⁰ and scientific understanding, in attempting to unify their diversity, attempts to return them to that unity which they properly possess in the human mind, and in the Divine thinking.

In Eriugena's doctrine on these points, every element has its precedents in the Greek Fathers, particularly in Gregory of Nyssa, Pseudo Dionysius, and Maximus the Confessor; and every essential point could be related to a parallel thought in Augustine. But in relation to his Greek sources, he has brought those elements into a systematically complete philosophy, implied no doubt, but never fully explicit, in his predecessors; while in relation to Augustine, he has selected and emphasized those aspects which are consistent with that philosophy. By no means a rejection, or a tendentious misinterpretation, of Augustine, this modification by selection and emphasis would serve, for those who followed it, as an alternative to that other, also partial, interpretation which was the basis of the medieval Augustinian *contemptus mundi*. To be sure, Eriugena's Augustine did not often prevail; but for those who came under the Scot's influence, it was of crucial importance.

A second factor, major in its significance for the modification of Augustinian influence in hexaemeral literature in the twelfth century, was that revival of Platonism associated primarily with the School of Chartres.³¹ The *Timaeus* of Plato, in the latin version and commentary of the fourth-century Neoplatonist, Chalcidius, widely available in medieval Europe, became the object of renewed study in the emerging schools, along with other Neoplatonic texts, both pagan and Christian, such as the commentary, *In somnium Scipionis*, of Macrobius and the *De consolatione philosophiae* and *Theological Tractates* of Boethius.³²

30. *Ibid.*, I, 7 (col. 446C-D).

31. The most important study of the Platonism of Chartres with reference to hexaemeral literature is that of J. M. Parent, *La doctrine de la création dans l'école de Chartres: Étude et textes* (Paris and Ottawa, 1938). On the School of Chartres generally, the fundamental work is still that of A. Clerval, *Les écoles de Chartres au moyen âge* (Paris, 1895).

32. On the several forms and diverse sources of twelfth century Platonism, see M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle*, (Paris 1957); and essays in W. Bierwaltes, ed., *Platonismus in der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (Darmstadt, 1969). For Chalcidius, see the edition, with valuable notes, by J. H. Waszink and P. E. Jensen, *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus (Plato latinus, ed. R. Klibansky, IV [London and Leiden, 1962])*. and the study by J. C. M. van Winden, *Calcidius on Matter: His Doctrine and Sources* (Leiden, 1959). On Macrobius, see M. Schedler, *Die Philosophie des Macrobius und ihr Einfluss auf die Wissenschaft des christlichen Mittelalters* (Beiträge, XIII, i [Munster i. w., 1916]).

Plato was no stranger to Christian tradition. His credit with the Church Fathers, both Latin and Greek, was so high that the notion that he might have been a disciple of Moses had a measure of plausibility.³³ In particular, the creation myth of the *Timaeus* seemed a striking parallel to the Genesis story, and early Christian attempts to elucidate in philosophical terms the hexaemeral narrative show themselves influenced by Plato's account at every turn.³⁴ But as an aid to exegesis, the Platonic account was ambiguous, and at some points constituted a major peril to Christian orthodoxy. The notions of *chaos* (in Neoplatonic interpretation, matter; perhaps eternal, perhaps an ultimately opposed principle?), of the *demiourgos* (a lesser deity?), of the "world soul" (a Divine hypostasis, to be identified with the Word or the Spirit?), severely troubled patristic exegetes, and often imperilled the orthodoxy of speculation about the Trinity and the creation.³⁵

The sources, both pagan and Christian, and the permutations, of the Platonism of Chartres are complex. What is essential is the fact that fresh confrontation with Plato raised anew all those philosophical problems which appear in patristic hexaemeral exegesis.³⁶ The interpretation of the *littera* of Genesis in terms of the *physica* of the *Timaeus* sometimes certainly produced a result which made of the biblical story little more than a cosmological allegory. At its best, however, this enterprise was a manifestation and a vehicle of a humanism which sought an understanding of nature as a sphere of revelation. It stood thus in opposition to that form of Augustinianism which regarded scientific knowledge as having, at best, a value purely instrumental in relation to the scriptures. From that standpoint, the hexaemeral exegesis of the

33. On this legend, see my note in E. R. Fairweather, ed., *A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Occam* (Library of Christian Classics, X [Philadelphia and London, 1956]), p. 424, n. 98.

34. See the literature referred to, *supra*, notes 5 and 17.

35. On these problems in ancient Platonism, see F. P. Hagen, "Die Materie und das Böse im antiken Platonismus," *Museum Helveticum*, XIX (1962), 73-103; C. J. de Vogel, "A la recherche des étapes précises entre Platon et le neoplatonisme," *Mnemosyne*, Ser. IV, VIII (1954), 111-122.

36. On such problems in the School of Chartres, see T. Gregory, *Anima mundi: La filosofia di Guglielmo di Conches* (Florence, 1955); also, on controversies with regard to the "world soul" and the atomistic conception of matter, H. Flatten, *Die Philosophie Willelms von Conches* (Koblenz, 1929), p. 113, n. 633; and L. Ott, "Die platonische Weltseele in der Frühscholastik," in K. Flasch, ed., *Parusia; Studien zur Philosophie Platons und zur Problemgeschichte des Platonismus* (Festschrift für J. Hirschberger, Frankfurt, 1965), pp. 307-31, esp. 328-29.

School of Chartres has affinities to the doctrine of Eriugena.

The twelfth century was a period rich in the development and refinement of exegetical traditions.³⁷ One significant participant in that widespread movement towards the definition of exegetical forms and more thorough theological explication of biblical texts was Honorius Augustodunensis.

II

The personal identity of Honorius remains obscure. He wished to hide his identity under a mantle of silence,³⁸ and five centuries of historical investigation, from the time of Johannes Trithemius to the present day, have done little to dispel the enigma. Although he was a prolific author, and widely popular in the Middle Ages, and although a large corpus of his works has survived, we still know practically nothing precise and secure about his biography. We know that he flourished sometime between the last quarter of the eleventh century and the middle of the twelfth, and that he lived, for some time at least, perhaps as a Benedictine monk, somewhere in the Danube valley between Augsburg and Vienna. Possibly he lived also for some time in Ireland, or England, or France, or the Rhineland: the evidence is inconclusive. The meaning of "Augustodunensis" in connection with him is uncertain,³⁹ and even the name "Honorius" is probably a pseudonym. Hypotheses about him have been plentiful, but unambiguous evidence has been short.⁴⁰

37. B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (2 ed., Oxford, 1952), *passim*.

38. Honorius Augustodunensis, *Elucidarium* (PL, 172, col. 1110): "*Nomen autem meum ideo volui silentio contegi, ne invidia tabescens suis iuberet utile opus contemnendo negligi . . .*"

39. The designation, "Augustodunensis" derives solely from the last chapter of Honorius' *De luminaribus ecclesiae* (PL, 172, col. 232). In the manuscripts of that work the spelling is always "Augustudunensis". The conventional modern spelling first appears in the *Appendix bibliothecae Conradi Gesneri* (Zurich, 1555), and becomes common in the following century. Various scholars have understood it as a reference to Autun, or Augst, or Augsburg, or Regensburg, or Canterbury, or Cashel (in Ireland).

40. The bibliography on this subject has become so vast as to be almost unmanageable. I have given a detailed and critical account of it up to 1969 in *Honorius Augustodunensis: De neocosmo* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1970), pp. 1-117. The fundamental modern study is that of J. Endres, *Honorius Augustodunensis: Beitrag zur Geschichte des geistigen Lebens im 12. Jahrhundert* (Kempten and Munich, 1906). Among many very recent works, see especially V. I. J. Flint, "The Career of Honorius Augustodunensis. Some Fresh Evidence," in *Revue Bénédictine*, 82 (1972), pp.

It is not our present intention to renew the attack upon Honorius' personal obscurity, but rather to make some comment upon his contribution to medieval interpretation of the creation narrative of Genesis, in his *Hexaameron*, or *De neocosmo*. This brief treatise, first printed by Bernhard Pez in the eighteenth century, was reprinted in the *Patrologia latina*.⁴¹ In the printed version, as in the manuscript tradition, the *Hexaameron* is preceded and followed by brief comments (*Quadraginta et sex annis*" and "*De nativitate domini*") on the symbolic significance of the date of the Incarnation; and the whole is entitled *De neocosmo*, for the "*intentio moysi*," according to Honorius, "*est restaurationem humani generis per Christum figuratiter narrare.*"⁴² Also, in the manuscript tradition, the *De neocosmo* is regularly accompanied by two treatises by Honorius on the Blessed Virgin Mary: the *Expositio in cantica canticorum*, and the *Sigillum sanctae Mariae*, which are, in effect, treatments of the same theme.⁴³

The *Hexaameron* proper is divided into two main sections: the first is a complete *Hexaameron*, in the traditional fashion, concluding with an account of the six ages of the world, as suggested by the six days of creation; the second part is really a second *Hexaameron*, this time purporting to summarize in simple form Augustine's discussions of the six days.

Honorius does not often refer explicitly to his sources; Josephus, Plato and Augustine are the only non-biblical names mentioned. Much of the material of the commentary is exegetical commonplace, and in the absence of explicit references or obvious literal parallels, it is difficult to identify the sources he used. But the first part of the work abounds in literal parallels to the *Hexaameron* of the Venerable Bede, to such an extent that he must have had a copy of Bede beside him as he wrote. Marginal notations in early manuscripts of the *De neocosmo* suggest that he attributed Bede's work to St. Jerome.⁴⁴

63-86; M.-O. Garrigues, "Qui était Honorius Augustodunensis?", in *Angelicum*, 50 (1973), pp. 20-49; R. D. Crouse, "Honorius Augustodunensis: Disciple of Anselm?", in H. Kohlenberger, ed., *Analecta Anselmiana*, IV, 2 (Frankfurt, 1975), pp. 131-139; M.-O. Garrigues, "Honorius était-il bénédictin?", in *Studia Monastica*, 19 (1977), pp. 27-46.

41. B. Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, II (Augsburg and Graz, 1721), col. 71-88 (= *PL*, 172, col. 253-266); the text is a transcription of a fourteenth century manuscript from Gaming (cf. Pez, II, vi). I have prepared a critical edition of the text (*Honorius Augustodunensis: De neocosmo*, pp. 175-232), but as it is not yet published, I shall give references to the *PL* edition, with corrections as necessary.

42. *PL*, 172, col. 253B.

43. *PL*, 172, col. 347-496; and col. 495-518.

44. This is true of nearly all the twelfth-century mss. of the *De neocosmo*,

Augustine is the obvious source of the second part of the work, which claims to be a brief paraphrase, "*nostro stylo*," of Augustine's discussions of the subject, so prolix, and so difficult for the "*infirmus intellectus*;"⁴⁵ and indeed, most of the content of this part can be traced to the *De genesi ad litteram*, or to other appropriate texts of Augustine.

There is nothing unusual, of course, in the use of Bede and Augustine in Medieval interpretations of Genesis; it would be genuinely surprising if they had been overlooked. But what is unusual about Honorius' work is the extent to which these traditional authorities have been supplemented and modified by less commonly approved sources: The *Timaeus* of Plato, and the *De divisione naturae* of John Scotus Eriugena.

In both sections of the *Hexaemeron*, there are marked indications of twelfth-century interests in the problems presented by the *physica* of the *Timaeus*, and in the instance where Plato's name is mentioned,⁴⁶ there is probably to be seen a direct reference to that dialogue. Although the content of the reference is such that the information could have come from any of a great many ancient or medieval sources, there is good reason to believe that Honorius did know the *Timaeus* directly. His use, at other points, of the unusual term, *sensilis*, a characteristic feature of Chalcidius' version and commentary, would best be explained by his familiarity with that text.⁴⁷ Furthermore, in the prologue to his own *Clavis physicae*, he

and suggests that Bede's *Hexaemeron* circulated under the name of Jerome. Robert Grosseteste also attributed it to Jerome: see J. T. Muckle, "Did Robert Grosseteste attribute the *Hexaemeron* of the Venerable Bede to St. Jerome?" in *Medieval Studies*, 13 (1951), pp. 242-246. C. W. Jones' account of the mss. of Bede includes no reference to such a tradition (*supra*, n. 6).

45. PL, 172, col. 260 B: "*Si enim ipsius verba posuero, nec pagina capit prolixitatem disputantis; nec infirmus intellectus gravitatem argumentis.*" Cf. Eriugena's comment on the "prolix" character of Augustine's account: *De div. nat.*, IV, 9 (PL, 122, col. 781c).

46. PL, 172, col. 263A.

47. Cf. J. H. Waszink, ed. *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus* (Plato latinus, IV, London and Leiden, 1962), p. 422. Honorius uses the term frequently, and sometimes explains the meaning of it, e.g., *De cog. vitae*, IV (PL, 40, col. 1009): "*Aer est spiritus sensilis, non sensibilis: id est, quem nos attrahendo sentimus, ipse nihil sentiens, cuncta tamen sub coelo viventibus spiramen exhibens.*" Cf. Honorius, *Clavis physicae* (ed. P. Lucentini, Rome, 1974), ch. 77, 1. 13, p. 56 (marginal gloss); ch. 273, 11, 1-6, p. 221; ch. 286, 11. 9-10, p. 232. The term is also used by William of Conches, *Glose super Platonem*, 172, 173 (ed. E. Jeuneau, Paris, 1965, p. 284), and by Gilbert of Poitiers, *Expos. in Boethii de trin.*, I, 2, 17-24 (ed. N. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius of Gilbert of Poitiers*, Toronto, 1966, pp. 81-83). Cf. also P. Classen, *Gerhoch von Reichersberg: Eine Biographie* (Wiesbaden, 1960), p. 434. In the two instances of the term "*sensilis*" in the

refers to the dialogue style of Plato, among others, as a model;⁴⁸ and the existence of a text of the *Timaeus* in close proximity to him seems assured by the mention of it in a twelfth-century library list particularly associated with him.⁴⁹

"*Peritissimus philosophorum Plato,*" says Honorius, "*librum suum* (i.e., the *Timaeus*) *sic, unus, duo, tres inchoavit.*" He then proceeds to a Pythagorean-Neoplatonic exegesis of this text in terms of the mathematical derivation of lower orders of being from the transcendent One, with the perilous suggestion of the application of that triadic structure of descent to the concept of the Trinity.⁵⁰

At another point, twelfth-century interests in the Platonic *physica* are again apparent, when Honorius, departing from Bede, observes with respect to the creation of the elements, that "*tetra rerum imago chaos vel informis materia cognominatur,*" and is anxious to make the point that the "*tenebrae*" which cover the face of the abyss must not be understood as a creature (i.e. an evil element), but simply as "*absentia lucis*".⁵¹

Again, in his exegesis of the Spirits' hovering over the waters, he picks up, probably from Eriugena, an alternative reading, "*vel aquas fovebat,*" closely associated in the history of hexaemeral interpretation with the Platonic doctrine of the *anima mundi* as "*vivificator*" of creation.⁵²

De neocosmo, the Pez (and PL) edition gives the corrupt reading, "*sensibilis*" (PL, 172, col. 254A, 261C).

48. *Clavis physicae*, prol. (ed. cit., p. 3).

49. The "*donatio Henrici,*" a list of books which "*Frater Henricus contulit huic ecclesiae,*" appears in Ms. Göttweig 33 (printed in T. Gottlieb, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskatalogue Österreichs*, Vienna, 1915, I, 9), and includes a remarkably comprehensive list of Honorius' works, together with a few other works particularly close to his interests. Unfortunately, the connection of the "*donatio*" with Honorius himself, and even with Göttweig, is far from clear.

50. PL, 172, col. 263B; cf. *Clavis physicae*, 118 (ed. cit., p. 88), and Eriugena, *De div. nat.*, III, 1 (PL, 122, col. 624, 625)

51. PL, 172, col. 255B; cf. Thierry of Chartres, *De sex diebus* (ed. N. Häring, in *Arch. d'hist. doct. et litt. du moyen âge*, 22, 1955, pp. 184-200), p. 152: "*Istam quattuor elementorum informitatem . . . antiqui philosophi tunc hylen, tunc chaon appelaverunt. Moyses vero nomine caeli et terrae eandem confusionem designat*"; William of Conches, *De philosophia mundi* (PL, 172, col. 54B); Chalcidius, *In Tim.*, CXXIII (ed. cit., pp. 166-167); see also, M.-D. Chenu, "Nature ou histoire," in *Arch. d'hist. doct. et litt.*, 20 (1953), pp. 20-30.

52. Cf. Ambrose, *Hexaemeron libri sex*, I, 8, 29 (ed. C. Schenkl, CSEL, XXXII, i, pp. 28-29); Augustine, *De genesi ad litteram*, I, 18 (ed. J. Zycha, CSEL, XXVIII, i, pp. 26-27); Eriugena, *De div. nat.*, II, 20 (PL, 122, col. 555 B); Honorius, *Clavis physicae*, 87 (ed. cit., p. 62); Chalcidius, *In Tim.*, LIV: "*Haec est illa rationabilis mundi anima . . . Isdem quippe virtutibus animae quibus sensilis mundus fovetur . . .*" (ed. cit., P. 102); Thierry of Chartres, *De*

In all these instances, whether the reference comes from Plato directly or not, the background reflected is unmistakably the problematic of hexaemeral exegesis in the context of twelfth-century Platonism. This is an interest which Honorius shares, of course, with many of his contemporaries, especially those of the School of Chartres.

But most interesting and most peculiar in the *Hexaemeron* of Honorius is the decisive influence of the *De divisione naturae* of John Scotus Eriugena. His bold appropriation of the fundamental tenets of Eriugena's exegesis of Genesis may well have given his contemporaries grounds for suspicion. That he was aware of this danger is evident from a passage in the *Clavis physicae*, where the *Discipulus* summarizes such views, and the *Magister* responds: "*Magna heresi redargueris.*"⁵³ And in the *Cognitio vitae*, in connection with a similar presentation, Honorius remarks that "*Hoc iterum infirmum intellectum scandalizat.*"⁵⁴

Although Eriugena's *De divisione naturae* was not formally condemned until 1210, suspicion of heresy attached to his name much earlier, partly because of the early condemnation of his doctrine of predestination, and partly because of a treatise on the Eucharist, falsely ascribed to him, condemned in the course of the Berengarian controversy in the mid-eleventh century.⁵⁵ An anonymous contemporary of Honorius reflects this suspicion: (Pseudo) William of St. Thierry, criticizing Abelard's description of "*temporalitatis huius cursum*" as "*involucrum*" (a term employed also by Honorius)⁵⁶ remarks that the use of this unusual term indicates that Abelard follows "*Johannem Scotum . . . qui frequentius hoc inusitato vocabulo usus est et ipse pro sua subtilitate de haeresi notatus est.*"⁵⁷ Caution, on grounds of such suspicion of Eriugena, may

sex diebus (ed. cit., pp. 192-194); William of Conches, *Glosae super Platonem* (ed. cit., pp. 144 ff.); T. Gregory, *Anima mundi. La filosofia di Guglielmo di Conches* (Florence, 1955).

53. *Clavis physicae*, 141 (ed. cit., p. 110): "*Nam si sic est, quis non confestim erumpat in hanc vocem et proclamet: 'Deus itaque omnia est et omnia Deus!' Quod monstruosum estimabitur etiam his qui putantur esse sapientes . . . magna heresi redargueris.*"

54. *PL*, 40, col. 1020.

55. On these points, the fullest account is that of F. Vernet, "Érigène," in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, V, col. 401-434, esp. 405-406, 429.

56. On the use of this term in the *Clavis physicae*, see M.-T. d'Alverny, "Le cosmos symbolique du XIIe siècle," in *Arch. d'hist. doct. et litt.*, 20 (1953), p. 35; Honorius also uses the term elsewhere: e.g., in the *Sigillum sanctae Mariae* (*PL*, 172, col. 495D).

57. *Disputatio altera adversus Abaelardum*, (*PL*, 180, col. 322). The same critic complains of the introduction in his own time of Greek sources: "*Id trahere videtur a quodam Maximo, quem puto graecum fuisse, quem et Joannes Scotus*

have dictated Honorius' own ascription of the *De divisione naturae* to "Chrisostomus,"⁵⁸ and his misplacing of "Joannes Scotus vel Chrisostomus" early among the excerpts from Isidore in the *De luminaribus ecclesiae*.⁵⁹

In the *Hexaemeron*, Eriugena's name is certainly never mentioned; but from the initial discussion of the *intentio* and *materia* of Moses, to the concluding line of the work, it displays the spirit and the doctrine, and sometimes the vocabulary of Eriugena.⁶⁰ In the first part, when Honorius goes beyond Bede, the sources are frequently to be discovered in Eriugena, either in Eriugena's own argument or in his extensive quotations from ancient sources. In the second part, the Augustine who is summarized is one who conforms very closely to Eriugena's interpretation of the Bishop of Hippo. There is strong emphasis upon the eternity of creation, "*causaliter et praedestinaliter*" in the divine wisdom;⁶¹ the division of the six days in the biblical story is understood as a concession to the slowness of human understanding, that "*a tardioribus . . . facile capitur, ut pomum fractum a parvulis manditur*,"⁶² or else, the hexaemeral division is a symbolic representation of the perfection of the cosmic order, signified by the perfection of the number six.⁶³ Virtually no attention is devoted to Augustine's anthropology, and none whatsoever to the Augustinian account of the fall of man.

To assess the full extent of Eriugena's influence in Honorius' commentary would require a very detailed discussion; we must

usque ad haeresim imitatus est," *ibid.*, col. 288. On the problems associated with the word, both for exegesis and philosophy, see M.-D. Chenu, "Involucrum: Le mythe selon les théologiens médiévaux," *Arch. d'hist. doct. et litt.*, 22 (1955), 75-79.

58. See the incipits, recorded by P. Lucentini, *Clavis physicae* (ed. cit.) p. 3. The ascription of Eriugena's works to John Chrysostom is fairly common after the time of Honorius; cf. N. Häring, "John Scottus in Twelfth-Century Angelology," in *The Mind of Eriugena*, pp. 158-181, p. 162 and note 17. The *De divisione naturae* was often known only by way of Honorius' *Clavis*; see the comments of M.-O. Garrigues, in a review of Lucentini's edition, in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 20 (1977), pp. 274-277.

59. *PL*, 172, col. 222C.

60. I have discussed the matter briefly in relation to the *De anima exsilio et patria*, in "Honorius Augustodunensis: The Arts as *via ad patriam*," in *Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen âge* (Montreal and Paris, 1969), pp. 531-539.

61. *PL*, 172, col. 260B; see the essay by R. Roques, "Genèse I, 1-3 chez Jean Scot Érigène" (supra, n. 1), esp. p. 210, on Eriugena's "éterniste" interpretation.

62. *PL*, 172, col. 262D-263A; cf. Eriugena, *De div. nat.* IV, 22 (*PL* 122, 848 A-B)

63. *PL*, 172, col. 263A; cf. *Clavis physicae*, 185, 11. 28-36 (ed. cit., p. 146-147)

rather be content to cite a few of the more striking examples. For instance, when Honorius declares that Moses intends to speak "figuraliter" of the restoration of all things in Christ, there are many possible *auctoritates*, including Eriugena;⁶⁴ but when he goes on to assert that the *materia* of Moses' account is "*hic sensilis mundus, in quem homo post lapsum est pulsus*," he certainly has in mind the Eriugenist doctrine according to which mundane corporeality is the mark of man's fallen condition.⁶⁵

Another significant instance is found in Honorius' account of the creation of man. The notion of man as *microcosm*, which underlies his view of man's relation to inferior creatures, could have been derived from many sources; Macrobius, Gregory the Great, Remegius of Auxerre, and many others, including Eriugena; but when he speaks of man as that "*coeleste animal*" in which God willed all things to be united, it is Eriugena who speaks.⁶⁶

Perhaps the most striking example occurs in Honorius' discussion of the ills of nature consequent upon the fall of man, where he speaks of the loss of paradisaical harmony of beasts with beasts, and of man with beasts — a world in which all things seem mutually contradictory. The thought could have many sources, but the voice of Eriugena comes through when Honorius goes on to assert that the world is none the less a "*universitas*," it is "*dei republica*,"⁶⁷ in which even apparently perverse elements serve good purposes, until, finally, the cosmos is transfigured in the new creation of the eighth day, when "*omnis corporea creatura in meliorem statum transformatur*."⁶⁸

64. PL, 172, col. 253B; cf. Eriugena, *De div. nat.*, V (PL, 122, col. 1001 B-D)

65. PL, 172, col. 254A. The PL text reads "*hic sensibilis mundus*," but the manuscript tradition is decisively in favour of "*sensilis*". For the doctrine here, see Honorius, *Clavis physicae*, 103-104 (ed. cit., pp. 75-76), and Eriugena, *De div. nat.*, II, 25-26 (PL, 122, col. 582-584).

66. PL, 172, col. 258C. On the microcosm idea in Eriugena, and its sources, see E. Jeuneau, ed., *Jean Scot: Homélie sur le prologue de Jean* (Paris, 1969), Appendix VII, pp. 336-338; cf. *Clavis physicae*, 248, 11. 24-26 (ed. cit., p. 196): "*Totus iste mundus sensilis in ipso conditus est . . .*" On man as "*coeleste animal*," cf. *Clavis physicae*, 241, 11. 20-23 (ed. cit., p. 190): "*Communicat autem animalibus corpore, vita, sensu et memoria sensibilium; participat vero celestem essentiam ratione, intellectu et memoria eternorum: in hac parte ad imaginem Dei factus est.*"

67. PL, 172, col. 258D-259A. On the notion of "*universitas*," cf. Eriugena, *De div. nat.* V (PL, 122, col. 954C). For "*Dei republica*," cf. *ibid.*, V (PL, 122, col. 969D, 972C, 984B).

68. PL, 172, col. 265B; cf. Eriugena, *De div. nat.*, V (PL, 122, col. 990D), where the idea is referred to Augustine, *De civ. dei*, XXII; see also *De div. nat.*, V (col. 884B), IV (col. 756A).

III

The *De neocosmo* is not a systematic theological treatise, but a popular tract, didactic and homiletic in character. The Eriugenist position we have described, and specified as its major doctrinal source, becomes explicit in only a few crucially significant instances, and is fully recognizable only when the *De neocosmo* is considered in the context of the fuller doctrinal statements of Honorius in other works, especially the *Cognitio vitae* and the *Clavis physicae*.

A particularly interesting aspect of Honorius' appropriation of Eriugena in general is the extent to which certain of the implications of that position are drawn out. Brian Stock, in several studies of Eriugena, has called attention to the concern for terrestrial reality implied in a "theophanic" view of the cosmos,⁶⁹ and indeed an emphasis upon the order and beauty of visible and invisible species is a significant feature of the *De divisione naturae*. But never in Eriugena does one come upon such rhapsodic expressions of delight in the diverse particulars of nature as one finds in Honorius. And never does one see in Eriugena that form of interest (surely more than "encyclopedic") in terrestrial reality which motivates such treatises as Honorius' *De imagine mundi* and *Summa totius*.⁷⁰

The totality of nature is, for Honorius, a *cosmos*, in Eriugena's sense of that word;⁷¹ though fallen, in man's fall, the world still represents a harmony, and is still the sphere of *multae divinae apparitiones*.⁷² Every element of it is precious, and the source of wonder and delight:

69. See B. Stock, "Observations on the Use of Augustine by Johannes Scottus Eriugena," in *Harvard Theological Review*, 60 (1967), pp. 213-220, and more fully, "The Philosophical Anthropology of Johannes Scottus Eriugena," in *Studi medievali*, 3rd series, 8 (1967), pp. 1-57; the character and influence of Eriugena's doctrine is explored by W. Beierwaltes, "Negati Afirmatio, or the World as Metaphor: A foundation for medieval aesthetics from the writings of John Scotus Eriugena," in *Dionysius*, 1 (1977), pp. 127-159.

70. The *De imagine mundi*, on cosmology, times and seasons, and universal history, is printed in *PL*, 172, cols. 115A-186C; also partially, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS; X. The *Summa totius de omnimoda historia*, a chronicle of universal history, is printed only in part (the Medieval section only) in *M.G.H. SS.*, X, and that portion is reprinted in *PL*, 172, cols. 187-196.

71. Cf. Eriugena, *Commentarius in Evangelium Johannis*, III, 6 (ed. E. Jeaneau, in *Sources chrétiennes*, 180, Paris, 1972, p. 232): "'Cosmos' quippe grece ornatus proprie interpretatur, non mundus."

72. Honorius, *De anima exsilio et patria* (*PL*, 172, col. 1246B); "*divinae apparitiones*" is Eriugena's translation of "theophania": *De div. nat.*, II, 23 (*PL*, 122, col. 577A).

Nempe totus hic mundus instar brevissimi puncti intra Deum colligitur; serenissima autem lux majestatis ejus extra undique versum in immensum diffunditur. Deus quippe universa supra et infra, interius et exterius, et in circuitu essentialiter replet; et nullius creaturae intellectus interminabilem ejus substantiam ulla cogitatione excidit. Hoc iterum infirmum intellectum scandalizat, et tacitus apud se volutat: Si cuncta in Deo sunt, ergo et lupi et serpentes imo et daemones in eo sunt. Hic, ut supra, nulla inconvenientia comprobatur, dum in his omnibus bonum reperiatur. Omne autem bonum in Deo est, extra quem nihil est.⁷³

All creatures sense God within them, for God is the life by which they live.⁷⁴ From this standpoint, the angel, though immortal, is not greater than the worm, for both have life; "*nec minus subsistit athomus quam olympus . . . stultus non intelliget hec . . .*"⁷⁵

Summus namque opifex universitatem quasi magnam citharam condidit, in qua veluti varias chordas ad multiplices sonos reddendos posuit . . . Spiritus enim et corpus quasi virilis et puerilis chorus gravem et acutum sonum reddunt, dum in natura dissentiunt, in essentia boni conveniunt. Ipsi ordines spirituum reddunt discrimina vocum . . . Qui omnes dulci harmonia consonant . . . Similiter corporalia vocum discrimina imitantur, dum in varia genera, in varias species, in individua, in formas, in numeros separantur: quae omnia concorditer consonant, dum legem sibi insitam quasi tinnulos modulibus servant. Reciprocum sonum reddunt Spiritus et corpus, angelus et diabolus, coelum et infernus, ignis et aqua, aer et terra, dulce et amarum, molle et durum, et sic caetera in hunc modum.⁷⁶

The world, even in its fallen state, is not the penitent's cell: it is the sphere of "*magna delectatio*."⁷⁷ There is no place for the ancient Platonist's inveterate suspicion of an ultimate opposition of

73. Honorius, *Cognitio vitae*, 25 (PL, 40, col. 1020).

74. *Ibid.*, 24 (PL, 40, cols. 1019-20); cf. *Elucidarium*, I, 5 (PL, 172, col. 1113A-B).

75. Honorius, *Quaestio utrum deus ubique sit* (Ms. Munich 22225, fol. 46V).

76. Honorius, *Liber XII quaestionum*, II (PL, 172, col. 1179B-D): C. Baumker, noticing this passage, refers to "den gleichfalls von platonischem Geiste erfüllten Honorius Augustodunensis;" *Studien und Charakteristiken zur Geschichte der Philosophie* (ed. M. Grabmann, Beiträge, XXV, 2 [Munster i. W., 1928]), p. 175. Cf. Eriugena, *De div. nat.*, I, 72 (PL, 122, col. 517C))

77. Honorius, *Elucidarium*, I, 12 (PL, 172, col. 1117C): "*Omnis itaque Dei creatio consideranti magna est delectatio . . .*"

principles, nor even for the austerity of the Augustinian "*utendum, non fruendum*."⁷⁸ Thus Honorius shares, with the Platonists of Chartres, that openness to the world, and confidence in the goodness of nature as "God's republic," which is the essential foundation of the Christian humanism of the twelfth century renaissance. It is especially interesting that Honorius, within a context of monastic piety, represents this humanistic attitude in a time when the tension between cloister and world, between worldly and sacred learning, is manifest in the decline and suppression of both the external and internal monastic schools;⁷⁹ and interesting, too, that he presents such a standpoint in works designed for the edification of the simple and unlearned.

Most of the works of Honorius are *elucidaria*, written in the simple, but elegant, rhymed prose of which he was master, designed to clarify for monks, and especially for preachers, the obscurities of Christian doctrine.⁸⁰ Time and again his concern is expressed for the "*simpliciores*," who are puzzled by the difficulties of the traditional theological texts, and for those whose progress is impeded by poverty of books or the oppression of practical affairs.⁸¹ Thus he provided guidebooks for the interpretation of the liturgy and of the more difficult books of Scripture; and also *compendia* of natural and human history, in the conviction that informed contemplation of the created order should be parallel to knowledge of the sacred text as a way of ascent to the *patria* of divine wisdom; for these two ways of knowledge, he remarks,

78. Cf. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, I, 4 (PL, 34, col. 21); on the character and difficulties of an Augustinian aesthetic, see the recent study by R. J. O'Connell, *Art and the Christian Intelligence in St. Augustine* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978). His comments on "The World of Resurrection" (pp. 164-165) are especially relevant to the argument of this paper.

79. See P. Delhaye, "L'organisation scolaire au XIIe siècle," *Traditio*, V (1947), pp. 211-68, section II: "Écoles des moines," pp. 225-38; J. Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (Eng. trans., N.Y., 1961), pp. 197-98. Leclercq quotes Peter Comestor: "There are some who do more praying than reading: they are the cloister dwellers; there are others who spend all their time reading and rarely pray: they are the schoolmen" (*Sermo IX*, PL, 198, 1747).

80. The most thorough account of the history of Latin rhymed prose, in antiquity and the Middle Ages, is K. Polheim, *Die lateinische Reimprosa* (Berlin, 1925). He devotes three pages (384-386) to Honorius, with special attention to the *Gemma animae* and the *Sacramentarium*. Honorius is by no means peculiar in using rhymed prose, but the thoroughness with which he employs it in nearly all his works is surely exceptional.

81. Cf. Honorius, *Hexaemeron* (PL, 172, col. 253B); *Cognitio vitae*, I (PL, 40, col. 1006); on the "*simplices*," see also Eriugena, *De. div. nat.*, I, 67, 73 (PL, 122, cols. 511C, 518C).

following Eriugena, are symbolized in the two-fold vesture of the transfigured Christ.⁸²

This combination of the luminous metaphysics of Christian Neoplatonism with an intense practical engagement in the edification of the "*oves Christi*"⁸³ sets Honorius apart from all his more noted contemporaries in the early twelfth century schools. He is not to be understood as a disciple, faithful or otherwise, of Anselm of Canterbury, whose more orthodox Augustinianism and measured scholastic prose bespeak a very different intellectual formation, and a very different audience.⁸⁴ He shares a philosophical position in common with the Platonists of Chartres, but never in Thierry and Bernard of Chartres or William of Conches does one find that perspective expressed in the popular and devotional forms so characteristic of Honorius. In Scriptural exegesis, he shows affinities to Rupert of Deutz and Gerhoch of Reichersberg, and is sometimes thought to be dependent upon Rupert;⁸⁵ but neither Rupert nor Gerhoch could share that rationalism, or humanism, which permits Honorius, following Eriugena, to define "*auctoritas*" as "*nihil . . . aliud . . . quam per rationem probata veritas*."⁸⁶ In comparison with the Scriptural glosses and *sententiae* of the School of Laon, the works of Honorius, under the strong influence of Eriugena, manifest a more marked affection for allegory, and a greater interest in extended theological explication of texts.⁸⁷ And while Honorius shares with

82. *De animae exsilio et patria*, PL, 172, col. 1246A; cf. Eriugena, *De div. nat.* III, 35 (PL, 122, col. 723D), and the discussion of this text in my article, "*Honorius Augustodunensis: The Arts as via ad patriam*," (*supra*, n. 60), p. 538. Eriugena's image comes from Maximus, *Ambigua*, VI (PG, 91, 1128C-D).

83. Honorius, *Sacramentarium*, CII (PL, 172, col. 806).

84. Various opinions on this point are discussed in my article "*Honorius Augustodunensis: Disciple of Anselm*" (*supra*, n. 40); see also the comments of M.-O. Garrigues, "*Honorius Augustodunensis: De anima et de Deo*," in *Recherches augustiniennes*, 12 (1977), pp. 212-278, pp. 231-232.

85. In the *Hexaemeron*, where Endres suggests influence is probable (*Honorius*, p. 41, n. 2), none is to be found. J. de Ghellinck, *L'essor de la littérature latine au XIIe siècle* (Paris, 1946), I, 114, rightly remarks that Rupert and Honorius speak with a very different spirit; Rupert's work is marked generally by his fanatical opposition to dialectic, which is also a strong characteristic of Gerhoch: see J. Bach, *Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters*, II, 475ff, esp. 512-14. C. Spicq, *Exquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge* (Paris, 1944), p. 140, contrasts Honorius' "*souci d'explication théologique*," with Rupert's "*recherche du sens littéral*."

86. Honorius, *Liber VIII quaestionum* (PL, 172, 1185B); cf. Eriugena, *De div. nat.* I, 69 (PL, 122, 513B): "*Nil enim aliud mihi videtur esse vera auctoritas, nisi rationis virtute reperta veritas . . .*"

87. See Spicq, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

William of St. Thierry and the Victorines an enthusiasm for the legacy of the Greek patristic tradition, he shares only in small measure their development of that legacy in the direction of a psychological mysticism.⁸⁸

Honorius, in doctrine and method, as well as in biography, stands thus as a *solitarius*, a theological pioneer, living in a personal obscurity perhaps necessitated by the very boldness of his intellectual stance. He wished to hide his name under a mantle of silence; and the accumulated evidence and hypotheses advanced in the course of five centuries of historical studies do not serve very far towards the penetration of that silence. The remark of Barthélemy Haureau still retains its challenge: "*l'auteur qui n'a pas voulu se nommer sera toujours 'inconnu'*".⁸⁹

Dalhousie University,
Halifax, N.S.

88. On the Greek Patristic sources (including Eriugena) of William, see J.-M. Dechanet, *Guillaume de saint-Thierry: l'homme et son oeuvre* (Bruges, 1942), esp. pp. 2, 11; J. Hourlier, *Guillaume de saint-Thierry: La contemplation de Dieu* (Paris, 1959), pp. 41-43; on these influences in William, the Victorines, and more widely, see M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle*, pp. 274-308.

89. *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la bibliothèque nationale*, V (Paris, 1892), p. 266.

Note: On all matters pertaining to Honorius, one must now consult the thorough and comprehensive study by M.-O. Garrigues, *L'oeuvre d'Honorius Augustodunensis: Inventaire critique* (Ph. D. diss., Université de Montréal, 1979), to be published shortly.